

Contents

Andrew Inglis	6
Thomas A L Ingram	9
Charles Isaac	29
Michael James	32
Wade Jaradine	33
Dan Thomas Jenkins	56
Lisa Thomas Jenkins.....	58
Mark Jennings	60
Carolyn G. John.....	65
Trevor Alan Johnson	67
Charlotte Johnson.....	70
Donna Johnston	73
Chris jones	77
Mary-Jane Jones.....	78
Mr Robert Jones	81
Susan Jones	82
Theo Jones	85
Trist Jones	90
Robert Oliver Kathro	94
Alison Keen	96
MR MARK L KENT	97
Professor Julie Kent & Mr Michael Kent.....	98
Nicola Kew	100
Anne Killoran	102
Charles King	104
Ellen kinnear.....	106
Jane Kinnersley	112
Tom Kinnersley	116
Joanna Knott.....	121
Liesbeth Kop.....	125

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

NICHOLAS LAMBRECHTS.....	134
Vanessa Land	147
Catherine Langston.....	148
Nick Larkin	160
Alan Lascelles	164
Louise Lawton	172
Simon Leat	174
Mrs Sally Leat	176
Penelope Leather.....	180
Ceri lees.....	181
Stuart lees.....	183
Liz Lees	185
Margaret Leppard.....	188
H J M Lester	228
Melanie Lester	233
Jacqueline Mary Lock	234
Kim Lock	257
Carol Long.....	274
Penny Lowery	275
Keith Luckhurst.....	276
Lyn Lynch	298
STEPHEN LYNCH	300
W J C Lyne	310
Helen and Frank Connor Madaney.....	319
Helen Madell	322
Kay Mahony	323
Brian Mahony.....	327
Louisa Malone	333
Kenneth Malone.....	339
Mrs Janet S Manfield	347
Peter Manfield	348
Helen Marchant	356

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

David Marjoram	358
Jackie Marjoram.....	362
Brian Martin.....	366
Simon & Mandy Martyn.....	367
Sharon Mason.....	369
Sheila Christina Maycock	371
Alison Elizabeth McLaren.....	373
Robin James Meadwell	375
Susan Miller.....	391
Francesca Mills.....	392
Helen Mitchell	394
Peter Money	396
Amanda Moors	398
Pam Moreline	415
MR D. MORGAN	417
Richard Morgan.....	428
Helen Morgan-Parra	442
Pat Morley	462
Sue-Claire Morris	468
Caroline Munday.....	469
Richard Munday.....	472
Kevin Murch.....	475
David Murphy	481
Martin Nancekivell	482
Lucy Neal	484
Penelope Newton.....	486
Malcolm Newton	488
Philip Newton	492
Frances Nicholls	494
Mark Nicholls	505
Lucy Nicholls-Brice	535
Heath Nickels	539

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

Gabriel Nother	540
Kayleigh Ojaim	548
Julia Ojaim.....	572
Anna Oldroyd	599
Judith Oliver.....	626
Naomi and Lionel Osborne	629
Mr S.J. Padbury	631
Julia Padbury	636
Ivan Parker.....	641
Richard Parkyn.....	643
Chrissie Parrott	660
Tim Parrott.....	671
Philip Parsons	673
pamela parsons	675
M.J.F Pash	693
Steve and Terri Passenger	695
Ali Pawson.....	697
Judith Pearce	699
Mr Tom Pearson	700
annette pearson	705
Janet Penrose	708
Julie Pepper	710
Nick Pepper	711
Linda Perry	713
Chris Perry.....	716
Roy & Margaret Peters	719
Amanda Peters	721
Alison Phillips	723
Colin and Christine Pilcher	733
Philippe Planel.....	734
Fern Purchall	754

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

Filtered Data Export

Andrew Inglis

Full name: Andrew Inglis

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.: SD06

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::
Sidm_06a

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: My concerns and objections:-

1 I have found out about this development I believe it is known as Sidm 06a and Sidb 06b today from a neighbour.

- I can find no reference on the ED planning website
- I can find no search facility of the ED planning website
- you have not used your APP to inform residents
- you have used no other discernible method to inform residents
- your website under 'second regulation 19' and 'commonplace' offers an option to comment or object but only if you can correctly identify the particular planning decision, which I couldn't.
- I have found no reference to this in the local newspaper (which I don't take)

2 Putting all the points together in 1 it is clear that there has been a deliberate attempt to 'under publicise' or hide this proposal. This is at best deceiving. I am

a computer literate and able communicator. If I can't find it - it ISN'T well enough publicised.

3 My other objections are obvious to all but the blind or those with an entirely different agenda. a It is a major development in a protected landscape (especially when allied to the other 238 houses proposed) These should be mandatorily refused except in exceptional circumstances. b The development will degrade the character of a protected area c It violates the GREEN WEDGE policy d it erodes the gap between Sidford and Sidbury e It sets precedent making other defences impossible f It directly contradicts the Marlcombe strategy g It ignores 'Brownfield First' h It is environmentally ridiculous I It is detrimental to local heritage j J must stand for JOKE - there is NO INFRASTRUCTURE to cope. Doctors, Dentists, Roads etc etc. You cannot as an authority meet your obligations now.

In conclusion it is UNSOUND and NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT.

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.: My concerns and objections:-

1 I have found out about this development I believe it is known as Sidm 06a and Sidb 06b today from a neighbour.

- I can find no reference on the ED planning website
- I can find no search facility of the ED planning website
- you have not used your APP to inform residents
- you have used no other discernible method to inform residents
- your website under 'second regulation 19' and 'commonplace' offers an option to comment or object but only if you can correctly identify the particular planning decision, which I couldn't.
- I have found no reference to this in the local newspaper (which I don't take)

2 Putting all the points together in 1 it is clear that there has been a deliberate attempt to ‘under publicise’ or hide this proposal. This is at best deceiving. I am a computer literate and able communicator. If I can’t find it - it ISN’T well enough publicised.

3 My other objections are obvious to all but the blind or those with an entirely different agenda. a It is a major development in a protected landscape (especially when allied to the other 238 houses proposed) These should be mandatorily refused except in exceptional circumstances. b The development will degrade the character of a protected area c It violates the GREEN WEDGE policy d it erodes the gap between Sidford and Sidbury e It sets precedent making other defences impossible f It directly contradicts the Marlcombe strategy g It ignores ‘Brownfield First’ h It is environmentally ridiculous I It is detrimental to local heritage j J must stand for JOKE - there is NO INFRASTRUCTURE to cope. Doctors, Dentists, Roads etc etc. You cannot as an authority meet your obligations now.

In conclusion it is UNSOUND and NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT.

Thomas A L Ingram

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

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.:

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths -Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

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.:

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 165 of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to be subject to development...We do not believe that

it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan”. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 3.6 and 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Thomas A L Ingram

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result

in degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths - Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Charles Isaac

Full name: Charles Isaac

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Its is contrary to many adopted policies in the Local Plan

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:
Remove EXMO_20 as a site being considered for housing development

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.: The proposed development of site EXMO_20 is fundamentally flawed for the following reasons:- 1) Roads that would serve the site are woefully inadequate and any increased traffic flow along the B3179 would add to the numerous accidents that already occur on that road. 2) The drainage and sewer system in Exmouth & Budleigh is notorious for its lack of capacity and it clearly cannot cope with its current loads with regular weekly discharges of sewage into the Exe and the sea. If consent were to be granted then I recommend that a Grampian Condition be imposed to ensue that the developer, land owner and SWW prove that sufficient new sewage infrastructure will be provided to cope with the additional load on the system. 3) Exmouth only has one secondary school and there is no capacity for any additional pupils - the subject site could house between

250 and 500 children of secondary school age. 4) Doctors surgeries and hospital facilities are already at full stretch and there is no additional capacity to provide healthcare for the residents of the new estate who could number as many as 3000. 5) The development proposed at Exmo_20 would inevitably bring hundreds of cats and dogs to the area to the great detriment to Woodbury Common Pebblebed Heaths(SAC/SPA). Developing Exmo_20 is contrary to POLICY PB01 of the local plan. There is no provision for any SANG. The extra dogs which could number as many as 1000 will also no doubt be taken to the beach and foul there too. and not in accordance with the mitigation strategy. 6) Exmo_20 would destroy the "tranquillity, wildness and dark skies" of the countryside, which is contrary to POLICY OL01. 7) Developing Exmo_20 would fragment and isolate habitats and destroy wildlife corridors, contrary to PARAGRAPH 13.23 of the Local Plan. It would be detrimental to irreplaceable habitats, veteran trees and species rich hedgerows across the site, contrary to PARAGRAPH 13.9. 8) Exmo_20 would have significant adverse effects on St John in the Wilderness Grade II* listed church and churchyard, drastically altering the peaceful setting for worship which currently exists for the congregation. This is contrary to POLICY HEO. 9) The development of Exmo_20 will cause increased risk of flooding. The site is upstream of Exmouth on the main rainwater catchment area of Withycombe Brook, on a subsoil of heavy clay which makes soakaways ineffective. It would exacerbate the already identified flood risk through the lower lying land at the bottom of the site and down through Withycombe. This is in conflict with POLICY ARO1B. 10) The location is not sustainable and would increase the need for car travel and increase traffic congestion, in conflict with PARAGRAPH 11.2. It is unsustainable development. It is isolated and people would need to travel much further than 800m to existing key services and facilities, contrary to PARAGRAPH 11.6. It is too far (and too steep) from any town centre for people to use walking or cycling as their choice of transport. This is contrary to POLICY TR01. 11) The main access point of Exmo_20 is significantly closer to Budleigh Salterton than Exmouth, making Budleigh its most convenient and accessible town. The services and infrastructure of Budleigh (High Street, Doctor's, school, beach etc) would be the obvious choice for residents of Exmo_20. This would lead to coalescence of Budleigh and Exmouth, contrary to POLICY OL05 of the local Plan. 12) Development of the site would further encroach on the important gap separating Exmouth from Lympstone and Budleigh which will lead to the three settlements eventually coalescing to become one ugly urban sprawl.

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.: Remove EXMO_20 from the Local Plan

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Michael James

Full name: Michael James

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?: 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 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.: I object to the EXMO_20 planned development of 700 homes. Firstly it is detrimental to our beautiful Pebblebed Heaths. (SAC/SPA) Secondly the preposed access point onto the B3179 is nearer to Budleigh Salterton than Exmouth and would put an obvious strain on services, already under pressure, such as GP services and schools and the infrastructure of Budleigh town to include the high street, beach and utilities. Specifically waste water and drainage. THIS IS CONTRARY TO POLICY 0L05 of the local plan. SE water already struggle to maintain services to Budleigh and 700 more homes would inevitably result in more sewage spills into the sea impacting wildlife and the health of local residents.

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.: Please ensure these comments are taken into account EXMO_20 should not be allowed to go ahead.

Wade Jaradine

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.: Reomove Exmo_20 from the draft plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heath" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Exmo_20 On page 392 the SA states “The 400m buffer from the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC coincides with the higher, more prominent parts of Exmo_20, meaning built development will not be permitted in this area and so reducing adverse landscape effects to a minor negative.” . The LPA refuse to use this wording in the Local Plan, stating multiple times that development including buildings can be located in the top 400m. The Local Plan should accord with the assessment in the SA, stating “No Built Development”. The viability of the site allocation should be reassessed due to this 400m constraint further compounding the significant and material reduction in the size of the site from the falsely claimed 85Ha, approved for allocation in the draft Local Plan on 3rd September 2024. Secondly, on page 396 the SA states “The north eastern part of Exmo_20 is in a mineral safeguarding area, but this largely coincides with the 400m buffer from the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC where development will not be allowed in any case.” The LPA refuse to use this wording in the Local Plan, stating multiple times that development including buildings can be located in the top 400m. The Local Plan should accord with the assessment in the SA, with the 400 metres adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI removed from the site allocation and the settlement boundary revised accordingly. The viability of the site allocation should be reassessed due to inability to construct the proposed access road without direct conflict with the SA’s conclusions, along with this additional 400m site area constraint further compounding the material reduction in the size of the site from the falsely claimed 85Ha, approved for allocation in the draft Local Plan on 3rd September 2024. Thirdly, on page 399 the SA states, regarding mitigation measures, “Mitigate impact upon Exe Estuary and Pebblebed Heaths SPAs – to be considered in the Habitats Regulations Assessment, though for areas of Exmo_04 and 20 within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths mitigation would not be seen as possible. Exmo_04 can be amended to exclude the most sensitive area, resulting in Exmo_04a.” There is no justification or consistency in excluding part of Exmo_04 but not Exmo_20. The Local Plan should accord with the assessment in the SA, with the 400 metres adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI removed from the site allocation and the settlement boundary revised accordingly. The viability of the site allocation should be reassessed due to inability to construct the proposed access road without direct conflict with the SA’s conclusions, along with this additional 400m site area constraint further compounding the material reduction in the size of the site from the falsely claimed 85Ha, approved for allocation in the draft Local Plan on 3rd September 2024.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.: Exmo_20 On page 392 of the SA, Exmo_20 is stated as being 85Ha and a map of a site this size was shown to the Strategic Planning Committee on 3rd September 2024, who were attracted by the large size of the site and voted for that site to be included in the draft Local Plan. The evidence provided was false, as that site did not exist as it was not available, therefore the decision was unsound. The site available was significantly and materially smaller, such that the committee was misled and the decision is therefore invalid.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.: Exmo_20 On page 390 the SA states " Sites on the north-eastern side of Exmouth, specifically Exmo_04, and Lymp_09, 10, 13, 14 and 17 lie especially close to the Pebblebed Heaths and as such development of these sites could lead to some of the greater adverse impacts and a large part of Site Exmo_04 falls within the existing 400 metre exclusion zone for development on account around domestic cat predation and recreation impacts". The 400m exclusion zone relates to urban effect, not "recreation impacts", demonstrating the LPA's (as the Competent Authority) misunderstanding of the Habitats Regulations. Recreational effects are dealt with by a wholly different assessment and different mitigation. On page 391 of the SA, Exmo_20 is considered but with no mention of "could lead to some of the greater adverse impacts" for the sites listed on p390, despite Exmo_20 being the largest site and closest (adjacent to) site to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, demonstrating an inconsistent assessment. The latest HRA currently states an "Inherent Conflict". There is now mention in the SA of the Strategic Nature Area and draft Nature Recovery Network but this has been added in further to the 1st regulation 19 consultation feedback and is material consideration in assessment of the site's allocation, in accordance with Paragraph 180 & 181 of the NPPF December 2023. These factors provide evidence to demonstrate the land's high biodiversity value to "establish coherent ecological networks", not least as a support habitat for the Section 41 Principle Importance species ground nesting Nightjar. The site's allocation needs to be reassessed with this evidence in mind, as currently the justification for its inclusion is unsound.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Exmo_20 Exmo_20 is falsely listed as a reasonable alternative on page 386 & 387. Firstly, the site was deemed unsuitable and unachievable, not just unachievable as stated. There has been no evidence provided demonstrating that site access, minerals and proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths can be addressed, with the access arrangements and impacts on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI reliant on a viable agreed mitigation strategy and supporting HRA which are both absent from the Local Plan evidence, notably the HRA being a required Core Submission Document. Also note that the Exmo_20 site was selected for inclusion in the Local Plan prior to the Appropriate Assessment, in conflict with the 'People over Wind' CJEU ruling. Furthermore, the Exmo_20 site as submitted for assessment in the HELAA was not available, but was not checked despite this being one of the three HELAA assessments. The site therefore in fact failed all three tests, and should be stated to have been found unsuitable, unachievable & unavailable. The site's current inclusion in the draft Local Plan is not legally compliant, unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.: Exmo_20 Exmo_20 should be marked blue “failed site sifting” on the map on page 384 as it was deemed unsuitable & unachievable in the HELAA and in accordance with the Site Selection Methodology (May 2022) failed site sifting. The site’s current inclusion in the draft Local Plan is unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.:

Exmo_20 There appears to be such significant changes to the Sustainability Appraisal that it is fundamentally a different document providing very different justification to the previous 1st Regulation 19 version, not least regarding the inclusion of HELAA failed sites such as Exmo_20. This appraisal has been retrospectively written based on consultation feedback regarding its shortcomings. The decisions made prior cannot rely on a subsequently fabricated document to provide evidence to somehow inform decisions such that they change from unsound to sound. The retrospectively created Site Selection Methodology (v2 December 2024) is now significantly relied upon in a futile attempt by the LPA to provide justification. The Exmo_20 site's inclusion in the draft Local Plan is unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Wade Jaradine

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.: It is not possible to follow the significant changes made to the Sustainability Appraisal, as there is no Schedule of Changes and no tracked changes version. I am therefore unable to make comments in accordance with the consultation requirements which states “Only make new representations if you are commenting on the specific changes listed in the Schedule of Changes, or if you did not respond to the first consultation”. The Schedule of Changes and a tracked changes version need to be made available and permitted to be consulted upon.

Dan Thomas Jenkins

Full name: Dan Thomas Jenkins

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Exmo_17

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.: I am writing to object to the above named development for the following reasons;

1) large housing estates of this nature should not be built on National landscape.

2) building on other land outside the National landscape would be cheaper allowing for a higher percentage of affordable homes for local people.

3) the entrance to this site would cause more traffic chaos and cut across the cycle track/ footpath from Exmouth to Budleigh causing risk to pedestrians, animals and other users.

This particular area is of such outstanding beauty and if built on will be irreplaceable to the local community, wildlife and local landscape.

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.: Please do not allow this housing development to proceed in this area.

Lisa Thomas Jenkins

Full name: Lisa Thomas Jenkins

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Exmo_17

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 whom it may concern, I am writing to object to the above named development for the following reasons; 1) large housing estates of this nature should not be built on National landscape. 2) building on other land outside the National landscape would be cheaper allowing for a higher percentage of affordable homes for local people. 3) the entrance to this site would cause more traffic chaos and cut across the cycle track/ footpath from Exmouth to Budleigh causing risk to pedestrians, animals and other users.

This particular area is of such outstanding beauty and if built on will be irreplaceable to the local community, wildlife and local landscape. Please do not allow this housing development to proceed in this area

Full name: Lisa Thomas Jenkins

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Exmo_17

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 whom it may concern, I am writing to object to the above named development for the following reasons; 1) large housing estates of this nature should not be built on National landscape. 2) building on other land outside the National landscape would be cheaper allowing for a higher percentage of affordable homes for local people. 3) the entrance to this site would cause more traffic chaos and cut across the cycle track/ footpath from Exmouth to Budleigh causing risk to pedestrians, animals and other users.

This particular area is of such outstanding beauty and if built on will be irreplaceable to the local community, wildlife and local landscape. Please do not allow this housing development to proceed in this area.

Mark Jennings

Full name: Mark Jennings

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Exmo_20

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: the current Goodmores development increase in construction traffic, general increase in traffic that new accommodation brings has and will continue to degrade the already poor state of the roads to and from and around Exmouth. Further increase in both construction and housing traffic can only cause more damage, wear and tear which is currently unable to be managed.

Commuter traffic is already causing significant delays to Exeter

All roads to and from Exmouth to surrounding areas are regularly hit by accidents and congestion.

Housing stock: there are a number of proposals for new housing in Exmouth, all rapidly eroding the natural beauty of our area and will undoubtedly have an impact on wildlife in Particular Pebble Bed Heaths, Bystock fishponds etc.

Is adequate consideration/forecasting made for the general impact of all these schemes both in terms of current occupancy of all new build projects and proposed projects and the impact on domestic and town amenities.

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

Where are 1400 people going to work, park their cars educate their children visit healthcare settings. All these services are under pressure now before this or other projects get the go ahead.

We already have water pollution a regular basis.

Local plan, is the need for continuous housing development evidenced or just part of a national target.

Does the local plan evidence population growth going forward rather than just meeting set targets.

Starting to build on exmo_20 site will not be part of a real community it will probably need to attract people with their own transport. It will undoubtedly increase pollution to sensitive open areas we have all supported.

What financial benefit can be demonstrated as a result of this development to the town.

What remedial/repair work will be funded by the developers

Can the developers evidence the impact they will have, hard facts, monies or grants rather than rhetoric.

I would ask the planning panel to seek/use formal processes to ensure concerns have been fully considered and that any current and future planning props have to meet stringent tests on local need/impact analysis.

Do we need these houses Will they be affordable for young families Will they provide jobs Can south west water cope with the sewage/water Can roads be maintained better than now Can wildlife be protected Is it morally right to erode natural often protected habitats

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Delete 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.: the current Goodmores development increase in construction traffic, general increase in traffic that new accommodation brings has and will continue to degrade the already poor state of the roads to and from and around Exmouth. Further increase in both construction and housing traffic can only cause more damage, wear and tear which is currently unable to be managed.

Commuter traffic is already causing significant delays to Exeter

All roads to and from Exmouth to surrounding areas are regularly hit by accidents and congestion.

Housing stock: there are a number of proposals for new housing in Exmouth, all rapidly eroding the natural beauty of our area and will undoubtedly have an impact on wildlife in Particular Pebble Bed Heaths, Bystock fishponds etc.

Is adequate consideration/forecasting made for the general impact of all these schemes both in terms of current occupancy of all new build projects and proposed projects and the impact on domestic and town amenities.

Where are 1400 people going to work, park their cars educate their children visit healthcare settings. All these services are under pressure now before this or other projects get the go ahead.

We already have water pollution a regular basis.

Local plan, is the need for continuous housing development evidenced or just part of a national target.

Does the local plan evidence population growth going forward rather than just meeting set targets.

Starting to build on exmo_20 site will not be part of a real community it will probably need to attract people with their own transport. It will undoubtedly increase pollution to sensitive open areas we have all supported.

What financial benefit can be demonstrated as a result of this development to the town.

What remedial/repair work will be funded by the developers

Can the developers evidence the impact they will have, hard facts, monies or grants rather than rhetoric.

I would ask the planning panel to seek/use formal processes to ensure concerns have been fully considered and that any current and future planning props have to meet stringent tests on local need/impact analysis.

Do we need these houses Will they be affordable for young families Will they provide jobs Can south west water cope with the sewage/water Can roads be maintained better than now Can wildlife be protected Is it morally right to erode natural often protected habitats

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.: Delete Exmo_20

Carolyn G. John

Full name: Carolyn G. John

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.: I wish to submit my objection to the proposal for a vast building site next to the B3179 that is used by all Budleigh and some Exmouth residents to travel to and from Exeter by car. This road would have to be widened significantly to cope with all the extra traffic generated, first for the building itself of 800 + houses, involving lorries and suppliers, and further by each potential house likely having one or two cars. The alternative route to Exeter from Exmouth to the west would also be impacted.

The site proposed is nearer to Budleigh centre (2.3 miles) than to the centre of Exmouth (4.0 miles). Exmo_20's limited access arrangements would significantly increase the need for car travel from the main access point proposed on the B3179, even if widened, to access facilities and services, therefore an unsustainable location for development. The site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton, which has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 site. At present, our surgery and primary school are struggling to cope with the existing population.

It has been stated that 'alternative sites' have been discounted for Exmouth, but can we be sure that all potential brownfield sites have been considered?

The existing population of Exmouth at the 2021 (last) census, was 35,488, the fifth largest settlement in Devon by population. This figure increases massively with the influx of visitors and tourists, not only in the summer but all year round, bringing an inevitable increase in road traffic on our narrow roads.

It is incredible that the planners/developers could think it desirable to build round St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) which will spoil the tranquility of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by the sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it.

The environmental and conservation impact of such a large development should not be dismissed. The site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of the site would undermine the conservation objections of the SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodland and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Policy TR01 now states that walking/cycling must be the natural first choice for transport, which cannot be achieved for Exmo_20. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking option less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

So for environmental, conservation and heritage reasons, I object to Exmo_20.

Trevor Alan Johnson

Full name: Trevor Alan Johnson

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be

required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Charlotte Johnson

Full name: Charlotte Johnson

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(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.:
there are far too many houses planned for this site. the infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate this number of homes. allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 16c, 32, 73b, (specifically footnotes 38 and 7) 180d, 181, 185a, 186b, 188, and 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant . it also conflicts with paragraph 3,6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the local plan.

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.: reduce the size of Exmo_20

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Trevor Alan Johnson

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in direct conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound, and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed

allocation would result in degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.

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.: Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Donna Johnston

Full name: Donna Johnston

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.: SD06

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::
Sidm_06a

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: To whom it may concern I have just been made aware re developments in sidford that the land 6a is up for the regulation 19 (second stage) and this email is in relation to opposing this. As residents we are very concerned about the green wedge policy and the national landscape policy being over ridden for the development of this site to be allocated.

Please find some of our concerns outlined below that were raised at a recent meeting:

1. Impact on National Landscape (formerly AONB) The proposed allocation falls within the East Devon National Landscape. Under the National Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 189, "great weight" must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of these areas. We are extremely concerned that once this site is approved, this sets precedent for others such as 6B to follow with a further development of 238 houses.

? Major Development: Building a housing estate here constitutes "major development" in a protected landscape. National policy dictates such applications should be refused

except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. ? Irreversible Harm: The introduction of high-density housing, street lighting, and associated infrastructure will permanently degrade the character of this statutory protected area, which provides significant value to the local economy through tourism and wellbeing.

2. Violation of Green Wedge Policy This site is currently designated as a GREEN WEDGE. The primary purpose of East Devon's Green Wedge policy is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and protect the individual identity of our towns and villages. ? Settlement Identity: Development here would erode the physical and visual gap between SIDFORD and Sidbury, leading to urban sprawl. ? Precedent: Allowing development on this site undermines the integrity of the Green Wedge designation across the entire district, making it impossible for the Council to defend other sensitive gaps in the future such as site 6b.

3. Failure to Prioritize Sustainable Alternatives The emerging Local Plan already identifies the proposed new town of Marcombe as the primary vehicle for meeting the district's housing targets. ? Marcombe Strategy: EDDC's own strategy is to concentrate growth in sustainable, purpose-built communities rather than "bolting on" unsustainable developments to existing villages in sensitive locations. ? Brownfield First: National policy in 2026 mandates a "brownfield-first" approach. The Council has not yet exhausted all urban regeneration opportunities or lower-quality "Grey Belt" sites before resorting to the destruction of high-value National Landscapes.

4. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints ? Biodiversity Loss: The site provides vital "green lungs" and wildlife corridors. Development would conflict with the Council's commitment to Biodiversity Net Gain and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. ? Infrastructure Deficit: Local services, including the Sid Valley medical Practice, narrow lanes and schools, are already at capacity. This allocation offers no credible mitigation for the increased pressure on local infrastructure. ? Detrimental to local heritage: The site is in very close proximity to Sidbury Castle an iron age fort, a Scheduled Monument, protected by Historic England and would impact the "commanding views over the river Sid and village." Conclusion For the reasons stated above, this site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes. We formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6a (allocated) and 6b (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan to protect the unique character of East Devon for future generations.

I would like my objection to be added to commonplace.

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 whom it may concern I have just been made aware re developments in Sidford that the land 6a is up for the regulation 19 (second stage) and this email is in relation to opposing this. As residents we are very concerned about the green wedge policy and the national landscape policy being over ridden for the development of this site to be allocated.

Please find some of our concerns outlined below that were raised at a recent meeting:

1. Impact on National Landscape (formerly AONB) The proposed allocation falls within the East Devon National Landscape. Under the National Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 189, "great weight" must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of these areas. We are extremely concerned that once this site is approved, this sets precedent for others such as 6B to follow with a further development of 238 houses.

? Major Development: Building a housing estate here constitutes "major development" in a protected landscape. National policy dictates such applications should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. ? Irreversible Harm: The introduction of high-density housing, street lighting, and associated infrastructure will permanently degrade the character of this statutory protected area, which provides significant value to the local economy through tourism and wellbeing.

2. Violation of Green Wedge Policy This site is currently designated as a GREEN WEDGE. The primary purpose of East Devon's Green Wedge policy is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and protect the individual identity of our towns and villages. ? Settlement Identity: Development here would erode the physical and visual gap between SIDFORD and Sidbury, leading to urban sprawl. ? Precedent: Allowing development on this site undermines the integrity of the Green Wedge designation across the entire district, making it impossible for the Council to defend other sensitive gaps in the future such as site 6b.

3. Failure to Prioritize Sustainable Alternatives The emerging Local Plan already identifies the proposed new town of Marlcumbe as the primary vehicle for meeting the district's housing targets. ? Marlcumbe Strategy: EDDC's own strategy is to concentrate growth in sustainable, purpose-built communities rather than "bolting on"

unsustainable developments to existing villages in sensitive locations. ? Brownfield First: National policy in 2026 mandates a "brownfield-first" approach. The Council has not yet exhausted all urban regeneration opportunities or lower-quality "Grey Belt" sites before resorting to the destruction of high-value National Landscapes.

4. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints ? Biodiversity Loss: The site provides vital "green lungs" and wildlife corridors. Development would conflict with the Council's commitment to Biodiversity Net Gain and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. ? Infrastructure Deficit: Local services, including the Sid Valley medical Practice, narrow lanes and schools, are already at capacity. This allocation offers no credible mitigation for the increased pressure on local infrastructure. ? Detrimental to local heritage: The site is in very close proximity to Sidbury Castle an iron age fort, a Scheduled Monument, protected by Historic England and would impact the "commanding views over the river Sid and village." Conclusion For the reasons stated above, this site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes. We formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6a (allocated) and 6b (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan to protect the unique character of East Devon for future generations.

I would like my objection to be added to commonplace.

Chris jones

Full name: Chris jones

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?: 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 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.: I must object to the building of a new estate of 700 new houses of local plan EXMO20. The project is, by far, too ambitious and far to close to Budleigh Salterton. In the summer months the high street is full to over flowing and parking becomes a lottery at best. We already have a new estate on the outskirts of the town, plus on the outskirts of Exmouth of around two and a half miles away, the new estate that begins at the top of Dinan Way and is still expanding westward. Surely that is enough building of new properties around Budleigh and Exmouth for the foreseeable future ??

Sent from my iPad

Mary-Jane Jones

Full name: Mary-Jane Jones

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.: The main vehicle access for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from Budleigh Salterton centre by road and 4 miles from Exmouth by road. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account when considering the Exmo_20 site, and it's facilities, services and amenities would be overwhelmed. Potential walking and cycling options to Budleigh Salterton or Exmouth are impractical given the site's position and topography.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Mary-Jane Jones

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.: The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town having runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. No consideration has been given to the risk of flooding due to the impact of climate change.

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.: Exmo_20 is unsound due to site selection not taking a risk-based approach so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Mary-Jane Jones

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.:

Access to the site via the B3179 would lead to traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. It will also have an adverse effect on regular traffic travelling to and from Budleigh Salterton. It is a rural road not built to support heavy traffic and suffers from many potholes and damage even now.

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.: Do not access the site via B3179.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Mr Robert Jones

Full name: Mr Robert Jones

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?: 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 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.: I am objecting to the building of approximately 700 houses plus industrial units on the area known as Exmo20. This land is still an area of outstanding natural beauty and the land is now part of the National Landscape. Building on land outside the National Landscape would be cheaper, making possible a bigger percentage of affordable homes. The exit from this site would increase traffic at an already very busy road junction. There would be a road going straight across the much used safe Exmouth to Budleigh Salterton cycle/footpath, endangering families with young children, elderly people, cyclists and people in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters. EDDC's duty is to conserve and enhance this land, building a large estate on Exmo17 is neither conserving or enhancing it.

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.: EDDC's duty is to conserve and enhance this land, building a large estate on Exmo17 is neither conserving or enhancing it.

Susan Jones

Full name: Susan Jones

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Exmo_17

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.: I object to the building of housing and industrial buildings on the Exmo-17 site for the following reasons:-

1. A large housing estate and industrial buildings should not be built on protected farmland in an area of outstanding natural beauty, now called National Landscape. EDDC have a duty to conserve and enhance it.

2. The proposed vehicle access road would go across the existing Exmouth to Budleigh Salterton cycle and walking path. This path is at present a safe place to walk and cycle with children away from traffic. It would not be the case if the access road crosses it.

3. This prime site with sea views would be used largely for high end housing which would probably be purchased by those outside of Exmouth. The need locally is for

affordable housing. Clinton Devon Estates have other less valuable land that should be considered rather than this land in the protected National Landscape.

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.: I strongly urge you to consider other options.

Full name: Mary-Jane Jones

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.: The development does not preserve a great enough rural boundary between the site and Pebbled Heaths, endangering habitats, in particular that of the ground nesting bird, the Nightjar.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, or if not possible, reduce the size. Move the boundary away from the Pebbled Heaths. Do not access the site via B3179.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Theo Jones

Full name: Theo Jones

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.:

1. Allocation of Exma_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies P801, PBOZ, PB03, PB04 and OLO2 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states "it was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA" and the Plan HRA states "there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks." This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU "People over Wind". Furthermore, selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32. 2. Allocation of Exmo 20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, P803, PB04 and OLO2 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other

urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km (HRA 4.10), and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk, it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m (Underhill-Day, 2005) currently proposed as it is recognised that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the Nightjar but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level.

3. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA.

4. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TRO1, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is "currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality", due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath SAC/SPA/SSSI. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contrary to the precautionary approach and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation. The Exmo_20 allocation is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation.

5. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by

having a housing development encircling it. 6. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo 20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats.. 7. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 165 of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property. 8. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TRO1 and TRO3, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, 11.2 & 11.6 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20's limited access arrangements would significantly increase the need for car travel from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services, being 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road, therefore an unsustainable location for development. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. Policy TRO1 now states that walking/cycling must be the natural first choice for transport, which cannot be achieved for Exmo_20. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps. 9. Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process, not the December 2024 amended version, presented in the 1" Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected.

10. As a local resident my family and I have felt the effects of overloaded local infrastructure. Budleigh Salterton had the most incidents of sewage outlets directly into the sea of any place in the UK. On numerous occasions last summer visitors to Budleigh beach were unable to enter the water. How can the addition of 700 homes be justified when the current sewage system clearly can't cope with the houses that are already in place? 11. The B3179 is a dangerous and highly trafficked road that cannot take more throughput without incurring serious risk. There is no obvious way to upgrade this road as it passes through protected habitats. Thank you

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan or reduce it in size so as not to infringe upon the Pebbleben Heaths and remove access via the B3179.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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: Mary-Jane Jones

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.: As Devon Wildlife Trust stated: the allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the Pebblebed Heaths' significant habitats. The development ignores the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.

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.: Reduce the size of Exmouth Exmo_20 by two-thirds. Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Trist Jones

Full name: Trist Jones

Other party name (if relevant): NO

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.: SD06

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::
Sid_06a, Sid_06b

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I have selected No re q. 2 above (there is no option to select Dont Know thus a 50:50).

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: This is a general comment re the proposed development re Sid_06a and Sid_06b (apologies if this is input into the wrong place - made aware of this plan very late on and cannot see a general comment section): First and foremost, the existing land protections must be fully respected and adhered to; otherwise one has to ask why those protections were introduced in the first place if they can simply be set aside when it becomes inconvenient. If, despite those protections, housing is eventually allowed – which many with a cynical slant, might perceive to be the case in the planning process – then any such permission should at least be used to help those least able to get new homes, such as first-time buyers, younger generations, and lower-income households/people. In that situation, there should be clear clauses requiring a definite percentage of the new housing to be targeted at these groups, with the clear expectation that the majority

of new homes are directed towards helping them onto the housing ladder, and with mechanisms to ensure that these commitments cannot easily be watered down later. If arguments nevertheless override existing protections and ultimately “win” in the end, then the very least that should be done, as an act of decency and genuine multi-lateral decision-making, is to dramatically reduce the volume of housing permitted on any such land, so that impacts on already-stretched local roads, public transport, schools, health services and other infrastructure are kept to an absolute minimum and not treated as an afterthought. Finally, where land is subject to specific landscape, environmental or planning designations, and where additional strain would be placed on local transport and community infrastructure, any move to set these aside should be tested carefully against the relevant legal and policy framework and fully explained. Local people are entitled to know on what legal basis existing protections are being overridden, how impacts on infrastructure will be addressed in practice, and how their associated rights and the council’s statutory duties have been taken into account.

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.: This is a general comment re the proposed development re Sid_06a and Sid_06b (apologies if this is input into the wrong place - made aware of this plan very late on and cannot see a general comment section): First and foremost, the existing land protections must be fully respected and adhered to; otherwise one has to ask why those protections were introduced in the first place if they can simply be set aside when it becomes inconvenient. If, despite those protections, housing is eventually allowed – which many with a cynical slant, might perceive to be the case in the planning process – then any such permission should at least be used to help those least able to get new homes, such as first-time buyers, younger generations, and lower-income households/people. In that situation, there should be clear clauses requiring a definite percentage of the new housing to be targeted at these groups, with the clear expectation that the majority of new homes are directed towards helping them onto the housing ladder, and with mechanisms to ensure that these commitments cannot easily be watered down later. If arguments nevertheless override existing protections and ultimately “win” in the end, then the very least that should be done, as an act of decency and genuine multi-lateral decision-making, is to dramatically reduce the volume of housing permitted on any such land, so that impacts on already-stretched local roads, public transport, schools, health services and other infrastructure are kept to an absolute minimum and not treated as an afterthought. Finally, where land is subject to specific landscape, environmental or planning designations, and where additional strain would be placed on local transport and community infrastructure, any move to set these aside should be tested carefully against the relevant legal and policy framework and fully explained.

Local people are entitled to know on what legal basis existing protections are being overridden, how impacts on infrastructure will be addressed in practice, and how their associated rights and the council's statutory duties have been taken into account.

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.:

This is a general comment re the proposed development re Sid_06a and Sid_06b (apologies if this is input into the wrong place - made aware of this plan very late on and cannot see a general comment section): First and foremost, the existing land protections must be fully respected and adhered to; otherwise one has to ask why those protections were introduced in the first place if they can simply be set aside when it becomes inconvenient. If, despite those protections, housing is eventually allowed – which many with a cynical slant, might perceive to be the case in the planning process – then any such permission should at least be used to help those least able to get new homes, such as first-time buyers, younger generations, and lower-income households/people. In that situation, there should be clear clauses requiring a definite percentage of the new housing to be targeted at these groups, with the clear expectation that the majority of new homes are directed towards helping them onto the housing ladder, and with mechanisms to ensure that these commitments cannot easily be watered down later. If arguments nevertheless override existing protections and ultimately “win” in the end, then the very least that should be done, as an act of decency and genuine multi-lateral decision-making, is to dramatically reduce the volume of housing permitted on any such land, so that impacts on already-stretched local roads, public transport, schools, health services and other infrastructure are kept to an absolute minimum and not treated as an afterthought. Finally, where land is subject to specific landscape, environmental or planning designations, and where additional strain would be placed on local transport and community infrastructure, any move to set these aside should be tested carefully against the relevant legal and policy framework and fully explained. Local people are entitled to know on what legal basis existing protections are being overridden, how impacts on infrastructure will be addressed in practice, and how their associated rights and the council's statutory duties have been taken into account.

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.: This is a general comment re the proposed development re

Sid_06a and Sid_06b (apologies if this is input into the wrong place - made aware of this plan very late on and cannot see a general comment section): First and foremost, the existing land protections must be fully respected and adhered to; otherwise one has to ask why those protections were introduced in the first place if they can simply be set aside when it becomes inconvenient. If, despite those protections, housing is eventually allowed – which many with a cynical slant, might perceive to be the case in the planning process – then any such permission should at least be used to help those least able to get new homes, such as first-time buyers, younger generations, and lower-income households/people. In that situation, there should be clear clauses requiring a definite percentage of the new housing to be targeted at these groups, with the clear expectation that the majority of new homes are directed towards helping them onto the housing ladder, and with mechanisms to ensure that these commitments cannot easily be watered down later. If arguments nevertheless override existing protections and ultimately “win” in the end, then the very least that should be done, as an act of decency and genuine multi-lateral decision-making, is to dramatically reduce the volume of housing permitted on any such land, so that impacts on already-stretched local roads, public transport, schools, health services and other infrastructure are kept to an absolute minimum and not treated as an afterthought. Finally, where land is subject to specific landscape, environmental or planning designations, and where additional strain would be placed on local transport and community infrastructure, any move to set these aside should be tested carefully against the relevant legal and policy framework and fully explained. Local people are entitled to know on what legal basis existing protections are being overridden, how impacts on infrastructure will be addressed in practice, and how their associated rights and the council’s statutory duties have been taken into account.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Robert Oliver Kathro

Full name: Robert Oliver Kathro

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?: 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 Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I have reviewed all of the comments (objections) to this and the previous consultation that relate to the St. Johns road site. I support all of the comments.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 cannot be made compliant, the site must be removed from the proposals as it is incompatible with multiple policies as listed in the comments that I have referred to.

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.: The St Johns road proposal comprises an extraordinarily large number of dwellings and for all the reasons stated by others who object it should not be included in the plan. No houses should be built there.

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.: There are no modifications that will make it sound. This consultation like many others is biased in favour of the proposals

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.: Like many consultations it is biased in favour and presumes that the proposals are sound when they are clearly not.

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.: I am not confident that the hearing will be unbiased.

Alison Keen

Full name: Alison Keen

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.:

Adjacent to Pebblebed heaths which the council have refused permission for other nearby homes to have holiday cottages on their own land as extra footprint from people would severely damage the Pebblebeds. Infrastructure is not capable of supporting this development as it is already breaking down for the current population. Secondary school in Exmouth is not adequate for increase in children attendance. Wildlife - both animals and plants would be severely affected, if not destroyed, having a knock on effect on our environment. Loss of green spaces/rambling - soon have less green space than London. The plan is in conflict with so many current lives and the well-being of Exmouth and surroundings.

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.: remove Exmo_20

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

MR MARK L KENT

Full name: MR MARK L KENT

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?: No

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: no consideration has been given to overload of traffic near to darts farm and up to the roundabout turning off to exmouth - this section is already unable to cope with traffic!

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: a bypass of ebford from the M25 junction to exmouth and sidmouth is required by not likely !!!

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

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.: as an transport exec

Professor Julie Kent & Mr Michael Kent

Full name: Professor Julie Kent & Mr Michael Kent

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.: SD06

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::
Sidm_31

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.: It is extremely disappointing that the second draft of the Local Plan still includes a proposal that the site Sidmouth_31 be used for housing development when it is clearly unsuitable.

As previously indicated there are significant reasons why this site should be removed from the plan relating to access issues, its position within the National Landscape (AONB), environmental impacts and increased risks of flooding in the area.

Access: In the plan it is proposed that access be via Windsor Mead - a small cul-de-sac adjacent to the site but where property, privately owned by a number of third parties prohibits access. Compulsory purchase orders would be necessary to secure access in this easterly direction which encroaches on local residents existing property rights and disturbs the road layout of the cul de sac. Furthermore exit from Windsor Mead onto the High Street (A3052) has poor visibility which increases risk of traffic collisions. The proposal for access in the Plan therefore is incoherent and unjustified. Any suggestion that the site might be accessed from the westerly edge also presents significant problems that have been raised previously - as Burscombe Lane is a single track lane with a very reduced width, poor pedestrian facilities and very limited visibility with the junction to the A3052.

National Landscape: The site sits in the National Landscape and is prominent from many directions especially the National Trust area of Salcombe Hill and Trow Hill. Any development here significantly extends the built area, potentially creates a more urban edge and built environment in a rural setting that is known for its attractions within the Sid Valley. On rising land towards Core Hill the site is within a green landscape that is a popular amenity for local residents for walking and other recreation. Since 2023 local authorities are expected to actively conserve and enhance the National Landscape.

Environmental degradation: Building on this site would without doubt cause environmental degradation - the removal of ancient hedges, extensive and significant excavation and removal of established habitats and flora. While mitigation measures may be proposed by any developer they cannot by definition replace like for like. New plantings or soil replacement will simply not be equivalent. A wide range of species have been documented in the area including bats and great crested newts that will without question be disrupted or destroyed by development.

Flood risk: There is a real danger that development on this site and increasing the housing density, hard surfacing and excavation could impact surface water drainage and cause flooding. Existing management of the water flows is weak as flooding occurs in Burscombe Lane (west), along the public footpath (north). Storm drains the east and south are old and unsuited for further development.

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.: We urge you to withdraw this site from the Local Plan.

Nicola Kew

Full name: Nicola Kew

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_17

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.: I am writing as a local resident to object to the proposed development on Exmo_17, which lies within a protected National Landscape.

Exmouth needs genuinely affordable homes for local people, not predominantly high-end housing in a sensitive landscape. Building outside the National Landscape would allow more affordable homes to be delivered at lower land cost.

The development would add hundreds of extra vehicles to already congested roads, particularly opposite the Liverton Trading Estate. For many people working in Exeter, driving would remain the only realistic option.

I walk the Exmouth–Budleigh path regularly with my dog and also cycle and run along it, as do many of my friends. I also spend a great deal of time on the South West Coast Path, which looks directly across these open fields. The proposed access road would cut across the cycle and footpath, require the loss of mature trees, and permanently change the character and safety of these much-loved routes.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the development of Exmo_17 and urge the council to protect this precious landscape.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Anne Killoran

Full name: Anne Killoran

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

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

The revised plan say that the Maer Road site has capacity for sewage treatment Information received states that SWW have been dumping sewage into the sea from Maer Road for the last 42 hours (Thursday 22nd) Maer Road has been constantly discharging untreated sewage into the sea throughout January The Maer Lane Sewage Works needs considerable investment to make it fit for purpose and able to meet the needs of the growing expansion of New builds EDDC needs to delay until they address errors in the Water Cycle Study

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: EDDC need to delay the local plan until they address the errors in the Water Cycle Study that is not accurate Maer Lane Treatment Works do not have spare capacity !!!

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.: No The Plan is not sound as there are inaccuracies with the Water Study and the facts about the capacity of the Maer Lane Treatment Works is not accurate

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.: Investment by SWW to expand the treatment works to cope with increase in volume due to high levels of new housing

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: The Water Cycle information is not accurate

Charles King

Full name: Charles King

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.: SD06

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.:
Sidm_31

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.:
From:

*** Personal details have been removed ***

To: East Devon Planning

21st January 2026

Dear Sirs,

I write to object to the above Planning Application and its inclusion in the Local Plan (2013-2031)

The application applies to a piece of land just above the house line at the top of Sidmouth. The field is categorized as AONB (now National Landscape) and previous

applications for development on this field have been refused on at least two occasions for that reason. The most recent application was also refused because of inadequate access through Burscombe Lane.

Up until 2023, EDDC had a duty to “have regard to” to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. This wording has been now been changed from “have regard to” to “seek to further” the purpose....

I fail to see any evidence that EDDC are taking any proactive steps to seek to further and positively conserve or enhance the special qualities of the National Landscape in proposing that this field be included in the Local Plan, having been rejected previously.

The site selection did not follow any logical process. It had already been refused previously and was not included in the local plan of 2024. There is no paper trail as to why it has been included in this version of the Local Plan, although it is clear that the pressure on EDDC to increase house-building capacity may have led to some hasty inclusions that cannot be justified.

The development site can be clearly seen from the main road into Sidmouth from the East.

Access to the site is clearly problematic and although the developer plans include access through Burscombe Lane, the Local Plan indicates a preferred access through Windsor Mead, which would require compulsory Purchase Orders on at least two private properties. There is therefore no clear access proposal.

Yours sincerely,

*** Personal details have been removed ***

Ellen kinnear

Full name: Ellen kinnear

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(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.: Remove Exmo_20 from local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Ellen kinnear

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.:

OBJECTION Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the competent authority the LOA

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.: Remove Exmo20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Ellen kinnear

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the See Stop Exmo.20 Facebook page for full comments SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk, it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the Nightjar but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Ellen kinnear

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind”. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NOPF paragraph 32

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Jane Kinnersley

Full name: Jane Kinnersley

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.:
Exmo20 is in conflict with para 109 of the NPPF Dec 2023.

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.: Budleigh Salterton must be taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo20 allocation

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jane Kinnersley

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.:

Exmo20 is in conflict with para 92 and 109 of the NPPF Dec 2023

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.: If Exmo 20 is to go ahead, access must be from the south.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jane Kinnersley

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?: Yes

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.:
Exmo20 is in conflict with para 206 of the NPPF Dec 2023.

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.: access to the south should be explored and/or the site boundary should be moved to the south.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jane Kinnersley

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.: The allocation of Exmo 20 is in conflict with paras 16c, 92, 114b, 114d, 180e and 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023.

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.: Do not access the site from the B3179

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Tom Kinnersley

Full name: Tom Kinnersley

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.:

Exmo_20 is in conflict with paras 92 and 109 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03. It also conflicts with paras 3.6 and 11.2 of the local plan

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.: Reduce the size of Exmo_20 and access the site from the South.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Tom Kinnersley

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.: The allocation is in conflict with Para 109 of the NPFF Dec 2023. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Para 11.6 of the Local Plan

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.: Do not access the site via B3179.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jane Kinnersley

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(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.: Reduce the size of
Exmo_20

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jane Kinnersley

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.: Do not access the site via B3179

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Tom Kinnersley

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.: Do not access the site via B3179

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Joanna Knott

Full name: Joanna Knott

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states "it was not possible to scene out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA" and the Plan HRA states "there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks". T his site was was selected on 03/09/24 (without option to reconsider) with the draaft local plan approved on 11/12/24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in 30/0125 HRA, contrary to CJEU 'People over Wind'. Please note, selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF para 32.

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.: Allocation of Exmouth_20 is in conflict with-areas.16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, and 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. it also conflicts with par3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04, and 0L02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmouth_20 site being so close to the adjacent Pebbled Heats SAC/SPA/SSSI, it

would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreation activities like dog walking, cycling and walking, thus causing harm to highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt of a rare species like the nightjar. In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA.

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.: It is in conflict with paras 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 and 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188, and 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with para 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the local Plan. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paras 16c, 92, 114b, 114d, 180e and 181 of the NPPF December 2023 and is therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with para 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and para 11.2 of the Local Plan. The current proposal is to have the bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncounted highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. The B3179 is a narrow windy road that is heavily used at rush hour times and the inevitable increase in traffic will cause countless delays for people getting to work and school. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 MUST be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The HRA (18.11.25) confirms there is "currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation...to air quality", due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath SAC/SPA/SSSI. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contrary to the precautionary approach and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation. The Exmo_20 allocation is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Joanna Knott

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.:

llocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: I want my voice to be heard

Liesbeth Kop

Full name: Liesbeth Kop

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.:

1.14

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

2. Do you consider that this part of the Introduction chapter is legally compliant?:

Yes

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Introduction chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Paragraph 1.14 appropriately highlights the importance of joint working and cross-boundary cooperation in plan-making, including reliance on shared strategies and evidence. However, this principle is not consistently carried through into later parts of the plan dealing with strategic cross-boundary growth locations. In particular, development at the West End and north of Topsham has clear cross-boundary implications with Exeter City Council. Exeter's Regulation 19 Local Plan includes a specific policy commitment (Policy TI1 – Topsham Infrastructure Delivery Framework) which requires jointly agreed approaches to infrastructure delivery, landscape setting and environmental mitigation in this area. The absence of a clear linkage between paragraph 1.14 and the policies governing development at the West End creates a disconnect between the plan's stated commitment to joint working and its operational policy framework. As drafted, the plan is therefore not fully justified or effective in how it proposes to address known strategic cross-boundary issues.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Introduction 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 Introduction 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.: Paragraph 1.14 should be modified to clarify that the principle of joint working applies not only at a general strategic level, but also to specific cross-

boundary growth locations, including development at the Exeter–East Devon boundary north of Topsham.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Introduction chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Liesbeth Kop

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

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: While the Local Plan process includes Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA), and a technical evidence paper for the Clyn Valley Regional Park (CVRP), these do not provide proportionate, site-specific justification for allocating CLGE20 and CLGE24A. This omission fails NPPF paragraph 31 and undermines Local Plan Strategy 10, which seeks to strengthen the CVRP as strategic green infrastructure. Allocating these parcels also conflicts with the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 duty to “seek to further” the purposes of protected landscapes.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove CLGE20 and CLGE24A from the development schedule and incorporate them into an expanded Clyn Valley Regional Park boundary. Add a new policy (or supporting paragraph) requiring adjacent development to deliver CVRP interface measures (habitat corridors, greenways, floodplain restoration, biodiversity net gain). This modification ensures the plan is legally compliant, sound, and consistent with the Duty to Cooperate by aligning with regional green infrastructure objectives.

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.: The allocation of CLGE20 and CLGE24A fails the NPPF soundness tests (paragraph 35)

because: Not justified – lacks proportionate, site-specific evidence on landscape sensitivity, biodiversity, and recreational value. Not consistent with national policy – conflicts with NPPF 174, which requires protection and enhancement of valued landscapes and green infrastructure. Not positively prepared – disregards opportunities to consolidate the CVRP and deliver strategic green infrastructure.

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.: Delete CLGE20 and CLGE24A from the West End housing/mixed-use allocation schedule and remove their allocation boundaries from the Policies Map.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: This section demonstrates compliance with the Duty to Cooperate because East Devon has engaged with neighbouring authorities and prepared Statements of Common Ground on housing, transport, and green infrastructure. The proposed modification to remove CLGE20 and CLGE24A and include them within an expanded Clyst Valley Regional Park also aligns with the strategic approach in the emerging Exeter Local Plan, which promotes green infrastructure and connectivity along the River Clyst corridor east of Clyst Road. Highlighting this shared objective reinforces cross-boundary coordination and supports effective delivery of green infrastructure at a strategic scale.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Liesbeth Kop

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?: Yes

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.: Land North of Topsham

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The modified approach to development at the West End fails to demonstrate effective compliance with the Duty to Cooperate in relation to strategic cross-boundary matters affecting Topsham and the Exeter–East Devon boundary. Exeter City Council’s Regulation 19 Local Plan (CSD-02) includes Policy TI1 – Topsham Infrastructure Delivery Framework (page 153), which explicitly requires joint working between Exeter City Council and East Devon District Council to plan, phase and deliver infrastructure and mitigation for development in this area, including transport, education, healthcare, green infrastructure, and the protection of Exeter’s landscape setting and the Clyst Valley. The modified West End strategy continues to rely on development north of Topsham without securing or embedding this joint framework within the East Devon Local Plan. As a result, the plan does not demonstrate that strategic cross-boundary infrastructure and environmental impacts have been addressed through constructive, active and ongoing cooperation, as required by section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 plan must be modified to explicitly require that development north of Topsham / at the Exeter–East Devon boundary is contingent upon a jointly prepared and agreed Topsham

Infrastructure Delivery Framework between East Devon District Council and Exeter City Council, consistent with Exeter Local Plan Policy TI1.

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.: The modified West End approach is not justified because it relies on development north of Topsham without a robust and proportionate evidence base demonstrating that such development: -Respects Exeter's landscape setting -Protects the Clyst Valley and emerging Clyst Valley Regional Park -Can be supported by timely and deliverable cross-boundary infrastructure Exeter's Regulation 19 Local Plan clearly identifies, through Policy TI1 (page 153), that growth in this location requires a coordinated infrastructure and landscape strategy. Proceeding without this framework means the location and scale of development are not supported by sufficient evidence.

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.: To make the modified approach to Development at the West End sound, the plan should be amended to include a clear spatial and policy-based landscape and green infrastructure framework for the Topsham / Exeter–East Devon boundary, as follows: a) Land east of Clyst Road should be explicitly identified and protected as part of the strategic green infrastructure network associated with the Clyst Valley, reflecting its role in maintaining Exeter's landscape setting, settlement separation, and the function of the emerging Clyst Valley Regional Park. b) Development proposals west of Clyst Road must be required to deliver defined landscape and green infrastructure mitigation, including buffers, habitat connectivity, public access and long-term management, to ensure that development does not erode the rural setting of Topsham or the landscape character of the Clyst Valley. c) These requirements should be secured through a jointly prepared Topsham Infrastructure Delivery Framework, agreed between East Devon District Council and Exeter City Council, consistent with Exeter Local Plan Policy TI1, and supported by corresponding policies and, where appropriate, amendments to the Policies Map.

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.:

The modified West End strategy does not demonstrate effective cross-boundary cooperation with Exeter City Council on a strategic matter, namely development north of Topsham and its associated infrastructure and environmental impacts. Exeter City Council has set out a clear policy position through Policy TI1 of its Regulation 19 Local Plan, requiring a jointly prepared infrastructure framework for this area. The absence of a corresponding and aligned requirement in the East Devon Local Plan indicates a failure to positively address a known strategic issue through plan-making cooperation.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Liesbeth Kop

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.: WS15

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.:
Clge_23 and Clge_25a

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:

WS15 supports further intensification at established destinations within the West End, relying primarily on generalised mitigation criteria. However, it is not supported by a sufficiently robust and spatially specific evidence base demonstrating that cumulative impacts on the Clyst Valley landscape can be adequately managed. In locations such as Dart's Farm, which are already major activity generators and lie within or adjacent to the Clyst Valley, the policy enables further development pressure without clear spatial limits or defined landscape functions. This undermines confidence that the approach to intensification is the most appropriate strategy when assessed against reasonable alternatives that would provide stronger landscape protection.

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.:

WS15 should be modified to introduce a spatially defined landscape and green infrastructure framework for the West End. This should: Identify land within the Clyst Valley as part of the strategic green infrastructure network, protected from incremental erosion by development; Require that intensification at established destinations (including visitor and employment hubs) is demonstrated not to result in cumulative harm to landscape

character, green infrastructure continuity, or settlement setting; and Secure delivery of landscape mitigation through clearly defined buffers, habitat connectivity, public access and long-term management arrangements.

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.: WS15 addresses development within the West End that has clear strategic cross-boundary implications, particularly in relation to landscape setting, transport effects, and green infrastructure at the Exeter–East Devon boundary. Exeter City Council’s Regulation 19 Local Plan includes Policy TI1 (Topsham Infrastructure Delivery Framework), which identifies the need for jointly planned infrastructure and landscape approaches in this area to protect Exeter’s landscape setting and the Clyst Valley. WS15 does not demonstrate how East Devon District Council has constructively engaged with Exeter City Council to align its approach to development intensification at established destinations within the West End with this framework. In the absence of a jointly agreed spatial or infrastructure strategy, the policy does not sufficiently address this strategic cross-boundary matter, and therefore fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

NICHOLAS LAMBRECHTS

Full name: NICHOLAS LAMBRECHTS

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 165 of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process, not the December 2024 amended version, presented in the 1st Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, 11.2 & 11.6 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20's limited access would significantly increase the need for car travel from the main access point proposed (B3179) to access facilities and services, being 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road, therefore an unsustainable location for development. This allocation would overwhelm Budleigh and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. Policy TR01 now states that walking/cycling must be the natural first choice for transport, which cannot be achieved for Exmo_20. The site's and local area's topography makes potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk, it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the Nightjar but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nicholas Lambrechts

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind”. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32.

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.: REMOVE EXMO_20 FROM LOCAL PLAN - RECONSIDER OTHER SITES

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Vanessa Land

Full name: Vanessa Land

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(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.: Too many houses built on our green space, and sewage system isn't capable

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.: Remove Exm 20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Catherine Langston

Full name: Catherine Langston

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Catherine Langston

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Catherine Langston

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Catherine Langston

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Catherine Langston

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of

sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Catherine Langston

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Do not access the site via B3179

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Nick Larkin

Full name: Nick Larkin

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will

also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Nick Larkin

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Alan Lascelles

Full name: Alan Lascelles

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?: No

2. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: If your intention is to be sustainable, then you need to look to the future and plan in a rail link from the main line, Exeter to London Waterloo to a) Exeter Airport Terminal from a point west of old broadclyst station 3.2K b) Marcombe Town Centre 3K c) Sky Park 1K. Clearly the proposed population of Marcombe would justify the expenditure and take traffic off the road and onto public transport. Exeter airport is increasing passenger numbers.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: Ref 2B

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.: You are not planning for the future. Refer to Light rail infrastructure in other localities and the significant usage / passenger miles.

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.: Ref 2B and 3B

4. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Exeter airport is the main location in the South west, other than Bristol. It is fundamental to the success of the Airport to provide a Rail link, thus avoiding long journey on roads, which currently are not fit for purpose and would be further congested when 20,000 inhabitants live in Marlcumbe if no rail link extended to this new suburb of Exeter.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Alan Lascelles

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?: Yes

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

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Much is too vague especially the term aspirations. Need to see the desire to establish a Development Corporation, to maximise the benefit to the local community, not the land owners.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: Ref 3C

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.: Ref 3C

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.: EDDC Draft Local

Plan - Design Feedback NPPF establish the mandate for planning authorities to create policy that facilitates the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable places and buildings. In addition, the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places to live and work. It is vital that detailed plans are evaluated and questioned, as well as 'demanding' better designs and adherence to recommended space criteria. It is a statement of fact that some of the new build in Cranbrook has a density greater than that of parts of Victorian terraces in London. Good examples of urban architecture Thicket Mead, Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Somerset. New Hall, Harlow, Essex Upton, West Northampton. Goldsmith Street. Norwich. Cambourne, Cambridgeshire. Poundbury, Dorset. In Poundbury, although there has been some opposition there has also been considerable praise. It is designed as a complete entity. The Duchy of Cornwall owned the land, so when it was designated for the expansion of Dorchester, *** Personal details have been removed *** saw an opportunity to put his ideas about architecture into practice, commissioning architects and developers to realise his vision. Positive view, that the community is a mix of owner occupation and tenants, but you can't tell which is which. EDDC need to look at other English developments for inspiration. In Cambourne developments are in keeping with the character of the local vernacular. In the new Town of Cambourne, Cambridgeshire, the total area of the site is 417 hectares (1,030 acres) only 133 hectares of which are for housing. The final density will be 31 dwellings per hectare which is appropriate for EDDC. The emphasis is a blend of green spaces and urban development. Reminiscent of the Garden City movement and founding fathers of town planning. This links the National Policy Framework policy with emphasises that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued. It also specifies that high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking. Design Codes . This in theory, sets out the rules to which new development design standards should adhere to. They are the framework to which planners follow to achieve the desired laid down standards. This is paramount when dealing with large scale projects, to maintain consistency of design across a site where there are multiple developers delivering developments over many years. It also incorporates, landscaping and estate layouts that allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles. It is also very clear that in modern housing estate layouts by the large-scale builders, privacy and being overlooked is not high on the criteria of housing estate layouts. Much more effort should be taken in design to mitigate this problem – not evident in Cranbrook. N.B. The planning officers negotiate higher design standards and are supported by councillors. Estate Layout . Although not part of the Local Plan remit, it should be noted that the 'Close' is an effective type of an estate layout. The 'close' was considered as a tried and tested way of being able to know ones neighbours. Social scientists have suggested small closes, where it is possible to know each of the neighbours, which does not happen in long streets. The new town of Cambourne in Cambridgeshire has included many developments with closes in line with this street layout. According to former

Professor of Geography at the LSE, “A neighbourhood means different things to different people; to the sociologist, an area in which people develop face to face relationship.” One crucial additional point, is due to the exceptionally high density of housing in Cranbrook, the closeness of properties and lack of privacy, ‘cheek by jowl’ with neighbours, which according to many Social Scientists has a detrimental effect on health and wellbeing and the built environment. Learning Planners and architects would argue that Cranbrook is limited to a small number of house styles from a core ‘national design pattern book’ from a few national house builders, using only about four external paint colours. Pink, Cream, off-white and light sand. There appears to be a semi – monopoly on the principal contractors using a very limited architectural style. Even some of the EDDC Planners were frustrated with the inferior design standards being built. The comes back to a robust, design code that must be rigorously insisted upon delivering. Published in April 2019, the Sunday Times stated that, ‘one of the fundamental problems with house building is the larger developer, that dictate design and the cost of building with no input than that of contained within statutory requirements. A good design code is fundamental of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps new residence to feel engaged with their communities’. In the failed Developer Led Planning Process, developers / consortium players, carry too much weight in the decisions making process. This view has been expressed by a Senior Planning Officer of EDDC. Small Developers . Emphasis should be placed on smaller developers with competent architects, which would benefit by having a more diverse housing design. Unlike the; moribund, mediocre and mundane designs in recent large-scale developments in East Devon. An exemplary example of high-quality design at a high density, lies in Goldsmith Street, Norwich, by London firm *** Personal details have been removed ***. As a Stirling Prize winner it was considered to be, “high-quality architecture in its purest most environmentally and socially conscious form”. This should be the aim of both social housing and private ownership. This type of development, should be considered for adjacent areas to the proposed new Town Centre for Marlcombe There must be more house builders involved, small, medium, large and Self Build plots. More builders, large and small, leads to a more diverse built environment. Build Quality . This should be integrated into the Local Plan, as part of the planning proses to eliminate builders which consistently do not meet Building Regulation, as this jeopardies the reputation of new housing estates. One house builder has removed its Quality Management Team. Vernacular Architecture Much more emphasis should be placed on the use of vernacular architectural styles, which have a true East Devon character (New Red Sandstone). Most of the architecture so far could be seen anywhere in the country. This is a major criticism of the development of Cranbrook. It appears that only historic buildings echo to the geological structure beneath. There should be a ‘Devon feel’ and a ‘suitable degree of variety’ – these special qualities of each area should be specified and be reflected in further development including, approved details such as the materials used. Economics .

There are many outstanding Town & Country Planners, which place high quality design as part of their professional decision making. However, there are also problems the industry is dominated by a small number of volume builders, which seeks very substantial returns on capital employed rather than, say, a steady but more modest revenue stream. Their mantra is to build profits not homes. Their desire is to build basic, unless they have pressure on them to build quality. A local Plan, should have more than aspiration it should be precise – this is what we want. Where planners and councillors show leadership and skill, we see great placemaking. Developers who recognise the advantages of good design have been at the forefront of using the best architects. Where they combine forces, the results can be spectacularly good. In the UK we have some of the best architects in Europe Footnote The biggest project on the EDDC agenda is Marlcombe which must not be a Cranbrook 2 according to the consultants view “Many people worry that any new places built will be soulless, unattractive dormitory suburbs... The nation cannot afford to build places that fail – and we should aspire to create great places, for everyone.” This is key to new stages of the town. The emphasis within the Garden City principles on high-quality environments for everyone backed by a fair development model is highly relevant to addressing today’s housing needs. The Town and Country Planning Association recognise the need to take action highlighted in a number of reports. Meeting housing needs is a principal concern, Garden Cities / Towns are holistically planned settlements that also offer ways of dealing with other challenges – climate change, innovation in design, local food production, and more all set within a context of participative governance

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: Subject to the comments outlined

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Alan Lascelles

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.: SD29

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::

Whim_08a, Whim_11

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Site Whim 11. *** Personal details have been removed *** a key player in the decision making process did not have a comprehensive understanding of the old cricket ground site and in particular, the results of a survey collated in Jan 2023 indicating that 64 /80 were opposed to the development. It is clear that the law regarding Localism is irrelevant at EDDC. It is my understanding that there is a covenant on the site by Whiteways Family, to use for recreation purposes only, not housing. Site Whim 11 - land adjacent to Bramley close. The councillors at the Strategic Planning Meeting which approved the development on this site were provided with false information by the individual acting for the developers. That there is no evidence that *** Personal details have been removed *** yung had visited the site before voting for the development. Within the emerging draft Neighbourhood plan great emphasis was placed on securing a green wedge between Whimple and Cranbrook, the draft was advocating no development west of the core village. The wishes of the villagers have been ignored. The village survey found that 86/87 were opposed to the site being developed. Councillors have acted without due diligence and unprofessionally in making 'seismic' major decisions without fully appreciating the evidence gathered about what development is acceptable and what is not by the citizens of Whimple. This includes the Whimple EDDC Councillor *** Personal details have been removed ***. Localism matters, but this has been steamrollered by the inadequately informed. In the EDDC draft Local Plan indicated only 41 houses were to be located in Whimple, but now we have 83 houses. This is totally unacceptable and an unsafe decision. Accordingly, one needs to determine the true motivating forces behind the decision to build twice the number? Furthermore, there is a very clear conflict of interest that *** Personal details

have been removed *** as a Parish Councillor and a District Councillor and in the role of Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee. In essence he is a developer, therefore he should have pulled away from the decision making process, instead he proposed the development of site Whim 8 . Accordingly, this decision should be consider unsafe. 50 houses does have a major impact on this village. In addition Whimble 500 homes have been allocated to the Parish of Whimble as part of Cranbrook. The geographical map Data provided by EDDC did not include, within the delineated boundary of Whimble the site for 500 homes, just site 8 and 11.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: Ref 2b

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.: Ref 2b

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.: It is not too late to make any changes as befitting current knowledge, understanding and circumstances.

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.: For the reason stated above. Individuals within EDDC has not acting professionally.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Louise Lawton

Full name: Louise Lawton

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.:

1. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable &

less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove exmo from the plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Simon Leat

Full name: Simon Leat

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 3.6 and 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: REMOVE EX

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: To check due process has been followed and be kept informed

Mrs Sally Leat

Full name: Mrs Sally Leat

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will

also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly. 3. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? *Ibis*, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the

Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John’s (Exmo_20)) that “new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heath” there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: remove EXMO_20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: I would like my voice to be heard

Penelope Leather

Full name: Penelope Leather

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paras 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 and 7), 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 and 191c, of the NPPF December 2023

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.: No mitigation policy has been produced to mitigate the risks for this site. Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Ceri lees

Full name: Ceri lees

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.:
Honi_18

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The proposed road entrance is really dangerous and I can believe it is legally compliant. This needs to be seriously investigated as in the past highway have opposed the plans for a junction here

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:
Another place for the junction must be found but I'm not sure there is one

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.:
ThA35 at this point is very windy, steep and with poor visibility in both directions a junction here for a housing estate is unsafe and unwise

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.: Because honi 18 was introduced very late in the plan with no info given to locals and no chance to cooperate

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Stuart lees

Full name: Stuart lees

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?: Paragraph

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.: Honi 18

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I am deeply concerned that the proposed junction that is need for the new housing site is simply not safe orcreasonable and that the change of opinion from highways agency is a response to plotical pressure and not because the plan is safe. In the past highways have rejected the plan for a site entrance above the copper castle and anyone who knows the road knows why. It is a dangerous and windy isection of road and it is on a steep incline. Visibility is limited both directions and it will be so dangerous especially in morning and evening for many cars from 100plus homes trying to get to work,do the school rum and so forth.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 Honi 18 plan needs another e ntrance to the site or else needs scrapping

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.: As above

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.: The Honi 18 plans were not part of the original plan and only came onto the table in 2024 and the people local to the site were not informed or consulted

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.: I wish to ensure local voices are represented

Liz Lees

Full name: Liz Lees

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.: SD06

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.:
Sidm_06a

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

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

1. Impact on National Landscape (formerly AONB) The proposed allocation falls within the East Devon National Landscape. Under the National Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 189, "great weight" must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of these areas. We are extremely concerned that once this site is approved, this sets precedent for others such as 6B to follow with a further development of 238 houses. Major Development: Building a housing estate here constitutes "major development" in a protected landscape. National policy dictates such applications should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Irreversible Harm: The introduction of high-density housing, street lighting, and associated infrastructure will permanently degrade the character of this statutory protected area, which provides significant value to the local economy through tourism and wellbeing. 2. Violation of Green Wedge Policy This site is currently designated as a GREEN WEDGE. The primary purpose of East Devon's Green Wedge policy is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and protect the individual identity of our towns and villages. Settlement Identity: Development here would erode the physical and visual gap between SIDFORD and Sidbury, leading to urban sprawl. Precedent: Allowing development on this site undermines the integrity of the Green Wedge designation across the entire district, making it impossible for the Council to defend other sensitive gaps in the future such as site 6b.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: Site 6 was previously rejected. Part of this site, now called 6a, has been reinstated without public consultation.

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.:

3. Failure to Prioritize Sustainable Alternatives The emerging Local Plan already identifies the proposed new town of Marcombe as the primary vehicle for meeting the district's housing targets. Marcombe Strategy: EDDC's own strategy is to concentrate growth in sustainable, purpose-built communities rather than "bolting on" unsustainable developments to existing villages in sensitive locations.

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.: Brownfield First: National policy in 2026 mandates a "brownfield-first" approach. The Council has not yet exhausted all urban regeneration opportunities or lower-quality "Grey Belt" sites before resorting to the destruction of high-value National Landscapes. 4. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints Biodiversity Loss: The site provides vital "green lungs" and wildlife corridors. Development would conflict with the Council's commitment to Biodiversity Net Gain and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Infrastructure Deficit: Local services, including the Sid Valley medical Practice, narrow lanes and schools, are already at capacity. This allocation offers no credible mitigation for the increased pressure on local infrastructure. Detrimental to local heritage: The site is in very close proximity to Sidbury Castle an iron age fort, a Scheduled Monument, protected by Historic England, Brook Farm Grade II listed farmhouse, Sidford Conservation Area and would impact the "commanding views over the river Sid and village." Conclusion For the reasons stated above, this site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes. We formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6a (allocated) and 6b (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan to protect the unique character of East Devon for future generations.

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.: Site 6 was previously rejected. Part of this site, now called 6a, has been reinstated without public consultation.

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.: As a member of SVA Planning Team and also a member of a local Sidford residents group.

Margaret Leppard

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Introduction chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: No mention of titanium anywhere – it's present but not in industrial quantities

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.:

1.15

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Introduction chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: NB Seaton does not have a neighbourhood plan

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: Foreword

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

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

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.: “Key to this vision is our commitment to delivering genuinely affordable housing and implementing strong measures to reduce carbon emissions both during construction and throughout the operational lifespan of new developments. We also aim to exceed government requirements for biodiversity enhancement and set out a comprehensive strategy to support thriving town centres, robust community facilities, and opportunities for local businesses to flourish. By creating spaces that enable residents to live and work close to home, we aspire to make East Devon even more attractive to the industries of the future. We hope this vision delivers as far as we can on what our community has told us is important”

Drafted according to NPPF 2023 NOT new 2024 Nonetheless a really good start- Thank you!

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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?: Yes

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.: I Appreciate lighting that maximises dark sky amenity

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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

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.: include locations that promote 'nature based tourism'

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: DS03

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.: Great! There are several adverts in Seaton that stick out like a sore thumb!!

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:

Thank you for including waterbodies, rivers and watercourses specifically

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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(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.: Please include not just play parks for children but open air gym equipment for adults

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal: 15. Our Outstanding Historic Environment

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

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: HE01

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Historic Environment chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: A question - are we just too nostalgic about historic environment? I refer to buildings not parks etc Green infrastructure. Let's design for sympathetic transition from historic to 21st century?

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

2. The Vision

1. To which part of the Vision chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

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

2.4

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 Vision chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: I support high tech NB MINERAL MINING ; Also Training for especially SUDS Technicians

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Vision chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Beware “haze of nostalgia” (BBC Reith lecture) that obstruct a clear view e.g p21 “Rural East Devon will retain its outstanding charm and character” ??

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

2. The Vision

1. To which part of the Vision chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

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

2.7

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Vision chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: ‘Beware cart before the horse’. Urgently and effectively apply Grampian condition

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

2. The Vision

1. To which part of the Vision chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

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

2.8, 2.9

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Vision chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Pie in the sky vision - you are embedding policy dissonance that makes it very difficult to move forward

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.21

1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?: 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.: Given the nostalgic haze exactly how will EDDC foster transformational sectors?

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.26

1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?: 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.: Nature of work is changing.

How do you make these calculations? Is working from home included in housing section? I couldn't find any mention in the document.

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.28

1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?: 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.: Will you have resources for this?

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.29

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.: I hope the council will fully address the creative tension that exists between 'self-containment' and welcoming, nurturing, change and personal growth that results from engagement with 'the other'.

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.44

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.: See comments above on technical education

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.6, 3.8

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.: The plan does not include any ideas about maximising use of existing housing stock Do we have empty homes officers? e.g. reduce number of 'buy to leave' investments, get the proportion of housing used for holiday lets Air B&B right to balance needs of tourists and locals; fund housing associations to purchase on open market; empty properties in disrepair that owners are unknown/ uncontactable, cannot afford improvements, why not increase enforced sales? See Scotland's Empty Homes Partnership. Raise empty homes premium on council tax. Rehabilitating empty homes provide great opportunities for practical training of tradespeople, genealogists to find owners, (See also p32)

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: Noted ..If Seaton is expected to be self- sufficient, please ensure the community hospital is re-opened

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: P35 Noted that Total (minimum) Housing Requirement (01/04/20 to 01/0431/03/42) - All supply sources (completions, commitments,

Seaton will deliver minimum housing requirement NB NOT NECESSARILY NEW HOMES!

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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

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.: Where is the settlement boundary for Seaton Will we merge with Colyford? With current development applications it seems that the settlements may well coalesce before 2042

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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?: 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.: Just of the development?

What about neighbouring community? And in the case of water, SUDS etc you must consider the various catchments.

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: SP08

1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?: 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.: Thank you! This is much needed and GOOD!

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.: EDDC must be able to consider development sites in context

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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(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.:
Importance of public art should be addressed across EDDC

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: WS04

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.:
Brcl_23

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.: I fully support Exeter Science Park

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: SD05

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.:
Seat_13a

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.:

Axeview development SEA-13a.

I re-iterate my concerns about neighbourhood surface water flooding should this development proceed

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: CC06

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.: minimise use of sources of PFAS especially in drainage by the end of 2042 PFAS will then be of concern as carbon is now. At least show you are aware please!

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: CC06

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.: The manufacture of building materials is a major source of greenhouse gases. Using existing housing stock in development projects can significantly reduce embodied carbon emissions.

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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

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.: Note that geotextile wrapped attenuation tanks are a source of PFAS (Forever chemicals) to environment

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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?: 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.: Risk zones relate to fluvial flooding only. Surface water flooding can occur outside EA defined fluvial risk area. When multiple SUDS along a watercourse are likely to increase flooding down stream see CIRIA SUDS Manual.

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: I appreciate the rewording here to make AR2 much more proactive. EDDC should apply the Grampian condition robustly without ‘fear or favour’

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

8. Meeting Housing Needs

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

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

8.1

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.: Thanks for taking older people's housing needs into account ? what about younger disabled?

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

8. Meeting Housing Needs

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

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

8.4

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.: overage clause – Problem- does the council have enough resource to monitor and act to implement?

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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(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.: As a long term singleton^1 I am concerned about the assumption that single people should be offered shared accommodation. Why not flatlets? Cater for introverts who are energised by time alone. Shared accommodation presents tremendous challenges to neurodivergent people. Why not develop medium rise blocks with communal recreational facilities on the ground floor (and roof?). With decent sound proofing (young people play loud music older people turn their TVs up because of poor hearing – apologise for stereotyping – time is running out!) , could mix up younger people and older people, increase social capital.

(1. VERY happily married for 16 years. Sadly now widowed!)

Full name: Margaret Leppard

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.: HN06

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?:
Yes

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.: Appreciate support for sub-dividing properties. Mutual benefit can be achieved, social capital increased

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

9. Supporting the Economy and Town Centres

1. To which part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

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

9.6

3. Do you consider that this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: I support green and nature tourism

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

9. Supporting the Economy and Town Centres

1. To which part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SE02

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

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Appreciate the new agricultural buildings conditions

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: again does EDDC have resource for monitoring

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

9. Supporting the Economy and Town Centres

1. To which part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SE05

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

3. Do you consider that this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Appreciate need for developers to provide employment and skills plan must include support for employment and skills to be used in management of common areas, NBS and SUDS in residential developments. Local bursaries available through colleges

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

9. Supporting the Economy and Town Centres

1. To which part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SE07

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 Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SE07 Town Centre Development Local shops and services

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

9. Supporting the Economy and Town Centres

1. To which part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SE10

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

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres 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 Supporting the Economy and Town Centres 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.: Include rural and heritage crafts

H J M Lester

Full name: H J M Lester

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Exmo_17

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.:

Objections to building on Exmo_17 (National Landscape) Re The proposal to build a huge housing estate and industrial building on our protected farmland which is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now known as National Landscape), opposite MacDonalds, Exmouth. Should this go ahead, I will regard it as crass negligence and maladministration on the part of EDDC, who will have failed to take into account the need for nature for our future generations. I also have other reasons for not wanting to see any building here.

1. Large housing estates should not be built on protected National Landscape (already mentioned, but needs emphasising again.)

2. The exit from this Exmo-17 site would create traffic chaos and the proposed vehicle access road would go straight across the existing Exmouth to Budleigh cycle/foot path and would require the felling of mature trees and bushes. This well-used path gives safe, tranquil access to cyclists, dog walkers, children, recreational walkers and people in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters. I think this would endanger these users and there would be a loss of a peaceful amenity within the National Landscape.

3. Chapter 8: Housing Needs Building on land outside the National Landscape would be cheaper, making it possible for a larger percentage of affordable homes. We desperately

need more social housing and affordable homes, but those being proposed on the National Landscape will be neither affordable nor social housing, as they are being built as usual for profit, being high end, with no thought to the needs of the local people. Instead, they will be bought by incomers who can afford them, once again lining the pockets of the builders. They might claim to be proposing to build affordable homes, but in reality this rarely happens and any numbers mentioned are greatly reduced. Has Exmouth Town Council's assessment of housing needs been consulted?

4. Chapter 11: Sustainable Transport The access road would be directly opposite the Liverton Trading Estate, which is a well-known bottleneck with queues of cars waiting to exit. A new roundabout has been projected plus two pedestrian crossings on the busy main road into and out of Exmouth. Traffic would be significantly held up at this point, as we experience with the pedestrian crossing outside Marks and Spencer causing traffic and the chaos caused with the building work and Dinan Way extension onto Exeter Road – in the middle of winter! What it will be like in summer is anybody's guess, but it can only get worse. To reach Exeter, where the jobs are, the choice would be to drive there, to catch two buses (passing every half hour) or a bus plus a train.

5. Chapter 12: Landscape Exmo_17 had two protections until EDDC , without any justification, recently removed its Coastal Preservation area status - despite hundreds of objections from residents. Why did you ignore these objections? It sounds suspiciously like another tick box exercise to say you have consulted with residents – not because you wanted to listen to what Exmouth residents had to say, but because you were obliged to consult. It is a very large, precious area of National Landscape farmland that is protected against large-scale developments. EDDC's duty is to 'conserve and enhance' it. (***) Personal details have been removed (***) on behalf of the Housing Minister, (***) Personal details have been removed (***) has confirmed this in a letter to our MP, (***) Personal details have been removed (***) of 18th August 2025 extracts from which I give below). "I would like to assure your constituent that the Government recognises the importance of the natural environment to both mental and physical health, and I hope that my response will provide reassurance and be of help in this regard. While the Government believes the reforms in its Bill are critical to meeting its ambitious targets of building 1.5 million safe and decent homes by the end of this Parliament, we are clear that this should not come at the cost of the environment. The Nature Restoration Fund (NRF) is not simply about streamlining how environmental obligations are discharged, but about using funds more effectively to secure better outcomes for the environment. ...the NPPF is clear that decision-makers should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development

within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.” In no way is building a large estate of 450 houses on Exmo_17 conserving or enhancing it, let alone being sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. Instead, it would decimate the natural beauty of the land, be noisy, an eyesore and no more would people be able to enjoy the peace, flora and faunas of this beautiful area. There is no reason to build proposed industrial units on this land. Logically, they should be built on the Trading Estate opposite or Exmo_18, both of which have the same landowner. The landowner has recently terminated the lease to a nearby farm of National Landscape pastureland adjacent to Exmo_17. Does this mean that they are hoping for a domino effect, building further estates on our irreplaceable National Landscape?

6. Chapter 15: Historic Environment The proposed estate would be close to Littleham’s medieval church where Lady Nelson is buried. There is also an old farmhouse on the perimeter. These National Landscape fields are in plain view from the coast path that runs along the World Heritage Jurassic Coast – a place of haven for people to view and walk along. Exmouth is advertised as being part of this world heritage site, but could easily lose this status and the tourism it brings, if house building were to start on this land.

7. The Exmouth Conservation Area Management Plan mentions that “..the removal of small building details or the addition of inappropriate extensions will have a marked effect over a longer period of time. It is therefore important to manage, monitor and enforce seemingly insignificant changes within the conservation area”. I do not call the building of 450 houses in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty an insignificant change, but a major one that will not enhance the town, but will in fact detract from its beauty. It also mentions that green spaces are offered additional statutory protection through local planning policies and that trees are often very much part of the visual structure of a town or village. Their retention and appropriate management therefore needs to be kept a high priority. The designation of conservation areas offers such protection to trees and woodland. Whilst the builders will claim that they will restore biodiversity, etc., there is no way they are going to be able to replace the trees they fell to the size at which they are now. At the moment all I can see is that Exmo 17 is being treated as Green Belt land, which is about urban planning and growth management. However, it is not Green Belt land, but National Landscape land, which is about landscape protection and conservation and nothing to do with building a massive number of houses. Furthermore, National Landscapes are given equal protected status with National Parks. A policy paper published by the previous government in 2022 gives a response entitled “ Landscapes Review (National Parks and AONBs) government response” gives a lot of information regarding the protection of our National Landscapes and National Parks. It starts off by saying: “All of England’s landscapes are important, but National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are our

most iconic and beautiful places. Based on their geology and history, these characteristic landscapes contain swathes of ancient woodland, deep peat and grassland, and many of our most threatened species such as the red squirrel, curlew and water vole. Protected landscapes represent our shared heritage and national identity, and are home to many of our rural communities and businesses. They also support our nation's health and wellbeing as unique places to experience natural beauty and tranquillity." and: "Our vision for protected landscapes is: 'A coherent national network of beautiful, nature-rich spaces that all parts of society can easily access and enjoy. Protected landscapes will support thriving local communities and economies, improve our public health and wellbeing, drive forward nature recovery, and build our resilience to climate change.'" The review recognised the vast majority of AONBs are indistinguishable from National Parks and are just as important for people and nature National Planning Policy chapter 15 and para 189 – 191 and 193, also states: "189 Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks 190 When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. 191 Within areas defined as Heritage Coast (and that do not already fall within one of the designated areas mentioned in paragraph 189), planning policies and decisions should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation. Major development within a Heritage Coast is unlikely to be appropriate, unless it is compatible with its special character." Para 193 mentions that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply various principles. The first mentioned states: "... if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused" This alone shows that considerable harm would be done to this site in building any houses, let alone 455, as they can be located on an alternative, non National Landscapes site – so planning permission should be refused.

8. EDDC must abide by The Countyside and Rights of Act 2020, in particular paras 85 and 87. “85.— General duty of public bodies etc. (A1) In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty in England, a relevant authority other than a devolved Welsh authority must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. 87.— General purposes and powers (A1) It is the duty of a conservation board established in relation to an area in England, in the exercise of their functions, to seek to further— (a) the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty, and (b) the purpose of increasing the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the area of outstanding natural beauty, but if it appears to the board that there is a conflict between those purposes, they are to attach greater weight to the purpose mentioned in paragraph (a).” This means that EDDC will be acting illegally if they decide to grant planning permission to Bloor Homes to build on National Landscape Land and should in fact be promoting Exmo 17 Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to residents and tourists alike.

I am also attaching two letters that were sent to the Exmouth Journal in 2025, by other people who clearly were not happy. I agree with their sentiments and would like you to take them into account.

Finally, I would appreciate it if, for once, you read and consider carefully all the objections you receive from people regarding Exmo 17 and do not treat them as just a tick box exercise to say that you have consulted with people. It does not matter whether it is one or a billion and one people who object, they all count and not only must be taken into account, but their concerns must be acted upon and not disregarded. Your portal is extremely difficult to get into and I consider that this is done deliberately so that people give up and the Council can claim that not many people objected – which could well be far from the case.

Melanie Lester

Full name: Melanie Lester

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.:

1. Move it away from the Pebblebed Heaths 2. Where are all the children who move into this development going to be educated. The comprehensive school is dire. The nearest primary school is St Peter's in Budleigh Salterton and it is falling down.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan. Sort out the woeful public transport. Rebuild the local primary school BEFORE you add yet more homes.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Jacqueline Mary Lock

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the draft local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heath SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heath SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? *Ibis*, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change

of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

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.: Remove Exmo_2 from the draft plan

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

Kim Lock

Full name: Kim Lock

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_17

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.:

Good evening. I am a frequent user of the Exmo_17 walk path and today I have learned that there are plans to build more houses and a road in the middle of the path leading to Budleigh. As someone who is autistic and uses this walk path as a safe space away from noisy roads, I am very upset that this walk path will be built upon with even more houses and a road. This walk path is used regularly by everyone every day and considering this walk path is also an area of outstanding natural beauty, it is horrible and upsetting that this path is even considered for building upon. Please DO NOT build on this path. Not only will building upon it be upsetting to everyone who uses it, but it would also disturb the natural wildlife that lives there as well as local farmers who use the nearby fields for their animals.

I appreciate you taking your time to read this and please consider what I have written. Thank you.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan”. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Take Exmo_20 out of the local plan

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East

Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncosted highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.: Exmo_20 On page 392 of the SA, Exmo_20 is stated as being 85Ha and a map of a site this size was shown to the Strategic Planning Committee on 3rd September 2024, who were attracted by the large size of the site and voted for that site to be included in the draft Local Plan. The evidence provided was false, as that site did not exist as it was not available, therefore the decision was unsound. The site available was significantly and materially smaller, such that the committee was misled and the decision is therefore invalid.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.: Exmo_20 On page 390 the SA states " Sites on the north-eastern side of Exmouth, specifically Exmo_04, and Lymp_09, 10, 13, 14 and 17 lie especially close to the Pebblebed Heaths and as such development of these sites could lead to some of the greater adverse impacts and a large part of Site Exmo_04 falls within the existing 400 metre exclusion zone for development on account around domestic cat predation and recreation impacts". The 400m exclusion zone relates to urban effect, not "recreation impacts", demonstrating the LPA's (as the Competent Authority) misunderstanding of the Habitats Regulations. Recreational effects are dealt with by a wholly different assessment and different mitigation. On page 391 of the SA, Exmo_20 is considered but with no mention of "could lead to some of the greater adverse impacts" for the sites listed on p390, despite Exmo_20 being the largest site and closest (adjacent to) site to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, demonstrating an inconsistent assessment. The latest HRA currently states an "Inherent Conflict". There is now mention in the SA of the Strategic Nature Area and draft Nature Recovery Network but this has been added in further to the 1st regulation 19 consultation feedback and is material consideration in assessment of the site's allocation, in accordance with Paragraph 180 & 181 of the NPPF December 2023. These factors provide evidence to demonstrate the land's high biodiversity value to "establish coherent ecological networks", not least as a support habitat for the Section 41 Principle Importance species ground nesting Nightjar. The site's allocation needs to be reassessed with this evidence in mind, as currently the justification for its inclusion is unsound.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.:

Exmo_20 Exmo_20 is falsely listed as a reasonable alternative on page 386 & 387. Firstly, the site was deemed unsuitable and unachievable, not just unachievable as stated. There has been no evidence provided demonstrating that site access, minerals and proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths can be addressed, with the access arrangements and impacts on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI reliant on a viable agreed mitigation strategy and supporting HRA which are both absent from the Local Plan evidence, notably the HRA being a required Core Submission Document. Also note that the Exmo_20 site was selected for inclusion in the Local Plan prior to the Appropriate Assessment, in conflict with the 'People over Wind' CJEU ruling. Furthermore, the Exmo_20 site as submitted for assessment in the HELAA was not available, but was not checked despite this being one of the three HELAA assessments. The site therefore in fact failed all three tests, and should be stated to have been found unsuitable, unachievable & unavailable. The site's current inclusion in the draft Local Plan is not legally compliant, unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.: Exmo_20 Exmo_20 should be marked blue “failed site sifting” on the map on page 384 as it was deemed unsuitable & unachievable in the HELAA and in accordance with the Site Selection Methodology (May 2022) failed site sifting. The site’s current inclusion in the draft Local Plan is unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.: Exmo_20 There appears to be such significant changes to the Sustainability Appraisal that it is fundamentally a different document providing very different justification to the previous 1st Regulation 19 version, not least regarding the inclusion of HELAA failed sites such as Exmo_20. This appraisal has been retrospectively written based on consultation feedback regarding its shortcomings. The decisions made prior cannot rely on a subsequently fabricated document to provide evidence to somehow inform decisions such that they change from unsound to sound. The retrospectively created Site Selection Methodology (v2 December 2024) is now significantly relied upon in a futile attempt by the LPA to provide justification. The Exmo_20 site's inclusion in the draft Local Plan is unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Jacqueline Mary Lock

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.: Exmo_20 It is not possible to follow the significant changes made to the Sustainability Appraisal, as there is no Schedule of Changes and no tracked changes version. I am therefore unable to make comments in accordance with the consultation requirements which states “Only make new representations if you are commenting on the specific changes listed in the Schedule of Changes, or if you did not respond to the first consultation”. The Schedule of Changes and a tracked changes version need to be made available and permitted to be consulted upon.

Carol Long

Full name: Carol Long

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?: 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 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.: I want to strongly object to the planning permission at the fields surrounding and above st Johns in the wilderness church. It's an area of out standing beauty, wild life haven, and another piece of countryside lost. Please re consider this, Exmouth is becoming more like a city, less more of a town, which we all love and cherish.

Penny Lowery

Full name: Penny Lowery

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?: 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 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.: The above is a terrible idea. I would like to voice my objection.

I can't write much as I've a visual impairment.

I hope you will reconsider. thank you.

Keith Luckhurst

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: I strongly object to the allocation of Exmo_20. A video taken at St John's Campsite on 21 January 2026 shows powerful, overflowing drains during heavy rain. This is real-world evidence of how vulnerable this area already is to flooding. Adding a major housing development above the town will only make this worse. Withycombe Brook already has a long history of flooding in Exmouth, and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment barely mentions it. The Exmo_20 site sits on higher ground, and its runoff flows directly into the brook, which then passes through some of the most populated parts of East Devon. This puts homes, businesses and residents at even greater risk.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF (Dec 2023) and is therefore unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan contains an over-supply of housing allocations because it does not use the "most recent data published at the time" from the ONS, as required by the MHCLG Housing and Economic Needs Assessment guidance. The figure of 1,188 quoted in paragraph 3.11 was calculated in February 2025, before the release of the 2024 ONS data, and is therefore invalid. Using the correct dataset reduces the figure to 1,156, with 80% equating to 925, and produces a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (without rounding errors). This represents a reduction of 567 dwellings. Many policies in the Plan rely on demonstrating an overriding need to justify impact or harm. Because the housing figures are incorrect, this justification does not exist—particularly in relation to the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 should be removed from the Plan due to the extensive mitigation required to address its impacts on the internationally and nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI. Additional numerical and mathematical errors appear in evidence documents HOU-002 (Oct 2025) and HOU-001 (Nov 2025). These errors must be corrected and re-consulted upon, as they underpin the Local Plan's housing policies. Paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF (Dec 2023) requires that "Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals." The current evidence base does not meet this standard

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 109 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) and is therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The proposed main vehicular access for Exmo_20 lies 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth. This would place disproportionate pressure on Budleigh Salterton, contrary to the settlement hierarchy, yet the town has not been properly considered by the LPA in assessing the impacts of this allocation. The site's topography, and that of the surrounding area, further reduces the practicality of walking and cycling—an issue not reflected in the policy maps—resulting in a development pattern that would embed car dependency rather than support sustainable travel.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) and is therefore unsound. The LPA has attempted to retrospectively alter the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify including Exmo_20. The May 2022 SSM was the version used during the Regulation 18 process. However, after 11 December 2024—the date the draft Local Plan was approved for Regulation 19 publication—the methodology was amended. This December 2024 version was then presented in the first Regulation 19 evidence library as though it had been used for site selection, despite not being applied at that stage. Such retrospective alteration raises serious concerns and appears inconsistent with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 SSM, which was used for Regulation 18, contains wording that would have prevented Exmo_20 from being selected. Relevant extracts include: Stage 2: Site Sifting (1.8) A sifting process is undertaken to ensure that only “reasonable alternatives” progress. Only sites meeting criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. Criterion a) Site must be assessed as “suitable, available and achievable” in the HELAA. Subtext point 6 “It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.” Under the methodology actually used at Regulation 18, Exmo_20 should have been excluded.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraphs 92 and 109, and with Local Plan policies TR01 and TR03, rendering it unsound. It also conflicts with paragraphs 3.6 and 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would substantially increase reliance on car travel, requiring residents to make additional and more convoluted journeys via the proposed B3179 access point to reach everyday facilities and services. There is no evidence that essential local services can be accessed safely or conveniently by walking or cycling. Recent changes to Policy TR01 strengthen this conflict, as walking and cycling being the primary modes of travel is now a mandatory requirement rather than an aspirational one. The site's isolated location and its dependence on the B3179 for access would result in an unsustainable pattern of development, generating significant vehicle movements for residents travelling to Budleigh Salterton and Exmouth. For homes located in the southern part of the site, the proposed access arrangement would require at least 1km of internal driving for every outward and return journey, further embedding car dependency. These roads are dangerous with hidden dips, extreme bends and accident hotspots.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 165 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) and with Local Plan paragraph 3.6 and policy AR01(b), rendering it unsound. The Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment references Withycombe Brook only as a footnote in Table 5-3, despite Exmouth having numerous and significant flood-risk pathways, with recorded fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 and 2012. Withycombe Brook already presents notable flood-risk areas, even before accounting for current and future climate-change impacts. Exmo_20 is a greenfield site located upslope of the town, with tributaries and surface runoff feeding directly into Withycombe Brook, which flows through the most densely populated wards in East Devon. The Local Planning Authority has not applied the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection to avoid increasing flood risk to people and property. I have video of overflowing drain taken outside St Johns campsite on 21st January which I am unable to upload but happy to share.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 and 191, and is therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Local Plan Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 and 13.24. Exmo_20 lies within Strategic Nature Area 368, which functions as a critical buffer between Exmouth and the internationally and nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI. The site provides supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging—a key qualifying species for the SPA and a Section 41 Priority species—and forms an important wildlife corridor linking the Pebblebed Heaths to the coast. Development here would undermine the conservation objectives of the SPA. Devon County Council is in the final stages of designating this land as a Local Nature Recovery Area within its forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy (due March 2026), in line with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains veteran trees, ancient woodland and species-rich hedgerows, all of which are vulnerable to fragmentation if development proceeds. Devon Wildlife Trust, in their Regulation 19 response, emphasise that the entire Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area identified for nationally important habitats and species. They state that SNAs should be prioritised for enhancement, not development, and warn that the sensitive habitats and species associated with the NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations would be exposed to significant detrimental effects. They conclude that it is not feasible to develop this site without causing adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC and strongly urge East Devon District Council to remove the allocation from the Local Plan. I reserve the right to comment further once a supporting HRA and mitigation strategy are available and request to be notified when these documents are provided.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) and is therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Local Plan Policies HE02 and OL01(D). A development of this scale surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (Grade II* listed) would cause significant harm to the church's remote, tranquil setting. The church, churchyard and surrounding buildings—part of a Medieval Saxon settlement site—are defined by dark skies, seclusion and a distinctive 'wilderness' character. This setting would be irreversibly damaged by encircling the area with housing, even if a buffer zone were retained. Historic England, in their Regulation 19 consultation response, emphasise that Exmo_20 covers a large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth, much of which lies within the setting of the Grade II* listed church. They state that development "could result in considerable harm" to this asset, which the NPPF identifies as being of the highest significance (para 206b). They also raise concerns about the proposed long access road from the B3179, noting that it could itself harm the setting and create future development pressure. Historic England advise that alternative access from the south should be explored. If evidence shows development can be accommodated in less sensitive southern areas, the site boundary should be amended. If this is not achievable, the scale and type of development should be reduced to only what can be justified without causing unacceptable harm.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 conflicts with NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraphs 16c, 92, 114b, 114d, 180e and 181, rendering it unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with Local Plan policies TR01, OL09 and PB04, as well as paragraphs 3.6 and 11.2. There is no viable access solution for the site. The proposal to route the majority of traffic onto the B3179 would require major, uncertain and uncOSTed highway works that Devon County Council has not confirmed as feasible. The cumulative and in-combination impacts on the B3179 must be assessed, including increased congestion and air-quality effects on the adjacent Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) states that there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects on integrity in relation to...air quality (East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA).” This is directly linked to the proposed primary access onto the B3179, which would channel additional traffic along the boundary of the protected site. Allocating Exmo_20 is therefore incompatible with the precautionary approach required under the Habitats Regulations and contrary to the Mitigation Hierarchy—where avoidance must be prioritised over mitigation, as mandated by the Environment Act 2021. The Mitigation Strategy itself confirms that “mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People Over Wind; Sweetman).” As no reasonable scientific certainty has been provided, the inclusion of Exmo_20 in the Plan is unlawful.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 conflicts with NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b and 188, rendering it unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with Local Plan paragraph 3.6 and policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02. Because Exmo_20 lies directly adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, it is unlikely that Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) of the necessary quality, scale, and proximity could be provided to divert residents from using the designated heathland for dog walking, cycling and other recreational activities. Such use would risk harm to protected habitats and species. Evidence shows that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” for ground-nesting European Nightjar, a qualifying SPA feature [Langston et al., 2007]. In the absence of robust evidence to the contrary, the Competent Authority must apply the precautionary principle. The RSPB, in their response to the first Regulation 19 consultation, expressed strong concerns that mitigation for allocations closest to the heathlands—particularly Exmo_20—would be ineffective in preventing damaging impacts on SPA/SAC habitats and species, including additional nitrogen deposition from increased traffic. They highlight risks of both direct and indirect loss of foraging habitat, increased cat predation on ground-nesting birds, and increased recreational pressure (including dogs off leads) if residents choose to use the heathland for daily activities. The RSPB further notes a significant risk that SANG and open space associated with the development would be insufficient to prevent harmful increases in recreational use of the designated heathlands. Although SD01 states that development within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths will not be permitted, there is no mechanism to prevent residents or domestic cats from accessing the heathland. This risk increases the closer new dwellings—and their associated cat

populations and recreational needs—are located to the protected site. I reserve the right to comment further once a supporting HRA and mitigation strategy are provided and request to be notified when these become available.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan.

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 conflicts with NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (including footnotes 38 & 7), 180d–188 and 191c, rendering it unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with Local Plan paragraph 3.6 and policies PB01–PB04 and OL02. A minimum 400m exclusion zone next to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI is required. This buffer is intended to mitigate cat predation and other urban pressures, yet evidence shows domestic cats can roam over 2km in rural areas [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers et al., 2010; HRA 4.10]. Given that the ground-nesting Nightjar is a qualifying SPA feature and highly vulnerable to predation—where even a single event can end a nesting attempt [Langston et al., 2007]—a precautionary buffer significantly greater than the pragmatic 400m currently proposed is warranted. Exmo_20's inclusion depends on a mitigation strategy and HRA that have not yet been produced in a form capable of supporting the Plan. In their absence, the precautionary principle must apply. At minimum, the 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI should be removed from the allocation. This land provides functionally linked foraging habitat for the European Nightjar (a key SPA species and Section 41 Priority species), and a larger buffer will also be required to address recreational impacts—dogs off leads, cycling, and walking—none of which have been assessed at site level. This position is supported by multiple ecological bodies, including DWT and RSPB. The East Devon National Landscape Partnership stated in the first Regulation 19 consultation that a 400m buffer “does not seem significantly large enough” to prevent disturbance, habitat fragmentation, and degradation, and therefore supports non-adoption of the site. If the site must remain under consideration, they recommend a substantial reduction in scale and a shift of development closer to the existing settlement to maintain a meaningful

rural boundary with the Pebblebed Heaths. The allocation is further weakened by the availability of multiple alternative sites requiring far less mitigation, and by the Plan's over-allocation of housing due to the failure to use the latest mandatory ONS data. Natural England also notes that the policy lacks clarity on the location of employment uses and recommends a natural buffer along the B3179, with potential to move the settlement boundary further from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer via S106. This would represent clearer, sounder planning and better reflect the restrictions required around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further once a compliant HRA and mitigation strategy are provided and request to be notified when these become available.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan

Full name: Keith Luckhurst

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 conflicts with multiple requirements of the NPPF (paras 16c, 32, 73b with footnotes 38 & 7, 180d–188, and 191c) and is therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with Local Plan paragraph 3.6 and policies PB01–PB04 and OL02. Because the site sits directly next to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, it depends on extensive habitat and species mitigation that has not been shown to be achievable or viable. The mitigation strategy itself states that a Likely Significant Effect could not be ruled out, and the Plan’s HRA confirms that the proposed growth would exceed threshold levels with no current means of mitigation. The site was selected on 03.09.24 and included in the draft plan approved on 11.12.24 on the assumption that mitigation would be developed later. An appropriate assessment was only undertaken in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to the CJEU “People Over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, reinforced by the “Dutch N” judgment. Selecting a site with known mitigation requirements also requires clear justification under the Mitigation Hierarchy (NPPF para 32). The LPA has not carried out this assessment, despite the availability of other suitable, lower-risk sites and an overall oversupply of allocations caused by not using the latest mandatory ONS data. Devon Wildlife Trust has already stated that the site currently acts as an essential buffer between Exmouth and the designated heathland, and that development would degrade ecologically important land outside the protected boundaries. Overall, the LPA has shown significant failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Habitats Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further once a compliant HRA and mitigation strategy are provided and request to be notified when these become available.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan

Lyn Lynch

Full name: Lyn Lynch

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.: The allocation is unsound as it conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan.

Full name: Lyn Lynch

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.:

There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179 but to make this viable would require major uncertain and uncounted highways works not confirmed by EDCC. Cumulative and in combination effects on B3179 must be considered both in terms of traffic and congestion and air pollution.

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.: Remove EXMO_20 from the plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

STEPHEN LYNCH

Full name: STEPHEN LYNCH

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?: 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 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.: I object to EXMO_20

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan.

Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Allocation of Exmo_20 is [also] in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan.

A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" *Ibis* 149.s1(2007)].

Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town

settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”.

The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory.

NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.”

Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? *Ibis*, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated

heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes.

In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands."

I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: STEPHEN LYNCH

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?: 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 Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan.

A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)].

Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths

SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”.

The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory.

NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.”

I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Delete 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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan.

A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)].

Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by

multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”.

The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory.

NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.”

I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Delete Exmo_2

Full name: STEPHEN LYNCH

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.: No viable access to the site. The B3179 access will add congestion and air pollution.

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.: Remove EXMO_20 from the local plan.

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.: Allocation of EXMO_20 is not legally sound and not legally compliant.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

W J C Lyne

Full name: W J C Lyne

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

Full name: W J C Lyne

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Full name: W J C Lyne

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.: Substantially reduce the area of proposed development if it cannot be excluded completely in light of other developments in East Devon.

Full name: W J C Lyne

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation.

Full name: W J C Lyne

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory.

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.: Remove EXMO_20 from the LPA completely, as new towns around Exeter and Clyst St Mary will provide adequate housing in more convenient areas for transport and work links.

Full name: W J C Lyne

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA appears to be in conflict with EDDC's responsibilities as a competent authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species regulations.

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.: Remove EXMO_20 from the Local Plan in its entirety.

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.: EDDC have largely ignored the substantial objections presented at the initial consultation.

Helen and Frank Connor Madaney

Full name: Helen and Frank Connor Madaney

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.: SD04

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Otry_21

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.:

Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020-2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1 a) b) c) 2 a) b) c) Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements

Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to: Sustainable transport - Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane. Environmental and landscape protection - The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle. Flood risk and water quality - Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure. The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: . . . AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 - which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity.

OL10 - which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. 1 The Council's own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan's objectives for protecting East Devon's rural character. 3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning. 4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b) High car dependency. c) Narrow approach roads, and d) Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging Access through residential roads raises significant safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. 5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks . Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that: a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit. d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents. 2 Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats. 6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Sparrowhawk, Merlin, Badgers, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development. 7. No Demonstrable Housing Need There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate. 8) Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density The site originally appeared as a "second-best option" for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is: . with national, local, and neighbourhood policies Environmentally harmful Infrastructure

ned Unjustified and unsupported by evidence Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry-2l be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan

Helen Madell

Full name: Helen Madell

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Exmo_04

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.:

Exmouth 04 should have never been included in the Local Plan, it was included at second meeting as 'least worse option', when in fact it is one of the worst options. This area is old parkland, laid out in mid to late 1700s, it contains many ancient and veteran trees and woodland., as verified by EDDC's own tree officer. This area is home to many endangered species, many of which are on the RED LIST, This area is WOODPASTURE PRIPORITY HABITAT, which has its own protections, however these protections are increased by the presence of many veteran and ancient trees. National Planning Policy standing advice is that planning should be refused, therefore it begs the question Why is this site being put forward? 50 houses could be accommodated on other sites in ,East Devon without destroying so much.. EDDC want to increase tree cover and increase biodiversity and yet want to destroy one of the most biodiverse sites in Exmouth . This site is unsustainable as a car would be required . This is a sloping site with water runoff from commons, hard landscaping could result in flooding further into Exmouth. This site is up to 400m buffer zone to the Pebblebed Heaths. Access to this site is dangerous

Kay Mahony

Full name: Kay Mahony

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.: SD04

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.:
Otry_21

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.:

REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF Otry_21 I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, I believe the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure leading to significant road safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists and car users. Development located to the south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane and exacerbate existing congestion in the town centre. Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the East Devon National Landscape and the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle. Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already demonstrated to

be under significant pressure from pollution and needing urgent attention to improve water quality. The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2.Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: a. SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. b. AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity. c. OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council’s own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan’s objectives for protecting East Devon’s rural character.

3.Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving: a. The distinctive countryside setting, b. The historic settlement pattern, and c. the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a. Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b. High car dependency. c. Narrow approach roads, and d. Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads and along Tip Hill where pavements are narrow and require the road to be crossed by pedestrians would significantly raise existing safety concerns, including those for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or to the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the town’s traffic flow increasing road safety concerns and risks to all users, especially the most vulnerable.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water’s Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that:

- Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development.
- The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity.
- The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit.
- Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents. Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats. The proposed inclusion of Otry_21 runs completely contrary to the Water Cycle Study and the Strategic Drainage Plan and the urgent requirement to improve water quality.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8. Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about

the soundness of the assessment process. The increase in density is unexplained and entirely inappropriate in a location where any development should reflect, and take full account of, the transition from the existing built environment of the neighbouring land to its rural surroundings.

Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies, plans and recent studies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence.

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Brian Mahony

Full name: Brian Mahony

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.: SD04

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.:
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, I believe the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision.

The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements

Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to:

a. Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure leading to significant road safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists and car users. Development located to the south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane and exacerbate existing congestion in the town centre.

b. Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high- quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the East Devon National Landscape and the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle. c. Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already demonstrated to be under significant pressure from pollution and needing urgent attention to improve water quality.

The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Ottery_21 does not meet these criteria .

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Ottery_21, including:

a. SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. b. AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character,

views, and biodiversity. c. OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists.

The Council's own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan's objectives for protecting East Devon's rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving:

a. The distinctive countryside setting, b. The historic settlement pattern, and c. the rural landscape between communities.

It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints

The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies:

a. Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b. High car dependency. c. Narrow approach roads, and d. Limited junction capacity.

Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads and along Tip Hill where pavements are narrow and require the road to be crossed by pedestrians would significantly raise

existing safety concerns, including those for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or to the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the town's traffic flow increasing road safety concerns and risks to all users, especially the most vulnerable.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks

Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that:

a. Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b. The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity. c. The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit. d. Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents.

Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats. The proposed inclusion of Otry_21 runs completely contrary to the Water Cycle Study and the Strategic Drainage Plan and the urgent requirement to improve water quality.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats

The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations.

The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need

There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8. Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density

The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re- emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process. The increase in density is unexplained and entirely inappropriate in a location where any development should reflect, and take full account of, the transition from the existing built environment of the neighbouring land to its rural surroundings.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies, plans and recent studies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence.

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan. Other Consultations I note that there is currently an application for outline planning permission for Otry_21 and a significant area of neighbouring land under reference 25/2468/MOUT for the construction of 140 houses. There are many hundreds of objections to this application, and I believe that these should be taken into account when considering the inclusion of this site in the Emerging Local Plan. Many people have commented that they have found the “Commonplace” site very technical and difficult to engage with and it presents a significant challenge to the layperson who wishes to participate in the debate around the inclusion of Otry_21. They have instead made their contribution by responding to the planning application directly and we trust that the Planning Inspector will wish to take account of their views.

Louisa Malone

Full name: Louisa Malone

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(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.: Remove Exmo20_ from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: Damage to wildlife caused by the proposed development

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Louisa Malone

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.:

Remote location requires car travel by all possible residents to either Budleigh or Exmouth. There is nothing local for people to walk too,

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.: Remove Exmo20_ from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Louisa Malone

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?: Yes

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.:
Insufficient infrastructure for the existing community demands let alone with 700 homes in a relatively remote location

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.: Remove Exmo20_ from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Louisa Malone

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?: Yes

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.:
Dangerous access by road. Development will lead to much increased road traffic along a narrow country road.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Louisa Malone

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?: Yes

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.:
Adjacent to the Pebble heaths will lead to damage

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Louisa Malone

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?: Yes

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.:
Damage to the Pebble heaths by residents of the proposed scheme using them for excessive / damaging recreational purposes

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Kenneth Malone

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.: All residents should need car travel to get to Budleigh at 2.3 miles away or Exmouth 4 miles away

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.:
Destruction of Strategic Nature Area 368

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.:
Hugely detrimental effect on St. John in the Wilderness Church and its protective Grade II Listing

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.:

Remove access from proposed site via Southern Wood

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.: No safe and viable access to the site. Huge roadworks required which will have detrimental affect on the Pebbleheaths

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.:

Exmo_20 as adjacent to Pebbleheaths difficult to provide suitable SANGS to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebbleheath

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.: Too close to Pebblebed Heaths and no viable migration nor habitat strategy exists

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kenneth Malone

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.:
Allocation of Exmo_20 conflicts with NPPF December 2023 and para 3. 6 of the Local Plan

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.: Remove Exmo_3 from the local plan

Mrs Janet S Manfield

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.:

Repeatedly I have tried to get on the Commonplace site to object, to find the site is not available. So I am contacting you this way. I wish to strongly object to the above development which will have a huge impact on Budleigh Salterton - as this is the nearest town 2.3. miles away. The planned development is on the far north east reach of Exmouth & although within its boundary is far nearer to Budleigh Salterton. We have little enough infrastructure in Budleigh as it is, adding 700 homes = at least 1400 cars & more than 1400 people is not sustainable.

Peter Manfield

Full name: Peter Manfield

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.:

Infrastructure and roads are incapable of coping with any more usage. Sewage is already at capacity and cannot cope look at the amount of leakage. It is nearer Budleigh Salterton who have NOT been consulted, this is only 2.3 miles from Budleigh and will have a huge impact.

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.: Remove EXM_20 from the local plan.

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.: A large development of 700 houses around the tranquil, remote setting of St John in the Wilderness Church will adversely affect the dark skies & "wilderness" setting regardless of a "Buffer Zone" left around it.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local 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.: Totally against Exmo_20 being in the Local Plan

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.:

Inadequate roads for increase in traffic. Lack of infrastructure to support a further approx. 1,500 people. This planned development is much nearer to Budleigh Salterton which will feel the impact on services

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: Totally against this development

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.: I have grave concerns about the effect on Budleigh Salterton just 2.3 miles away. The planned development is much nearer to Budleigh Salterton than Exmouth. Hence already stretched services there will not be able to cope.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: I am totally against this development

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.: The only access to this development is via the Common Road B3179. This road is already becoming very busy with additional developments. 700 houses = at least 1400 cars. How is this road to cope? Every existing junction has poor visibility & a danger to enter / exit.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local 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.: Totally opposed to this development

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.:
Over use of the Heathland for recreation ie increase in cycling, walking, dog walking.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local 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)

Full name: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.:
damage & disturbance to the local area of East Devon National Landscape, due to increased traffic & visitor numbers

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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: Mrs Janet S Manfield

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.: The effect on species & habitat on the Pebblebed Heath.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local 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.: My extreme opposition to this whole development

Helen Marchant

Full name: Helen Marchant

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Exmo_04a

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.:

Dear Planning Policy Team,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed allocation of land known as Exmouth 04 (off Higher Marley Road, known locally as The Lawn) in the Second Ref 19 Consultation of the East Devon Local Plan.

This site is a historic parkland and wood-pasture priority habitat of exceptional environmental and heritage value. It supports numerous protected and endangered species, many of which are recorded on the Red List, as detailed in the ecological reports. The site also contains a significant number of veteran and ancient trees, including some of the oldest Lucombe Oaks in the country. Such habitats are irreplaceable and should be afforded the highest level of protection.

The Lawn predates the Marley estate and was likely laid out in the mid-18th century when the former house “Whimsey” was built. Its historic parkland character remains intact and contributes substantially to the local landscape setting and heritage value of the area. Development would result in irreversible harm to this historic environment.

The site also functions as a vital wildlife corridor, with ancient woodland on either side of a narrow field, enabling species movement through the landscape. Additionally, there is an underground stream running through the centre of the site. Any diversion or hard landscaping associated with development would significantly increase flood risk, with potential downstream impacts on Exmouth, particularly given runoff from surrounding commons.

Access to the site via Higher Marley Road would increase traffic pressure, with knock-on effects on Dinan Way and routes across the Common. This raises serious concerns regarding highway safety, congestion, and the sustainability of access arrangements. Furthermore, the site lies within approximately 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths, an area of internationally recognised ecological importance, and development risks increasing recreational and environmental pressure on this sensitive landscape.

I understand that national planning policy and standing advice indicate that development on such sensitive wood-pasture and historic parkland sites should be refused. It is therefore deeply concerning that this allocation has been put forward despite the acknowledged constraints. The scale of development proposed (up to 130 dwellings) is wholly inappropriate for a site that was previously considered suitable for far fewer homes, if any.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the allocation of Exmouth 04 in the Local Plan and urge East Devon District Council to remove this site from consideration and afford it appropriate long-term protection.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

*** Personal details have been removed *** Exmouth Resident

David Marjoram

Full name: David Marjoram

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.: SD04

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:
Otry_21

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.: RE: Request The Removal of Otry_21 From EDDC Emerging Reg.19 Local Plan:

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision.

The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. a) b) c) 2. a) b) c) Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements: Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to:

Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane.

Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle.

Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure.

The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19): Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity. OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council's own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan's objectives for protecting East Devon's rural character.

13. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan: The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving: a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints: The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b) High car dependency. c) Narrow approach roads, and d) Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks: Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that: a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity. c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit. d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents.

2 Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats: The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need: There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds

demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8). Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density: The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process.

Conclusion: For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

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.: I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon

Jackie Marjoram

Full name: Jackie Marjoram

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.: SD04

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::
Otry_21

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.: RE: Request The Removal of Otry_21 From EDDC Emerging Reg.19 Local Plan:

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. a) b) c) 2. a) b) c) Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements: Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to: Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane.

Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle.

Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure.

The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19): Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity. OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council’s own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan’s objectives for protecting East Devon’s rural character.

13. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan: The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving: a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b) High car dependency. c) Narrow approach roads, and d) Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety

concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks: Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that: a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity. c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit. d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents.

2Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats: The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need: There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8). Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density: The site originally appeared as a "second-best option" for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local

infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process.

Conclusion: For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

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.: I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon

Brian Martin

Full name: Brian Martin

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Exmo_17

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.: I wish to raise objection to the inclusion in the Local Plan to the development of land identified as EXMO_17 for the reasons as follows:

(1) Large housing estates should not be built on land designated as National Landscape. This land should be protected.

(2) The access road would go straight across the much-used Exmouth to Budleigh cycle/footpath, endangering users. (children/elderly/cyclists/families/dogs) and cause traffic chaos on the Salterton Road.

Simon & Mandy Martyn

Full name: Simon & Mandy Martyn

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?: 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 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.: This email is to protest strongly, but calmly & rationally, about the above project.

By way of briefest possible background, I am 3rd generation Budleigh Salterton, and my paternal ancestors lived & farmed in Devon for centuries.

The second point I would place on record is that, after a business career spent almost entirely abroad & spanning 34 years, I have spent my last 31 years working for wildlife conservation across the world, and my wife and I have been long-running supporters of Devon Wildlife Trust. We are both now 85, but still reasonably fit, active and capable of rational thought

The beautiful and wildlife friendly habitat on Woodbury Common is far too valuable to be turned into yet more 'Urban Sprawl'. In fact the whole of the much loved SW countryside is now under constant threat from development - to say nothing of the massive increase in road traffic. And when we made our last trip to Exeter along the B3179 last week we were horrified by the sheer quantity of roadside litter.

I will not expect a response to this message, other than a possible routine standard acknowledgement, or spark reconsideration of the proposed large scale housing development. However, If this sort of development on natural landscapes continues, all our future generations will bitterly regret it.

We are always open to contact by telephone and would welcome a chance for calm discussion: we know that some of our friends and neighbours have already raised highly relevant issues concerning increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, public transport etc.

Best wishes, because we know you are all very busy, but a development of this size in this location is seriously wrong from every angle.

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.: Delete Exmo_20.

Sharon Mason

Full name: Sharon Mason

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?: Paragraph

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

5.3

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?: 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.:

Planning on an area of ANOB should never be entertained. Exmouth is the 2nd largest town in Devon and green space within it are disappearing fast due to development of houses at Plum Park, Dinan way, plus the new road from Dinan way on to the Exeter road. We can not encroach on our natural habitat for the environment, nature and wildlife, going forward we should protect these spaces to help towards helping the reduction of global warming, instead of building houses we should be planting more trees, more natural flowers meadows for wild life and saving our planet. With the diverse weather we have had this year, extreme heat, down pours, cold snaps. There is a storm drain on castle lane adjacent st Margaret's view this is inadequate for purpose as it floods even with a small amount of rain, so recently the road has nearly been impassable, flooded and water streaming across the road into the stream which was full to the top. Plus it was like an ice rink with recent weather. With new houses being built on a downward slope to castle lane extra run off of surface water is going to increase this problem and create even more flooding in this area. Enlarging Littleham brook on the building ground is still not going to cope with the extra water at castle lane, when the tiny brook meanders around houses down to sea. Traffic and parking is a great issue in Exmouth where ever you go streets full of parked cars, pavements and in grass verges. Which is dangerous to other drivers who can not see adequately, pedestrians, school children, blind, deaf and disability scooters and more. Castle lane is what it says a lane, the traffic that uses it increases immensely when the caravan park, at Sandy Bay is open. So more traffic using this road due to more houses is to dangerous, it's not built for that much traffic. There is a pinch point where the traffic is

single file at the bottom of st Margaret's view due to 2 houses opposite one another adjacent to the road. 410 houses will mean 820 more cars, plus more for visitors. The traffic on the Salterton road already makes it very hard to get out of Capel lane, so with another entrance near McDonald's turning, which is also busy and hard to get in and out even with the road entrance improvements. It's just going to cause more congestion. To travel from littleham crossroads to the caravan site, it's so busy at the shops, parked cars are always towing and growing, plus the HGV delivery to the co-op, it's a minefield to pass. There are parked cars all the way down to the turning for castle lane, bollards at Parminster close, parked cars, turning into plum park and industrial site, parked cars everywhere, then the school entrance which is always obscured, then there is a bend with chevrons on the road that indicates no parking but it's full of cars, you go around that bend blind, confronted with fast oncoming traffic, Lorrie's and the bus. It's hazardous at best. Green lane leading to capel lane is a bus route, cars are parked everywhere and in anyway a car can just be dumped, not parked. This road is an obstacle course. There is traffic calming on Capel lane, these roads are not adequate for even more traffic. As is Exmouth, these roads are only way in and out of Exmouth is the Woodbury road which is a speed track, two major accidents have happened just before Christmas and the Exeter road out to the 3052. These are the only two routes for emergency vehicles as well and with a greater population in Exmouth and greater need for these services, people are going to die as getting these services through and then on perhaps to hospital is going to be life threatening. Drive along the Exeter road on bin collection day, the hold ups are extreme. There is traffic poor bin men trying to do their job around Exmouth is beyond a challenge and their safety is paramount. There last and probably the most important is the question of all the extra amenities that will be required and even need now already, doctors, dentists, shops, schools, how can a secondary school take in more pupils when there's no room for expansion and it's already one of the biggest schools in Devon. Finally sewage, we have so many problems, polluting the sea from over flows, Maer lane sewage works problems, the amount of sewage lorries always tooing and froing to phear park, and budleigh Salterton has the same problems to, this is very serious to our general health and the environment, the sewers just can't cope. Exmouth is bursting at the seams, I think we have had our fill of houses, that aren't for locals as they are too expensive. Enough is enough.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Sheila Christina Maycock

Full name: Sheila Christina Maycock

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.: SD06

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.:
Sidm_31

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

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

1. Any reference to direct access to the site via Burscombe Lane, which currently has a field gate immediately from the road to the site, has been removed in this version of the plan, following challenge from Burscombe Lane residents to the Highway access. Windsor Mead would experience similar Highways issues in relation to access & egress to the A 3052. 2. The plan now states that 'it is expected that access for all road users would be off Windsor Mead'. I do not see how this is possible, given that there is currently no way through from Windsor Mead to the site. The intervening land between the end of Windsor Mead and the site is in private ownership.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove site Sidm_31 from the plan

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.: see 2b above

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.: see 2c above

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.: see 2b above

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Alison Elizabeth McLaren

Full name: Alison Elizabeth McLaren

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function

of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Robin James Meadwell

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the High Quality Design chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: It is for EDDC to ascertain and establish whether this chapter is legally compliant.

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.: A number of Developers operate nationally and have multiple trading names which are used across the regions. It is common practice among Developers that they pre-existing designs for house types. The result is that there a multiple new housing developments across the regions of the UK where the housing provided comprises of the same styles of house being built and numerous areas now appearing uniform externally and internally and with no distinct variation. Small, local Developers are often more capable of providing housing which is sympathetic to the surrounding area and landscape.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the High Quality Design chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: It is for EDDC to establish whether this chapter is compliant with the Duty to co-operate.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

Proposal: 12. Our Outstanding Landscape

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

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: 12.1 - 12.36

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.: The protection which this chapter seeks to assert is encouraging, but the large scale housing development which is proposed entirely contradicts this chapter. Housing development on the scale proposed across the region will have a significant and irrevocable impact on the landscape and the surrounding areas where developments have been proposed and in particular the substantial housing development proposed for Exmouth, Axminster, Honiton, Topsham and Seaton. If these developments proceed as planned and all properties are occupied it will substantially increase the population and condense the region, the required infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population would also see the landscape irrevocably altered and damaged. Protecting the landscape as desired should be paramount and the large scale housing developments proposed are incompatible with this policy.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: 14.1 - 14.14

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.: The proposals for housing development totals in excess of 14,800 new dwellings, this could easily see a population increase of in excess of 30,000 - 40,000 people. Using open spaces to create housing on this scale has the effect of reducing the open space available for residents in the region to enjoy. This will become even more condensed during peak holiday periods and the tourism which East Devon has traditionally benefited from. The effects of the housing proposals will have significant and detrimental impact and there will simply be considerably more people seeking to use the open spaces of the coast and countryside. This increases the need for maintenance of these areas, along with the need for increased parking etc. which would also require the loss of further land.

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

Proposal: 15. Our Outstanding Historic Environment

1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Historic Environment chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: 15.1 - 15.20

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 Historic Environment chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Historic Environment chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: As with the policy for protection of the landscape, the protection of the historic nature of East Devon should be paramount. It is the character of East Devon which attracts so many tourists to the area year after year and preserving this character is essential. The proposals for so much development in Exmouth, Axminster, Seaton, Topsham, Sidmouth, Ottery St Mary and Honiton collectively will substantially alter the aesthetic appearance of these areas and the detrimental impact of so much development will not be felt until after construction. I have witnessed the effects of over development in other parts of the Country where developers have "promised" new construction would be sympathetic to and in keeping with the surrounding area. However, construction of housing in the numbers proposed can and does have a detrimental effect to the original area.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

Proposal:

2. The Vision

1. To which part of the Vision chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

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

2.1 - 2.11

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::

Comments relate to all sites and tiers shown in Figure 3.

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Vision chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Whilst I cannot comment on whether the proposed developments shown in Figure 3 of the Local Plan are legally compliant or not, the proposed volume of development for housing and land for Employment Land is contradictory to the vision as set out in the introduction. Development of land for Residential and Employment on this scale and in the locations identified would have a significant and detrimental impact on the natural landscape. Using areas of land which are currently part of the natural landscape and completely undeveloped will be lost to the future generations which the Local Plan states it is seeking to protect.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Vision chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Vision chapter legally compliant. 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 total number of new Residential homes proposed in the Local Plan is 14,816. This would significantly increase the population of East Devon as the majority of homes would be occupied by 2 or more people or families, this could potentially increase the number of residents by more than 30,000 people and increasing the population on this scale, even over a period of 15 years, will again irrevocably change the rural nature of East Devon and place significant strain on the existing infrastructure. If new roads are built to ease the burden on roads such as the A35 and A30, this will again irreversibly alter the landscape which East Devon District Council states it is seeking to protect. There are currently 3,246 residential properties for sale in East Devon (Rightmove, as at 24 January 2026) and a further 379 new build houses for

sale in East Devon (Zoopla, as at 24 January 2026). Whilst the current proposals for 14,816 new residential properties to be built includes 10,000 at the new development of Marcombe, the remainder are predominantly to be located in Axminster (1,100) and Exmouth (1,450). As at 24 January there are 481 properties for sale in and around Axminster and 1,346 for sale in and around Exmouth, the current availability of properties across all price ranges does not suggest that current demand is excessively greater than the supply such that it warrants the volume of new housing proposed. Whilst the development of further new housing may be necessary, this may be better focused on targeting specific needs, such as the development of housing suitable for those wishing to downsize and to enable the sale of family homes.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Vision chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.:

Whilst it is clearly important to have a clear local plan and vision, setting a housing plan to meet the arbitrary and overly optimistic targets of a Government that has not considered the local needs and requirements is not in the best interests of current or future residents. Governments change, as do national policies; regions and the landscapes do not change and local knowledge is essential when considering any development proposals.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: It is assumed that legal advice was obtained, however the Spatial Strategy sets out Settlement Boundaries and Infrastructure along with the Justification Policy for both and again emphasises the need to protect the identity and of the natural landscape, yet the volume of housing stated to be required is entirely contradictory to these objectives. The policy of seeking to attract new industries and employment is a hope and not a fact. Housing development on the scale proposed without existing opportunities is unjustified and the national policy to increase populations in all areas is flawed and any change in Government is likely to see amendments to the current policy. Whilst there may be a requirement for some small developments to proceed (under 10 dwellings), the large scale developments identified for Axminster, Seaton and Sidmouth of circa 1,450 dwellings would substantially increase the population and increase the demands on infrastructure and local services. Whilst Developers may be required to contribute to infrastructure requirements with a Section 106 demand, Developers (particularly national Developers) often renege on such requirements or delay undertaking such works. I work closely with the Construction industry and have seen numerous examples of this conduct by Developers across the Country. The developments earmarked for Axminster and Seaton in particular appear excessive in the number of homes required and particularly given the close proximity of substantial developments to the south of Chard and close to the boundary between Somerset and Devon, along with the proposed developments in West Dorset close to Lyme Regis. These developments may be in different counties, however they substantially increase the population of the region generally.... once what has been built is actually sold.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 number of houses to be developed requires a substantial reduction unless and until the employment opportunities exist to justify the further development beyond the existing available housing stock. It is a fallacy that providing new build homes reduces house prices generally.

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.: The Spatial Strategy is contradictory. The stated protections in place to preserve the natural landscape and the identity of communities are not compatible with the substantial new building that is stated to be required. The hope of attracting new industries and employment does not justify or require the actual development.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Whilst this chapter may comply with the Government requirement for local authorities to agree with the national plan, that does not make it right for the region.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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.: The volume of housing proposed for East Devon is substantial, even if the development of Marcombe is excluded, the proposed new housing for Exmouth, Axminster, Honiton, Topsham, Ottery St Mary, Seaton and Sidmouth will significantly increase the population across East Devon by circa 12,000 people if all of the proposed developments proceed and all properties are sold. New development of housing on such a scale has numerous detrimental effects and will require significant additional infrastructure to be constructed and all of which would alter the entire landscape and the very character which other policies of EDDC are seeking to protect. Large national Developers will make grand promises to construct sympathetically and to enhance areas, the reality is often extremely different. The National Planning Proposal is flawed in many respects and any change in Government is likely to see amendments to this plan. The requirement for new housing should be based upon demand and the need. At present this does not exist and issues such as the lack of affordable housing can be addressed more appropriately at a local level and not by a national government policy and excessive over-development across the region is not the solution.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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.:

6.1 - 6.16

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

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: It is assumed that East Devon District Council have taken appropriate legal advice in this respect. However, the chapter addresses only the construction phases of commercial and residential properties and the requirement for such properties to be energy efficient once constructed. This chapter does not address the effects of large scale construction on water usage during construction or the of construction waste materials entering water courses or the surrounding environment. In addition, this chapter does not address the increased water demands of large scale residential developments on local resources or the impact of increased sewage. Further, this chapter is silent on any mitigating requirements by any developments in relation to: - flood risk -increased vehicle numbers -increased traffic -increased energy use -increased domestic waste - increased food waste This is not an exhaustive list of issues, but all of these issues will exist with a substantial increase in the local population through large scale residential housing development.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: This chapter should address all aspects of mitigating climate change and not just the use of reduced carbon methods of construction and renewable energy use during construction and following completion of any developments. Increased demands on water usage and increased foul waste are equally significant issues for climate change considerations.

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.: As stated in the response to questions 2b and 2c.

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.: The modifications required to this chapter are extensive and should address all aspects of the impact of large scale developments and what measures will be required to mitigate all of the wide ranging issues and simply those envisaged in relation to low carbon construction and renewable energy.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: As stated in previous answers, this chapter does not address any of the climate issues arising from: the increased number of vehicles; increased demands on water and sewage; managing changes to flood risk caused by large scale housing development.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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.:

7.1 - 7.13

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

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

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

This chapter omits a number of other climate related issues and in particular there is no commentary relating to the increased vehicle numbers which will occur with a substantially increased population. There is also no reference to the increased domestic waste which will require treatment and disposal.

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 may be helpful if this chapter cross-references the Mitigating Climate Change chapter, and vice-versa. Whilst this chapter does address the fundamental issues relating to flood risk and water usage, it does not address the issues of relating to the increased volume of vehicles which will arise with the substantial residential development proposed. It also does not address issues relating to increased domestic waste and how this would be disposed of or whether there would be any construction of Energy from Waste facilities (or similar). There are also no comments as to any alterations to existing infrastructure or new infrastructure requirements.

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.: It is for EDDC to thoroughly investigate and consider the numerous effects of significant developments on the region and climate

more widely. The fact that there is no reference in this chapter to the substantial increase of vehicles and increases in domestic waste and how these issues will be managed is a serious omission and residents should be aware of EDDC's plans and proposals in this respect.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: This chapter does not address the numerous climate effecting issues which would be created by the significant volume of construction and substantial population increase.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

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.:

8.1 - 8.54

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Whether or not this chapter is legally compliant is a matter for East Devon Council. It is my opinion that this chapter is contradictory to the stated aims of East Devon Council to preserve the natural landscape and habitats. The aim of the national plan imposed by the current Government is to increase populations irrespective of local infrastructure, existing communities natural landscape and regional employment.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 large scale construction of new build dwellings does not reduce house prices of the existing stock and aid affordability. The percentage of "affordable" housing on new build developments is relatively low and prices of dwellings allocated as "affordable" will not be less than a similar size property in the area and is often marketed at a higher price by Developers as a new build can often be considered to be more desirable. Aiming to meet local housing need with widespread large scale development is not a solution in itself and often creates more issues than it resolves, usually by increasing demand on local health services, utility resources and infrastructure. New Housing developments in any proposed area should not be approved until any existing developments being constructed have sold all of the dwellings constructed have sales agreed as this is the true measure of the demand for such housing. For example, the Linden Homes development on Chard Road in Axminster still has stock available from earlier phases and is now commencing on Phase 4 construction. If new builds from earlier phases is still unsold, how can planning

approval for large scale developments in other areas of Axminster be justified? The supply is exceeding the demand.

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.: Meeting the potential housing needs of an ageing population can be met with smaller scale development and targeted development of property type, such as bungalows, and potentially increasing the availability of family homes.

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.: As stated in the responses to questions 2b, 2c and 3b.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Whilst the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is likely compliant with the Duty to Co-operate, this does not of itself mean that it provides appropriate solutions for the current and future housing demands and needs.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robin James Meadwell

Proposal:

9. Supporting the Economy and Town Centres

1. To which part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SE05

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

3. Do you consider that this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: A number of Developers are national businesses and operate by appointing Design & Build Contractors with a national presence to undertake the construction works. Many D&B Contractors have an existing permanent workforce of thousands covering regions around the UK. Any large scale construction of housing development would likely entail the use of an existing workforce and associated trades and sub-contractors are often businesses which have worked on numerous previous projects. Large scale housing development does not of itself create employment or employment opportunities in large numbers. Whilst this policy would seek assurances from Developers to provide skills training and employment opportunities, in practice this is unlikely to be achieved as it is contrary to the existing business models of a number of large Developers and Construction businesses.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Supporting the Economy and Town Centres chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: It is a matter for EDDC to ascertain whether this chapter complies with the duty to co-operate.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Susan Miller

Full name: Susan Miller

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?: 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 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.: I still think there are far too many homes being built on green belt land, particularly the area just off Salterton Road, opposite Liverton Business Park where The Range, Pets At Home etc are. More "brown field" sites in town should be found to build on, if people are supposed to be so desperate to find homes.

Also, will there be more cycle paths built as part of this new "Local" plan? There are nowhere enough cycle paths in Exmouth at present. Exeter, in comparison, is quite well provided for with cycle paths.

Francesca Mills

Full name: Francesca Mills

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.: The main access point of Exmo_20 is significantly closer to BudleighSalterton than Exmouth, making Budleigh it's most convenient and accessible town. The services and infrastructure of Budleigh (High Street, Doctor's, school, beach etc) would be the preferred choice for residents of Exmo_20. This undermines the settlement hierarchy and would lead to coalescence of Budleigh and Exmouth, contrary to POLICY OL05 of the Local Plan. An alternative site to Exmo_20 for housing allocation should be selected, one which was deemed available, achievable & suitable in the HELAA. Exmo_20 would cause harm to the adjacent Pebblebed Heaths (SSSI/SAC/SPA/NNR) due to Exmo_20 being a supporting foraging habitat. Developing Exmo_20 is contrary to POLICY PB01 of the local plan and not in accordance with the mitigation strategy. Exmo_20 would cause harm to the heritage assets, most significantly St John in the Wilderness Grade II* listed church and churchyard, drastically altering the attractive rural setting for worship & burials which currently exists. This is contrary to POLICY HE02. Exmo_20 would have a detrimental effect on the adjacent designated wildlife sites and destroy the "tranquility, wildness and dark skies" of the countryside, which is contrary to POLICY OL01. Exmo_20 development would be in conflict with the Strategic Nature Area 368, fragmenting and isolating habitats and destroy wildlife corridors, contrary to PARAGRAPH 13.23 of the Local Plan. It would cause harm to irreplaceable habitats, veteran trees and species rich hedgerows across the site, contrary to PARAGRAPH 13.9. Exmo_20 is in conflict with POLICY OL09 and POLICY PB04 as the Habitats Regulations Assessment (30.01.25) states that there is "currently not sufficient

certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA) such that the Plan fails the integrity test. Development of Exmo_20 on heavy clay subsoil with ineffective soakaways, would exacerbate the already identified downstream flood risk along Withycombe Brook through Exmouth, which is already beyond its design capacity. This is in conflict with POLICY AR01B. Exmo_20 would increase the need for car travel and increase traffic congestion, in conflict with PARAGRAPH 11.2. The isolated location is unsustainable development as people would need to travel much further than 800m to existing key services and facilities, contrary to PARAGRAPH 11.6. It is too far (and too steep) from any town centre to use walking or cycling as their choice of transport. This is contrary to POLICY TR01.

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.: Complete overhaul of infrastructure before new developments occur. Also increase in medical facilities for elderly population.

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.: Current infrastructure including sewerage, medical facilities are unable to cope with current population & this will proposal will cause additional pressure. Also the huge damage caused to the environment to this area which is rich in wildlife should be considered. Brownfield sites should be used before any greenfield development is considered.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Helen Mitchell

Full name: Helen Mitchell

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.: The size of EXMO_20 is too large and too close to Woodbury Common, a Strategic Nature Area. Access to the site from the B3179 is not sensible. This road is already busy as a main access route into Budleigh Salterton and access route to properties in the Marley area of Exmouth. It is narrow, twisty and dangerous particularly at night when motorist can be blinded by oncoming headlamps. It cannot accommodate the extra traffic that 700 new homes would create.

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.: Remove EXMO-20 from the Local Plan or scale it down to a much smaller site accessed from Dinan Way. Do not build close to the Pebbled Heaths which is listed as a SPA/ SAC/ SSSI and contains protected wildlife.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Peter Money

Full name: Peter Money

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_17

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.: I am very concerned about the proposed Local Plan particularly the proposal in it to build 400 odd houses and industrial units on the fields to the immediate East of Littleham church, Exmo_17 (National Landscape). This would have a negative effect on Exmouth in many ways. The area is part of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (or National Landscape) and is one of the major attractions of Exmouth and particularly the eastern edge of the town.

But National Landscapes are also regional and national assets and should be protected as such. Building on them on this scale should be very much a last resort. There is a briefing document dated November 2024, Guidance for Local Planning Authorities, produced by the National Landscapes Association which makes this very point and indeed in stronger terms. It states that Section 85 of the Countryside and Right of Way Act 2000 (as amended by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act² in December 2023) requires 'relevant authorities', in exercising or performing any function that affect AONBs in England, to "seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty." It states that this is a 'statutory duty', not discretionary, and is a strengthening of the previous 'duty of regard'.

When it comes to site allocation the guidance states that if promoting a site allocation would not align with the duty to seek to further the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty, then consider amending or deleting a site allocation (For example, choosing NOT to allocate a particular site within or close to the AONB boundary)

It is extremely difficult to see how building 400 odd houses and industrial units on the AONB is in any way seeking to further the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the AONB. In fact clearly it is doing the opposite and therefore it would seem to me East Devon would be failing in its statutory duty if it were allow this allocation to remain in the plan.

In fact, as far as I can see the plan as a whole is very weak indeed on the question of AONBs. In its calculations and projections it seems to ignore the fact that planning and development in AONBs are totally different to in none-NL areas. Both areas seem to be just lumped in together. This seems particularly significant in an area like East Devon as it has such a high proportion of AONB land. It seems to me that this must call into question as to whether or not the plan as a whole can be considered a reliable enough document to underpin so many planning decisions for such a long period of years.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Amanda Moors

Full name: Amanda Moors

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Exmo_17

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.:
Chapter 8: Housing Needs

The real need in Exmouth is for houses that include social rent as well as shared housing schemes - my daughter cannot get social housing even though she is homeless. Has Exmouth Town Council's assessment of housing need been consulted for this?

The vast majority of houses proposed for the prime site of Exmo_17 will be very expensive and bought up by people from outside the area as well as those looking for second homes. The number of affordable houses will likely be fewer than proposed.

Chapter 11: Sustainable Transport

The proposed estate on Exmo_17 would bring a further 800-900 vehicles onto local roads. The access road would be directly opposite the Liverton Trading Estate, which is a well-known bottleneck with queues of cars waiting to exit.

A new roundabout has been proposed, plus two pedestrian crossings on the busy main road into and out of Exmouth. Traffic would be significantly held up at this point, causing increased air pollution and slowing drivers' progress. To reach Exeter, where the jobs are, the choice would be to drive there, or to catch two buses (passing every half hour) or to catch a bus plus a train.

The A376 is already problematic as it is so busy at commute times - one minor accident leaves the area gridlocked as traffic cannot get into or out of Exmouth when this road is out of action.

Chapter 12: Landscape

Exmo_17 had two protections until EDDC, without any justification, recently removed its Coastal Preservation area status, despite hundreds of objections from residents. It is a very large, precious area of National Landscape farmland that is protected against large-scale developments.

EDDC's duty is to 'conserve and enhance' it. (***) Personal details have been removed (***) on behalf of the Housing Minister, (***) Personal details have been removed (***) has confirmed this in a letter to our MP, (***) Personal details have been removed (***) of 18th August 2025). In no way is building a large estate on Exmo_17 conserving or enhancing it. Once gone, it is gone forever.

There is no reason to build the proposed industrial units on this land. Logically, they should be built on the Trading Estate opposite or Exmo_18, both of which have the same landowner.

The proposed vehicle access road would go straight across the existing Exmouth to Budleigh cycle/foot path and would require the felling of mature trees and bushes. This well-used path gives safe, tranquil access to cyclists, dog walkers, children, recreational walkers and people in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters. We think this

is dangerous and a loss of a peaceful amenity within the National Landscape. It is a loss of irreplaceable mature trees which take 30-60 years to get to early maturity.

The landowner recently terminated the lease to a nearby farm of National Landscape pastureland adjacent to Exmo_17. Could it be that they are hoping for a domino effect, building further estates on our irreplaceable National Landscape?

Chapter 15: Historic Environment

The proposed estate would be close to Littleham's medieval church where Lady Nelson is buried. There is also an old farmhouse on the perimeter.

These National Landscape fields are in plain view from the coast path that runs along the World Heritage Jurassic Coast. We risk losing this status.

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.: Removal of Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncostered highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heath" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amanda Moors

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Pam Moreline

Full name: Pam Moreline

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Environmental Impacts:

- The site is habitat for deer, rabbits, hedgehogs, foxes, badgers, which need to be preserved, along with trees, birds, insect life, butterflies, etc.
- East Devon Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve is in the immediate vicinity and will be affected by:
- increase (in large amounts) of traffic, which will pass nearby;
- footfall will dramatically increase, and disturb a nature reserve with its birds and wildlife;
- beavers (which are a protected species) are resident at Bystock Pool on the Nature Reserve, and active there at this time. Mental Health:
- Ruination of yet more natural beauty, by massive development such as the one proposed. Traffic Concerns:
- Monumental increase in traffic (700-1,000 more vehicles at a conservative estimate).
- Impact on Dinan Way of a major through road into Dinan Way from the development; already a hugely busy road, it will now become more of:
- an eyesore;

- noise and pollution will be horrendous;
- Dinan Way will soon become a potential motorway in a residential area.

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.:

Environmental Impacts:

- The site is habitat for deer, rabbits, hedgehogs, foxes, badgers, which need to be preserved, along with trees, birds, insect life, butterflies, etc.
- East Devon Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve is in the immediate vicinity and will be affected by:
 - increase (in large amounts) of traffic, which will pass nearby;
 - footfall will dramatically increase, and disturb a nature reserve with its birds and wildlife;
 - beavers (which are a protected species) are resident at Bystock Pool on the Nature Reserve, and active there at this time.
- Ruination of yet more natural beauty, by massive development such as the one proposed.
- Traffic Concerns:
 - Monumental increase in traffic (700-1,000 more vehicles at a conservative estimate).
 - Impact on Dinan Way of a major through road into Dinan Way from the development; already a hugely busy road, it will now become more of:
 - an eyesore;
 - noise and pollution will be horrendous;
 - Dinan Way will soon become a potential motorway in a residential area.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

MR D. MORGAN

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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?: Yes

2. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.: Strategy Policy DS01: 'Design and Local Distinctiveness'.

(Pages 200-201). Quote: "Appropriate lighting (limiting the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation) to oversee public spaces and reduce crime opportunities;"

I support the addition of reference to "appropriate lighting" and its definition, as many areas included within or near to the East Devon National Landscape have outstanding or sensitive landscape features and topography (i.e. towards the top of a valley). Or these areas are within the vicinity of the activities of the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC and bat activities which would be adversely affected by light pollution from inappropriate lighting initiatives. Such a policy should also be considered in the context of wider new developments within or near the East Devon National Landscape so as to avoid creating inappropriate lighting in areas which have distinctive topography and/or landscape feature and wildlife activities.

4. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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

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.: ‘Strategy Policy DS02: ‘Housing density and efficient use of land’.

(Page 203). Quote: “Proposals for residential development should seek to maximise the number of new homes and density of development of any site but to do so in a manner that is compatible with site setting and characteristics and which conserves or enhances the character of the area especially in a National Landscape and makes efficient use of land. Proposals for developments of 50 or more dwellings and those in environmentally or heritage sensitive locations especially in or 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. Codes, amongst other matters, may specify density recommendations for key allocations.”

I do not support the proposed amendment that new development should seek to maximise rather than optimise the number of new homes and the density of any sites. This approach will not actively look to maintain or conserve the density characteristics of existing adjacent developed sites, such as for parking, landscaping, private garden space and/or boundary designs. Moreover, the minimum quoted figure of 50 dwellings for a major development scheme where a design code will need to be proposed and agreed with by the local planning authority, is too high, as it will increase the likelihood of more generic housing estate schemes being designed by developers. This minimum figure needs to be set much lower at 35 dwellings to ensure that even smaller developments will actively look to deliver a design code which ensures that appropriate density requirements and less generic looking housing estates are delivered in environmentally or heritage sensitive locations.

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.: This statement on page 203 should be re-written to read as:

"Proposals for residential development should seek to optimise the number of new homes and density of development of any site in a manner that is compatible with site setting and characteristics and which conserves or enhances the character of the area, especially in a National Landscape or sensitive location and makes efficient use of land. Proposals for developments of 35 or more dwellings and those in environmentally or heritage sensitive locations, especially in or 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. Codes, amongst other matters, may specify density recommendations for key allocations."

The revised wording will ensure sites are not simply crammed with as many new homes as possible which might not be suitable for their context or the surrounding environment. Setting a lower threshold figure of 35 dwellings also promotes the need to deliver high quality design, including for smaller developments in villages and towns, through a design code that is agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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?: Yes

2. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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 PB03: 'Protection of irreplaceable habitats and important features'.

(Pages 247-248). Quote: "Priority Habitats and habitats supporting protected and notable species Impacts on Priority Habitats and habitats which support the functionality of Priority Species, such as bat foraging and commuting habitats, cirl bunting nesting and foraging habitat will require adequate mitigation and compensation for any potential direct or indirect adverse impacts from development. And additional habitats to include: intertidal mudflats, rivers and streams, estuarine habitats, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, broadleaf mixed and yew woodland, traditional orchards, lowland heathland and maritime slopes and cliffs."

I support the inclusion of the listed additional habitats in this paragraph which will help afford greater protection to irreplaceable habitats and important features.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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?: Yes

2. Do you consider that this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Chapter 14: 'Open Space and Sports and Recreation' –

Strategic Policy OS01: 'Access to open space and recreation facilities'. Paragraph 14.3 (Page 276). Quote: “Assessment of existing and planned open spaces will be key in decision-making, ensuring developments meet or exceed minimum standards. This policy helps protect existing facilities and supports the creation of new ones, enhancing public health and wellbeing. Open space provision should create safe spaces, for women, girls and all users aligning with designing out crime principles. Parks and recreations should be designed with the following in mind...”

I do not support specific reference to “women and girls” in this paragraph as this promotes gender discrimination and does not identify that boys and men, as well as those users who do not identify with a particular gender, can also be as equally vulnerable to being victims of different levels and types of crime. Therefore, in the interests of all specified and non-specified gender inclusion, the paragraph needs to be re-written.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: This paragraph for Policy OS01 needs to be re-written to read as: “Assessment of existing and planned open spaces will be key in decision-making, ensuring developments meet or exceed minimum standards. This policy helps protect existing facilities and supports

the creation of new ones, enhancing public health and wellbeing. Open space provision should create safe spaces for all users aligning with designing out crime principles.”

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

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Paragraph

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

3.8

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

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: 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.: Paragraph 3.8 (Page 29).

Quote: "Delivering a sufficient supply of homes' homes is an NPPF policy theme. The NPPF requires Local Plans to identify and meet as a minimum the objectively assessed development needs for their area. The purpose of this strategic policy is to set out what the housing development requirements are for East Devon for the plan period. This is central to the council's 'plan, monitor and manage' approach to housing development. 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."

The final amended sentence in paragraph 3.8 does not provide any indication of a commitment to undertake further consultation with the public at every stage of this review/update. This would be necessary to ensure there is local support of the proposals, and to acknowledge local knowledge on the opportunities and limitations of delivering additional new housing is recognised and given equal consideration.

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.: A follow-on final sentence needs to be included after the

proposed amendments for paragraph 3.8, which reads as: "Any review/update of the plan will seek to further consult with the local population, as part of a further consultation exercise, to establish their views on such proposals and that local knowledge will be recognised and given sufficient consideration as part of any amendments that might be made to housing development requirements."

This approach for further consultation would also align with the 'duty to cooperate' policy of EDDC and is a statutory requirement.

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Paragraph 3.8 does not provide evidence that further consultation with the local population will take place if there is to be any amendments made to housing development requirements after the Local Plan has been adopted.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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?: Yes

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

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:

Page 53, Quote: "Quote: "Development will need to occur and proceed on broadly in accordance with the basis of an agreed whole new community masterplan shown below plan policy and on an East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2042 – Second Regulation 19 Publication Draft 53 agreed phased basis. The new community will be built to distinctive high quality design standards, drawing inspiration from the local context including the unique surrounding historic environment, creating safe and attractive places with a rich character that enhance health and wellbeing. Design should be innovative, with an explicit focus on sustainable construction and building operation and renewable energy production and use."

Reference to "Design should be innovative" has not be qualified further in relation to how this might be achieved. There needs to be a further qualifying sentence that states the need to discourage ubiquitous, monotonous, generic housing estate style developments, and instead promote more individual higher quality designs which are sympathetic and in keeping with the local context, in order to promote a sense of place, space and individual local identity.

Quote: "Marlcombe will provide: A) Affordable housing provision in accordance with strategic policy HN02;, with an aspiration of 40% on-site provision subject to viability; "

The word "aspiration" (bottom of page 53) in relation to affordable housing provision comes across as non-committal and lacking in determination to deliver the 40% on-site provision of affordable housing provision. It needs to be changed

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.:

Following on from the sentence (at the top of page 53) that "The new community will be built to distinctive high quality design standards, drawing inspiration from the local context including the unique surrounding historic environment, creating safe and attractive places with a rich character that enhance health and wellbeing." There needs to be a follow sentence which reads as: "Design should be innovative, high quality and sympathetic to the local context in order to promote a sense of place, space and individual local identity. Designs that promote monotonous, generic looking estate style developments will be discouraged."

The sentence at the bottom of page 53 needs to be re-written to read as: "Affordable housing provision in accordance with Strategy Policy HN02 will seek to deliver 40% on-site provision." This provides developers of this new settlement that the Local Planning Authority, through the Local Plan, will be robust in their requirements that 40% on-site affordable housing provision must be delivered wherever possible, unless there are defensible reasons why this cannot be achieved.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Richard Morgan

Full name: Richard Morgan

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will

also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Richard Morgan

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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.: SD05

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.:
Seat_13a

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:
Strategic Policy SD05: Seaton and its development allocations:

(Page 101). Quote: 'Land west of Axeview Road (Seat_13a)': "This site is allocated for around 39 dwellings. Archaeological assessment through geophysical survey and field evaluation should be undertaken prior to the site being developed. Development must be sensitively located and designed to ensure that it avoids damage to archaeological remains and conserves the setting of Roman and Earlier Settlement remains at Honeyditches Scheduled Monument. The development will need to maximise opportunities for localised improvements/contributions to enhance sustainable travel modes. 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."

I support the inclusion of this final sentence in relation to the importance of Beer Quarry and Caves SAC and bat activities being a vital consideration and the need for them to be conserved when considered against any potential future development of this site. I would hope the inclusion of this sentence will ensure that it is given robust and defended consideration by the Local Planning Authority against the economic benefits of future development.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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: MR D. MORGAN

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.: SD05

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.:
Seat_05

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:
Strategic Policy SD05: Seaton and its development allocations. (Page 101).

Quote: 'Land off Harepath Road (Seat_05)': "This site is allocated for around 130 dwellings and 2.2 hectares of employment land. The employment land should be located in the field immediately north of the existing Harepath Road Industrial Estate. The small areas of adjoining woodland to the north should be enhanced through additional planting. Tree planting/landscaping on the northern edge is required and will help soften boundary edges with the countryside. 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. Development proposals should explore opportunities to improve bus stop infrastructure on Harepath Road, to promote sustainable travel. Proposals should also consider pedestrian/cycle access onto Colyford Road and the Seaton – Colyford multi-use trail. Seat_03 and Seat_05 will need to come forward as a co-ordinated and comprehensive development that delivers the proposed large-scale mixed-use development on the northern edge of Seaton and seeks to deliver the long-standing need for a football pitch as part of a viable package of planning obligations. A harmonised vehicular access will need to be provided off Harepath Road."

I support the inclusion of this last sentence in relation to the need for a harmonised vehicular access needing to be provided off Harepath Road. Harepath Road is the safest main route that would serve this site given its long, straight design and nearby access to the A3052. The alternative option of using Colyford Road with its more winding character heading both towards Seaton and the neighbouring village of Colyford, and without pavements, would create a higher level of safety compromise from increased traffic volume. Therefore, Harepath Road presents a better engineered solution to serve the needs of any new development that might take place on this site. It provides any developers looking to submit an application for this site with a clearly defined, evidence-based and legally sound requirement.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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: MR D. MORGAN

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.: SD05

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.:
Seat_03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:
Land to the south of Harepath Hill (Seat_03):

(Page 100-101), Quote: "This site is allocated for around 75 dwellings. Built development should be concentrated in the less prominent eastern edge near Harepath Road, and/or to the south adjoining existing dwellings up to around the 55m contour line. Development should also respect the setting of the Grade II listed Harepath Farm."

I do not support the inclusion of the word "around" in relation to 55m for the contour line in relation to the adjoining the existing dwellings. The inclusion of the words "around the" in relation to the 55 m contour line is an approximation term rather than being specific in relation to a minimum distance away from adjoining existing dwellings. As such, it makes the 55 m distance of the contour line open for re-interpretation or manipulation by an applicant. The consequences of this could have an adverse impact on occupiers of the existing dwellings to the south of the boundary/contour line in terms of loss of privacy and visual intrusion of the new dwellings', particularly if they were taller chalet bungalows or two-storey houses. Likewise, the impact of the existing dwellings to the south of the contour line could have an adverse impact on the occupiers of any new dwellings built on this identified site to the south of Harepath Hill. The use of "around the" is open to interpretation and could in relation to the desired 55

m contour line being reduced, be successfully reduced if an applicant was to challenge this with the Planning Inspectorate in the event a planning application was refused by the Local Planning Authority.

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.:

The previously quoted and fixed figure of 55m for the contour line must be retained in the Local Plan to provide transparent, rigid guidance to any new development on this site of what would be the required minimum figure they need to adhere to, rather than making it open for interpretation. This would also link in with good design practises and policies in terms of respecting existing design and boundary characteristics. Therefore the wording of this sentence in the Local Plan needs to read as: "This site is allocated for around 75 dwellings. Built development should be concentrated in the less prominent eastern edge near Harepath Road, and/or to the south adjoining existing dwellings up to the 55m contour line."

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: I believe the Local Plan must set robust, concrete guidelines, especially in relation to distances from a contour line in order to reduce ambiguity and potentially manipulation by applicants, which might otherwise have an adverse effect on occupiers of existing dwellings.

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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.: SD05

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.:
Seat_02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:

Quote: 'Land at Barnards Hill Lane (Seat_02)': "This site is allocated for around 40 dwellings. A wide buffer should be provided to the northern boundary with tree planting/landscaping in the northern and western edges to soften the boundary with the countryside and create a well considered and designed northern edge to Seaton. 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. [Development would need to provide a safe access onto Polar Tree Drive and also consider impacts on and proximity to the Poplar Tree Drive/Barnards Hill Lane junction, with mitigation to improve road safety and/or calm traffic potentially required]."

I do not support the removal of the quoted last sentence on Page 100 of the Local Plan: "Development would need to provide a safe access onto Poplar Tree Drive and also consider impacts on and proximity to the Poplar Tree Drive/Barnards Hill Lane junction, with mitigation to improve road safety and/or calm traffic potentially required." To date there has been no formal application and no feedback from Devon Highways in relation to this site.

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.: As a greenfield site in a built up area, safety for road users and pedestrians must promote the highest levels of safe access into and out of any new development. Poplar Tree Drive and Barnards Hill Lane lead into junctions for a number of existing large housing estates, with the majority of occupiers being car users. Therefore, the proposed deletion of the sentence for “providing a safety access onto Poplar Tree Drive and/or Barnards Hill Lane” is unsound and must therefore be retained in the final Local Plan. Retaining this sentence on page 100 of the Local Plan provides an additional layer of engineered safety design that an applicant would need to be able to demonstrate they can successfully deliver, beyond the potentially lesser standard of “improved road safety and/or calm traffic” measures.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: MR D. MORGAN

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?: 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.: (Page 150). Quote: 'Affordable housing as a percentage of the site total': "An aspiration for 40% through grant funding and bespoke viability work for the new community."

I do not support the use of the word "aspiration" in this revised statement in relation to affordable housing provision for the new community of Marlcombe. The term "aspiration" does not demonstrate a robust commitment to trying to deliver 40-percent affordable housing provision, but potentially a more flexible, reduced level. This 'flexible' approach would ultimately not meet the district's wider requirements for affordable housing provision, where any shortfall at Marlcombe might not be deliverable in other settlements. Furthermore, it would potentially be open for negotiation and manipulation by developers seeking to reduce their onsite provision of affordable housing, which has been evident during the life of the current adopted East Devon Local Plan. The emerging new East Devon Local Plan, therefore, must demonstrate a more rigid and committed requirement that this new settlement does deliver the minimum requirement of 40% on-site affordable housing provision.

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.: This sentence needs to be rewritten to read as: "A commitment to deliver affordable housing for at least 40% will be sought for the new community, including through grant funding and bespoke viability work."

4. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Helen Morgan-Parra

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncostered highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingl

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Helen Morgan-Parra

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Pat Morley

Full name: Pat Morley

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will

also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Pat Morley

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Sue-Claire Morris

Full name: Sue-Claire Morris

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.: The infrastructure would be heavily impacted and there is already sewage in our seas. 700 more homes would cause more problems related to this.

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.: Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Caroline Munday

Full name: Caroline Munday

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.: SD06

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::
Sidm_06a

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

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

1. Impact on National Landscape (formerly AONB) ?The proposed allocation falls within the East Devon National Landscape. Under the National Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 189, "great weight" must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of these areas. I am extremely concerned that once this site is approved, this sets precedent for others such as 6B to follow with a further development of 238 houses. ?Major Development: Building a housing estate here constitutes "major development" in a protected landscape. National policy dictates such applications should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. ?Irreversible Harm: The introduction of high-density housing, street lighting, and associated infrastructure will permanently degrade the character of this statutory protected area, which provides significant value to the local economy through tourism and wellbeing. 2. Violation of Green Wedge Policy ?This site is currently designated as a GREEN WEDGE. The primary purpose of East Devon's Green Wedge policy is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and protect the individual identity of our towns and villages. ?Settlement Identity: Development here would erode the physical and visual gap between SIDFORD and Sidbury, leading to urban sprawl. ?Precedent: Allowing development on this site undermines the integrity of the Green Wedge designation across the entire district, making it impossible for the Council to defend other sensitive gaps in the future such as site 6b. 3. No evidence of this planning or area offered up for planning was disclosed by

either the council or seller of Brook Farm during the purchasing process (purchased in July 2022). Solicitors are now aware. Brook Farm is a Grade 2 listed building and an important historical asset as referenced on page 137 of the site selection report. 4. Lastly I am concerned that the extension of the settlement boundary of Sidmouth was extended to include site 6.a without sufficient consultation to meet EDDC policy compliance requirements.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 remove 6.a and 6.b permanently as part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter.

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.:

1. Failure to Prioritize Sustainable Alternatives ?The emerging Local Plan already identifies the proposed new town of Marcombe as the primary vehicle for meeting the district's housing targets. ?Marcombe Strategy: EDDC's own strategy is to concentrate growth in sustainable, purpose-built communities rather than "bolting on" unsustainable developments to existing villages in sensitive locations. ?Brownfield First: National policy in 2026 mandates a "brownfield-first" approach. The Council has not yet exhausted all urban regeneration opportunities or lower-quality "Grey Belt" sites before resorting to the destruction of high-value National Landscapes. ? 2. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints ?Biodiversity Loss: The site provides vital "green lungs" and wildlife corridors. Development would conflict with the Council's commitment to Biodiversity Net Gain and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. ?Infrastructure Deficit: Local services, including the Sid Valley medical Practice, narrow lanes and schools, are already at capacity. This allocation offers no credible mitigation for the increased pressure on local infrastructure. Detrimental to local heritage: The site is in very close proximity to Sidbury Castle an iron age fort, a Scheduled Monument, protected by Historic England and would impact the "commanding views over the river Sid and village." Living next to the field in question as custodians of part of this countryside and being an observer to the amount of Bio Diversity that this area has; bats, a large variety of Birds of Prey (sparrowhawks, buzzards, kestrels), many species of bird (some less common like the Willow Tit, butterflies (some rare), voles, field mice, to merely name a few. Any building on this land would be detrimental to this beautiful

green space that is enjoyed by many who use the public footpath and use this space as an area of well-being and leisure. This is also an area that is used by local residents who do not have the luxury of having gardens. A change to this environment would have a negative impact on a space that is widely used by the community. There are significant flooding issues in this area in addition to all the points raised above that already affect the areas around Brook Lane, Lower Brook Meadow, Brook Farm and Two Bridges. Video files of biodiversity are too large to attach.

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.: To remove 6.a and 6.b permanently as part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter.

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.: For the reasons stated above, this site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes. I formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6a (allocated) and 6b (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan to protect the unique character of East Devon for future generations. There has been a complete lack of transparency around the possible development of this land.

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.: I consider that the voice of Sidford residents needs appropriate representation in this decision making process.

Richard Munday

Full name: Richard Munday

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.: SD06

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::
Sidm_06a

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

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: N/A

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: 1) Impact on National Landscape (formerly AONB): The proposed allocation falls within the East Devon National Landscape. Under the National Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 189, "great weight" must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of these areas. I am extremely concerned that once this site is approved, this sets the precedent for others such as 6B to follow with further development into AONB protected areas. 2) Violation of Green Wedge Policy: This site is currently designated as a GREEN WEDGE. The primary purpose of East Devon's Green Wedge policy is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and protect the individual identity of our towns and villages. • Settlement Identity: Development here would erode the physical and visual gap between Sidford and Sidbury, leading to urban sprawl. • Precedent: Allowing development on this site undermines the integrity of the Green Wedge designation across the entire district, making it impossible for the Council to defend other sensitive gaps in the future such as site 6b.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: I don't believe that this proposal can be made legally compliant and should be permanently removed from the list of preferred sites.

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

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.:

N/A

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.: 1)

Failure to Prioritize Sustainable Alternatives: The emerging Local Plan already identifies the proposed new town of Marlcumbe as the primary vehicle for meeting the district's housing targets. • Marlcumbe Strategy: EDDC's own strategy is to concentrate growth in sustainable, purpose-built communities rather than "bolting on" unsustainable developments to existing villages in sensitive locations. • Brownfield First: National policy in 2026 mandates a "brownfield-first" approach. The Council has not yet exhausted all urban regeneration opportunities or lower-quality "Grey Belt" sites before resorting to the destruction of high-value National Landscapes. 2. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints • Biodiversity Loss: The site provides vital "green lungs" and wildlife corridors. Development would conflict with the Council's commitment to Biodiversity Net Gain and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. • Infrastructure Deficit: Local services, including the Sid Valley medical Practice, narrow lanes and schools, are already at capacity. This allocation offers no credible mitigation for the increased pressure on local infrastructure. • Detrimental to local heritage: The site is in very close proximity to Sidbury Castle an iron age fort, a Scheduled Monument, protected by Historic England and would impact the "commanding views over the river Sid and village."

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.: I don't believe that this proposal can be made sound nor legally compliant and should be permanently removed from the list of preferred sites.

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

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: N/A

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.: This site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes. We formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6a (allocated) and 6b (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan to protect the unique character of East Devon for future generations.

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.: This site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes. We formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6a (allocated) and 6b (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan to protect the unique character of East Devon for future generations.

Kevin Murch

Full name: Kevin Murch

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.: SD04

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::
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council’s own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to:

a) Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane.

b) Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle.

c) Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure.

The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including:

a) SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries.

b) AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity.

c) OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists.

The Council’s own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan’s objectives for protecting East Devon’s rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving:

a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints

The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies:

- a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre,
- b) High car dependency.
- c) Narrow approach roads, and
- d) Limited junction capacity.

Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks

Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that:

- a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development.
- b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity.
- c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit.
- d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents.

Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need

There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8). Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density

The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is: “Unsustainable
“In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies “Environmentally harmful “Infrastructure-constrained “Unjustified and unsupported by evidence

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Full name: Kevin Murch

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.: SD04

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::
Otry_21

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)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

David Murphy

Full name: David Murphy

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Exmo_17

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.:

Dear Council, I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed application of Exmo-17. I do not believe that it would be in the interest of the public, to permit Bloor Homes, to construct a large housing estate and industrial units on land adjacent Capel Lane and Salterton Road, Exmouth, known by yourself as Exmo-17. This land is a protected area of Outstanding National Beauty, now known as National Landscape.

As well as the obvious permanent destruction of the land and wildlife, I have other major concerns as follow; -

1. Large housing estates should not be built on National Landscape.
 2. Building on land outside of the National Landscape, would be considerably cheaper, thus providing the option of the inclusion of a higher percentage of 'affordable' homes.
 3. The proposed exit from the site (Exmo-17), would almost certainly cause traffic chaos, and the access road would directly cut across the much-used Exmouth to Budleigh cycle/footpath, thus endangering all users including the aforementioned, together with the sizeable number of users with disabilities, children, families and dogs.
- Yours sincerely, *** Personal details have been removed ***

Martin Nancekivell

Full name: Martin Nancekivell

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.: SD04

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::
Otry_01b

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

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

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

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.: .

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

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.: With a view that OTRY-01b must harmonise access and interaction with land at Thorne farm(OTRY-09). the roundabout is going to be placed as in the attachment to the west of the the farm buildings (as per highways preference in a previous planning application)

going into OTRY-01b which hasn't come under the allocation. There is no sound or justifiable reason why OTRY-01a cannot be increased west to mirror the development to the north (OTRY_09) when you consider the potential position of the roundabout.

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.: .

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: .

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.: There is no reasonable or logical explanation why this can't be incorporated to make better use of the infrastructure which needs to be implemented.

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.: To explain in detail how this might have been overlooked, and the benefits it could bring to the plan .

Lucy Neal

Full name: Lucy Neal

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.: SD07

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.:
Brcl_12, Brcl_29

2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

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.:

1. Development on this scale is too large for a village of the size of Broadclyst. The community and facilities will not be able to cope with this number of houses suddenly arriving at one time. For example, the primary and secondary schools are already full and oversubscribed – there will be no school places available for new residents immediately. The Doctors surgery is also at capacity. The number of homes in these areas has increased from an initial figure of 70 in the plan. It is also not included in the parish Neighbourhood Plan which allowed for the required number of houses that needed to be built within the parish. There is currently significant numbers of houses being built in nearby Cranbrook, West Clyst and Tithebarn without the need for even more houses in a small village. 2. The land on which is proposed building on, regularly floods and is constantly waterlogged in winter. The local plan needs to state that there needs to be mitigation within any developments against flooding and where the displaced water which falls on built land will go – it will end up increasing flooding in the surrounding roads and dwellings which already flood. 3. The sewage network will not cope with additional houses feeding into it – particularly on this scale. There are already multiple events every year where the sewage discharges and floods onto the surrounding roads – this will only increase if there is further inflow to the sewage system. 4. There are no suitable footpaths for access into the village. Access to the

primary school is along Town End, which does not have a footpath along its full length to the development – young children would therefore need to walk along the road to access the school. This road is narrow and gets very busy at school times so would be a significant hazard. Likewise, access to the secondary school is along Whimple Road. This is an extremely dangerous road with fast, busy traffic and no footpath. It has a blind summit part way along where any pedestrians would not be seen by oncoming traffic. Children have been known to have been clipped by cars walking along this road. The local plan should acknowledge this and require speed limit reductions. 5. Roads surrounding this development are narrow and unable to take additional traffic. At school drop off / pick up times, the roads become entirely congested already without adding additional cars and subsequent pollution from standing traffic. Town End, the route to the primary school and northbound B3181 is very narrow single road with few passing places. Crannaford Lane has become increasingly busy since Cranbrook was built and is now a key link out to the A30 eastbound. This road will inevitably become much busier with this development as it is immediately next to it. However this lane is a small single carriageway road, which is prone to both potholes and flooding. The route into Exeter from this development, the B3181 passes through both West Clyst and Pinhoe, both of which are already subject to considerable traffic delays – this development will further increase the gridlock in these areas.

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.: * A reduction in the number of houses * Speed limits and pedestrian access requirements for access roads to this site should be acknowledged and required. * Requirements for coping with sewage and flooding should be included in the local plan

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.: Not listening to local residents

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Penelope Newton

Full name: Penelope Newton

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.: The proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths is too great and will undoubtedly lead to disturbance of the unique wildlife of this site. I do not believe a 400m buffer is sufficient to mitigate against these impacts. The additional public pressure 700 new homes will generate from dog walkers in particular will have significant impacts together with the high likelihood that domestic cats from the site will predate sensitive birds and invertebrates such as butterflies. They also predate lizards and snakes. This must not be allowed to happen. Once this special wildlife are lost it is extremely hard to replace. The wildlife of the Pebblebed heaths need to be able to move outside of the area itself they cannot be expected to remain in the boundaries so 400m is a zone in which the wildlife may move so a further buffer zone is needed from the 400m point of about the same again to minimise impacts on this sensitive flora and fauna. Also, migratory birds may be deterred from accessing the Pebblebed heathland because of the disturbance caused by both the building works and the new conurbation with associated people and traffic movements and also the additional night time lighting which will appear. Additional issues that a development of this size will cause include a significant increase in sewerage loading. The Exmouth sewerage system is already overloaded and regularly causing operation of the storm overflows which are affecting water quality in the watercourses and of course at our bathing beaches. Until this excessive operation of storm overflows is stopped this development should not proceed and nor should any others in this sewerage catchment. Then there is the impact of the additional vehicles and vehicle movements in this area. Exmouth already suffers congestion problems

especially at peak times of day this development would add additional loading to some significant congestion hotspots and to the problems of congestion on the Exmouth-Exeter Road.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the plan

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.: Doesn't meet the wishes of the local population

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Malcolm Newton

Full name: Malcolm Newton

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.: The proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths is too great and will undoubtedly lead to disturbance of the unique wildlife of this site. I do not believe a 400m buffer is sufficient to mitigate against these impacts. The additional public pressure 700 new homes will generate from dog walkers in particular will have significant impacts together with the high likelihood that domestic cats from the site will predate sensitive birds and invertebrates such as butterflies. They also predate lizards and snakes. This must not be allowed to happen. Once this special wildlife are lost it is extremely hard to replace. The wildlife of the Pebblebed heaths need to be able to move outside of the area itself they cannot be expected to remain in the boundaries so 400m is a zone in which the wildlife may move so a further buffer zone is needed from the 400m point of about the same again to minimise impacts on this sensitive flora and fauna. Also, migratory birds may be deterred from accessing the Pebblebed heathland because of the disturbance caused by both the building works and the new conurbation with associated people and traffic movements and also the additional night time lighting which will appear. Additional issues that a development of this size will cause include a significant increase in sewerage loading. The Exmouth sewerage system is already overloaded and regularly causing operation of the storm overflows which are affecting water quality in the watercourses and of course at our bathing beaches. Until this excessive operation of storm overflows is stopped this development should not proceed and nor should any others in this sewerage catchment. Then there is the impact of the additional vehicles and vehicle movements in this area. Exmouth already suffers congestion problems

especially at peak times of day this development would add additional loading to some significant congestion hotspots and to the problems of congestion on the Exmouth-Exeter Road.

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.: Remove this section from the plan

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.: Goes against the wishes of the local people

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Malcolm Newton

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.: The proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths is too great and will undoubtedly lead to disturbance of the unique wildlife of this site. I do not believe a 400m buffer is sufficient to mitigate against these impacts. The additional public pressure 700 new homes will generate from dog walkers in particular will have significant impacts together with the high likelihood that domestic cats from the site will predate sensitive birds and invertebrates such as butterflies. They also predate lizards and snakes. This must not be allowed to happen. Once this special wildlife are lost it is extremely hard to replace. The wildlife of the Pebblebed heaths need to be able to move outside of the area itself they cannot be expected to remain in the boundaries so 400m is a zone in which the wildlife may move so a further buffer zone is needed from the 400m point of about the same again to minimise impacts on this sensitive flora and fauna. Also, migratory birds may be deterred from accessing the Pebblebed heathland because of the disturbance caused by both the building works and the new conurbation with associated people and traffic movements and also the additional night time lighting which will appear. Additional issues that a development of this size will cause include a significant increase in sewerage loading. The Exmouth sewerage system is already overloaded and regularly causing operation of the storm overflows which are affecting water quality in the watercourses and of course at our bathing beaches. Until this excessive operation of storm overflows is stopped this development should not proceed and nor should any others in this sewerage catchment. Then there is the impact of the additional vehicles and vehicle movements in this area. Exmouth already suffers congestion problems especially at peak times of day this development would add additional loading to some

significant congestion hotspots and to the problems of congestion on the Exmouth-Exeter Road.

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.: Remove this development from the plan

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.: Because you are not cooperating with the wishes of local people by insisting on including this development.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Philip Newton

Full name: Philip Newton

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.: The proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths is too great and will undoubtedly lead to disturbance of the unique wildlife of this site. I do not believe a 400m buffer is sufficient to mitigate against these impacts. The additional public pressure 700 new homes will generate from dog walkers in particular will have significant impacts together with the high likelihood that domestic cats from the site will predate sensitive birds and invertebrates such as butterflies. They also predate lizards and snakes. This must not be allowed to happen. Once this special wildlife are lost it is extremely hard to replace. The wildlife of the Pebblebed heaths need to be able to move outside of the area itself they cannot be expected to remain in the boundaries so 400m is a zone in which the wildlife may move so a further buffer zone is needed from the 400m point of about the same again to minimise impacts on this sensitive flora and fauna. Also, migratory birds may be deterred from accessing the Pebblebed heathland because of the disturbance caused by both the building works and the new conurbation with associated people and traffic movements and also the additional night time lighting which will appear. Additional issues that a development of this size will cause include a significant increase in sewerage loading. The Exmouth sewerage system is already overloaded and regularly causing operation of the storm overflows which are affecting water quality in the watercourses and of course at our bathing beaches. Until this excessive operation of storm overflows is stopped this development should not proceed and nor should any others in this sewerage catchment. Then there is the impact of the additional vehicles and vehicle movements in this area. Exmouth already suffers congestion problems

especially at peak times of day this development would add additional loading to some significant congestion hotspots and to the problems of congestion on the Exmouth-Exeter Road.

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.: Remove this section from the plan

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.: Goes against the wishes of the local people

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Frances Nicholls

Full name: Frances Nicholls

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(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove it

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.: On page 392 of the Sustainability Appraisal, it is stated that the 400 metre buffer from the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA coincides with the higher, more prominent parts of Exmo_20, and that built development will not be permitted in this area, thereby reducing adverse landscape effects to a minor negative. However, this conclusion is not reflected in the Local Plan policies, which repeatedly state that development, including buildings, may be located within the upper parts of the site, including within the 400 metre zone. The Local Plan should accord with the findings of the SA, explicitly confirming no built development within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths. This discrepancy is material. The exclusion of built development within the 400 metre zone significantly reduces the developable area of the site and directly affects its viability. This constraint further compounds the significant and material reduction in site area from the 85 hectares presented to Members and approved for allocation on 3 September 2024, and the site's viability should therefore be reassessed. On page 396, the SA states that the north-eastern part of Exmo_20 lies within a mineral safeguarding

area, but that this largely coincides with the 400 metre buffer where development would not be allowed in any case. Again, this position is not carried through into the Local Plan, which continues to allow development, including buildings, within the upper 400 metres of the site. The Local Plan should reflect the SA conclusions by removing land within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI from the allocation and revising the settlement boundary accordingly. This inconsistency is particularly acute in relation to access, as the proposed access road would need to pass through land which, according to the SA, should not be developed. This creates a direct conflict between the Local Plan proposals and the SA conclusions, further undermining deliverability and viability. Finally, on page 399, the SA states that mitigation for impacts on the Exe Estuary and Pebblebed Heaths SPAs would be considered through the Habitats Regulations Assessment, but that for areas of Exmo_04 and Exmo_20 within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths, mitigation would not be possible. Exmo_04 was amended to exclude the most sensitive area, resulting in Exmo_04a. No equivalent amendment has been made to Exmo_20, with no clear justification for this inconsistency. In line with the People over Wind ruling, mitigation cannot be assumed to justify site selection where likely significant effects cannot be excluded. The Local Plan should therefore accord with the SA by excluding land within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths from Exmo_20 and revising the settlement boundary. Without this, and given the cumulative reduction in site area from the falsely claimed 85 hectares, the allocation of Exmo_20 is not justified, not viable and unsound.

Full name: Frances Nicholls

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.: On page 392 of the Sustainability Appraisal, Exmo_20 is described as extending to approximately 85 hectares, and a site of this size was presented to the Strategic Planning Committee on 3 September 2024. The scale of the site was clearly a material consideration, and Members were attracted by the perceived ability of a site of this size to accommodate development and associated mitigation, leading to the decision to include Exmo_20 in the draft Local Plan. However, the evidence presented to Members was not accurate, as the 85 hectare site shown did not in fact exist as an available site. The land promoted through the HELAA and subsequently available for allocation was significantly and materially smaller. Availability is one of the three HELAA tests and is a fundamental requirement in assessing site suitability. The presentation of a larger, unavailable site therefore misrepresented the true development potential and mitigation capacity of Exmo_20. This discrepancy is particularly significant given the site's proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, where scale and land take are directly relevant to the ability to address impacts through avoidance and mitigation. In line with the People over Wind ruling, mitigation cannot be assumed or relied upon to justify site selection in advance of a lawful Appropriate Assessment. Presenting an inflated site area prior to completion of the HRA materially undermines the evidential basis of the decision. As Members were asked to make a strategic allocation decision on the basis of incorrect and misleading evidence regarding site size and availability, the decision to include Exmo_20 is not soundly based, is procedurally flawed, and the allocation is therefore unjustified and unsound.

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.: Remove EXMO_20 from the plan

Full name: Frances Nicholls

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: On page 390 of the Sustainability Appraisal, it is stated that sites on the north-eastern side of Exmouth, including Exmo_04 and Lymp_09, 10, 13, 14 and 17, lie especially close to the Pebblebed Heaths and that development of these sites could lead to some of the greater adverse impacts. The SA further states that a large part of Exmo_04 falls within the 400 metre exclusion zone on account of domestic cat predation and recreation impacts. This is incorrect. The 400 metre exclusion zone relates to urban effects, principally cat predation and urbanisation, not recreational impacts, which are assessed separately through access and visitor pressure mitigation. This demonstrates a misapplication of the Habitats Regulations framework by the LPA in its role as Competent Authority. On page 391, Exmo_20 is considered without similar reference to “greater adverse impacts”, despite being the largest site and directly adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. This represents an inconsistent and unbalanced assessment within the SA. The latest HRA identifies an “inherent conflict” between development at Exmo_20 and the integrity of the European site, yet this is not clearly reflected or reconciled within the SA conclusions. Furthermore, Exmo_20 was selected for inclusion in the Local Plan prior to the completion of the Appropriate Assessment, contrary to the People over Wind CJEU ruling, which requires that mitigation cannot be relied upon to screen out likely significant effects. The reliance on future mitigation strategies, in the absence of a complete and robust HRA (a Core Submission Document), undermines the legality of the allocation. The subsequent introduction of references to the Strategic Nature Area and draft Nature Recovery Network, following the First Regulation 19 consultation, further indicates that material biodiversity considerations have been added after site selection. In accordance with

paragraphs 180 and 181 of the NPPF (December 2023), this evidence highlights the site's role in establishing coherent ecological networks, including as supporting habitat for Section 41 species such as the ground-nesting Nightjar. The allocation of Exmo_20 should therefore be reassessed in light of this evidence, as its current justification is not legally compliant, unjustified and unsound.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove it

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.: On page 390 of the Sustainability Appraisal, it is stated that sites on the north-eastern side of Exmouth, including Exmo_04 and Lypm_09, 10, 13, 14 and 17, lie especially close to the Pebblebed Heaths and that development of these sites could lead to some of the greater adverse impacts. The SA further states that a large part of Exmo_04 falls within the 400 metre exclusion zone on account of domestic cat predation and recreation impacts. This is incorrect. The 400 metre exclusion zone relates to urban effects, principally cat predation and urbanisation, not recreational impacts, which are assessed separately through access and visitor pressure mitigation. This demonstrates a misapplication of the Habitats Regulations framework by the LPA in its role as Competent Authority. On page 391, Exmo_20 is considered without similar reference to “greater adverse impacts”, despite being the largest site and directly adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. This represents an inconsistent and unbalanced assessment within the SA. The latest HRA identifies an “inherent conflict” between development at Exmo_20 and the integrity of the European site, yet this is not clearly reflected or reconciled within the SA conclusions. Furthermore, Exmo_20 was selected for inclusion in the Local Plan prior to the completion of the Appropriate Assessment, contrary to the People over Wind CJEU ruling, which requires that mitigation cannot be relied upon to screen out likely significant effects. The reliance on future mitigation strategies, in the absence of a complete and robust HRA (a Core Submission Document), undermines the legality of the allocation. The subsequent introduction of references to the Strategic Nature Area and draft Nature Recovery Network, following the First Regulation 19 consultation, further indicates that material biodiversity considerations have been added after site selection. In accordance with paragraphs

180 and 181 of the NPPF (December 2023), this evidence highlights the site's role in establishing coherent ecological networks, including as supporting habitat for Section 41 species such as the ground-nesting Nightjar. The allocation of Exmo_20 should therefore be reassessed in light of this evidence, as its current justification is not legally compliant, unjustified and unsound.

Full name: Frances Nicholls

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Exmo_20 is incorrectly listed as a reasonable alternative on pages 386 and 387. The site was assessed in the HELAA as unsuitable and unachievable, not merely unachievable as stated. In addition, the site as submitted was not available, despite availability being one of the three HELAA tests, and this was not properly checked. The site therefore failed all three HELAA assessments. No evidence is provided demonstrating that site access, mineral constraints or proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths can be satisfactorily addressed. The proposed access arrangements and impacts on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI rely on a viable mitigation strategy and supporting HRA, neither of which are provided within the Local Plan evidence base, despite the HRA being a Core Submission document. Furthermore, Exmo_20 was selected for inclusion in the Local Plan prior to the Appropriate Assessment being undertaken, which is contrary to the People over Wind ruling. The site's inclusion is therefore not legally compliant, unjustified and unsound.

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.:
Exmo_20 is incorrectly listed as a reasonable alternative on pages 386 and 387. The site was assessed in the HELAA as unsuitable and unachievable, not merely unachievable as stated. In addition, the site as submitted was not available, despite availability being one of the three HELAA tests, and this was not properly checked. The site therefore failed all three HELAA assessments. No evidence is provided demonstrating that site

access, mineral constraints or proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths can be satisfactorily addressed. The proposed access arrangements and impacts on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI rely on a viable mitigation strategy and supporting HRA, neither of which are provided within the Local Plan evidence base, despite the HRA being a Core Submission document. Furthermore, Exmo_20 was selected for inclusion in the Local Plan prior to the Appropriate Assessment being undertaken, which is contrary to the People over Wind ruling. The site's inclusion is therefore not legally compliant, unjustified and unsound.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Frances Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 was assessed in the HELAA as unsuitable and/or unachievable and, in accordance with the Site Selection Methodology (May 2022), would have failed site sifting at that stage. On this basis, the site would be expected to be identified as a failed site (blue) on the plan figure at page 384. The Plan does not clearly explain why Exmo_20 has departed from this outcome, and its subsequent inclusion in the draft Local Plan is therefore not clearly justified and is unsound.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Frances Nicholls

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.: The Sustainability Appraisal has undergone significant changes since the First Regulation 19 consultation and now reads as a materially different document, providing substantially different justification, particularly in relation to the inclusion of HELAA-failed sites such as Exmo_20. The revised appraisal appears to have been reworked in response to consultation feedback on earlier shortcomings, rather than forming part of the evidence base that informed the original site selection decisions. As a result, it is unclear how decisions taken prior can reasonably rely on a subsequently revised appraisal to alter conclusions from unsound to sound. Further reliance is now placed on the revised Site Selection Methodology (v2, December 2024), which appears to have been introduced retrospectively to support the allocation. Taken together, the inclusion of Exmo_20 in the draft Local Plan is not clearly justified and remains unsound.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Mark Nicholls

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Second Regulation 19 draft represents a significant change from the version consulted on at the First Regulation 19 stage. It now provides materially different reasoning, particularly in relation to the inclusion of HELAA-failed sites such as Exmo_20. The revised appraisal appears to have been substantially amended in response to consultation feedback, rather than forming part of the evidence that originally informed site selection. This creates uncertainty as to whether the allocation of Exmo_20 was evidence-led, or whether the appraisal has been revised to support a decision already made. The later reliance on the revised Site Selection Methodology (v2, December 2024) further reinforces concerns of post-hoc justification. As such, the allocation of Exmo_20 is not clearly justified and the Plan is therefore unsound.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is unsound because it relies on future agreements, strategies and evidence that do not currently exist, meaning the Local Plan cannot demonstrate that the site is deliverable or effective. Development depends on a whole-site masterplan, multi-landowner agreement, cost-apportionment mechanisms, highway solutions, mineral safeguarding resolution and extensive mitigation, none of which are secured at plan stage. The cumulative cost and complexity of these requirements raise serious viability risks, increasing the likelihood that mitigation, infrastructure or affordable housing would be reduced through later negotiation. A sound Local Plan should resolve these conflicts through site selection, not defer them to planning applications. Parts of the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, creating an unresolved policy conflict. The allocation also performs poorly in climate terms, increasing car dependency, emissions and loss of existing carbon-storing habitats. Given the Plan's over-allocation of housing, the inclusion of such a constrained and high-risk site has not been justified against less problematic alternatives. Exmo_20 should therefore be removed or fundamentally reconsidered.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is not sound and is not legally compliant because it conflicts with paragraph 16(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023). That paragraph requires plans to be clearly written, unambiguous, and based on robust and up-to-date evidence, so that it is evident how decision-makers should apply policies to development proposals. The Plan is based on an incorrect housing requirement, arising from the failure to use the most recent Office for National Statistics (ONS) data available at the time, as required by the MHCLG Housing and Economic Needs Assessment guidance. The annual housing need figure of 1,188 dwellings, quoted at paragraph 3.11 of the Plan, was calculated in February 2025, before the publication of the 2024 ONS household projections, and is therefore out of date and invalid. Applying the most recent ONS data reduces the annual housing need figure to 1,156 dwellings. When the Plan's own 80% delivery assumption is applied, this equates to 925 dwellings per year, resulting in a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 dwellings (without rounding distortion). This represents a reduction of 567 dwellings compared to the figures used in the Plan. This over-allocation is material. Numerous Local Plan policies rely on an asserted overriding housing need to justify harm to heritage assets, protected landscapes, biodiversity and internationally designated sites. Where the underlying housing requirement is overstated, the justification for allocating highly constrained and mitigation-heavy sites — such as Exmo_20 — falls away. This is particularly significant given the site's reliance on multiple, complex and unproven mitigation strategies to address impacts on the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further concerns arise from additional numerical and mathematical errors identified in evidence documents HOU-002 (October 2025) and HOU-001 (November 2025). These documents underpin the

Plan's housing strategy and spatial distribution. Until these errors are corrected and the evidence base reconsulted upon, the housing figures cannot be relied upon. Taken together, the reliance on outdated data, the presence of unresolved calculation errors, and the resulting lack of clarity about the true scale of housing need mean that the Plan does not meet the requirements of paragraph 16(d). The housing requirement is ambiguous, inadequately evidenced, and incapable of providing a clear basis for decision-making. In these circumstances, the continued allocation of Exmo_20 — a site with substantial and unresolved environmental constraints — cannot be justified and should be removed from the Plan unless and until the housing evidence base is corrected, updated, and subject to further consultation.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is not sound because it conflicts with Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023), which requires development to be located and designed to make effective use of sustainable transport modes, and to ensure that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport are fully taken up, having regard to the site's location and characteristics. Exmo_20 is poorly related to existing settlements. The main vehicular access point is approximately 2.3 miles by road from the centre of Budleigh Salterton and 4.0 miles by road from the centre of Exmouth. This distance, combined with the site's elevation and surrounding topography, significantly limits the realism of walking and cycling as everyday travel choices. These constraints are not evident from the Local Plan policy maps and have not been adequately addressed in the supporting evidence. As a result, the allocation would be heavily reliant on private car travel for access to shops, services, education, healthcare and employment. This directly conflicts with Policy TR01, which requires walking and cycling to be the primary modes of transport, and with paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan, which seeks to locate development where sustainable travel choices are genuinely available. In addition, the proximity of Exmo_20 to Budleigh Salterton, a lower-tier settlement, has not been properly considered. A development of this scale risks placing disproportionate pressure on Budleigh Salterton's services and infrastructure, undermining the settlement hierarchy and directing growth towards a town that is not identified as a focus for such expansion. Taken together, the distance from services, topographical constraints, reliance on car travel and failure to properly consider impacts on neighbouring settlements mean that Exmo_20 does not represent a sustainable location for development. The allocation is therefore unsound, as it is not

justified, not consistent with national policy, and conflicts with the Local Plan's transport and spatial strategy.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The allocation of Exmo_20 is not sound because it promotes development in a location that would be inherently car-dependent, contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) and the Local Plan's transport strategy. Paragraphs 92 and 109 of the NPPF require development to be located and designed so as to reduce the need to travel, support healthy lifestyles, and enable access to services by walking, cycling and public transport. Paragraph 109 in particular requires that opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes are taken up, depending on the nature and location of the site. Exmo_20 fails this test. The site is physically separated from Exmouth and Budleigh Salterton, with primary access proposed from the B3179, resulting in a long and indirect route to reach everyday services such as shops, schools, healthcare and employment. It has not been demonstrated that a sufficient range of regularly needed local services can be accessed by walking or cycling from the site in a safe, direct and realistic manner. This failure is compounded by recent changes to Local Plan Policy TR01, which now require walking and cycling to be the first and mandatory mode of travel, rather than merely an aspiration. The Exmo_20 allocation directly conflicts with this requirement, as its isolated location and access arrangements would necessitate frequent car use for routine daily activities. The internal layout of the site further reinforces car dependency. Housing is proposed at the southern part of the allocation, while the main access point is located on the B3179 to the north, meaning residents would be required to drive approximately one kilometre within the site before even reaching the public highway for every outbound and return journey. This is incompatible with the concept of sustainable, walkable neighbourhoods. As a result, the Exmo_20 allocation would generate significant and

unavoidable vehicle movements, increasing traffic, carbon emissions and air pollution, and undermining the Plan's stated objectives for sustainable transport and healthy communities. The allocation is therefore in direct conflict with Policies TR01 and TR03, paragraphs 3.6 and 11.2 of the Local Plan, and the NPPF's requirement for development to be genuinely sustainable in both location and design. Accordingly, the Exmo_20 allocation is unsound, as it is not justified by its location, is not consistent with national policy, and would undermine the Plan's own transport strategy.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmouth has a well-documented history of flooding, including serious events in 1960, 1983 and 2012, and is already recognised as having multiple and significant flood-risk pathways. Withycombe Brook, which flows through some of the most densely populated parts of the town, already experiences flood risk even before the effects of climate change are fully taken into account. The Exmo_20 site sits above Exmouth on greenfield land, with surface water and tributaries draining directly into Withycombe Brook. Large-scale development here would increase runoff and could worsen flood risk downstream, putting existing homes and communities at greater risk. Despite this, the Local Plan does not demonstrate that a sequential, risk-based approach has been properly applied to avoid development in locations that could increase flooding. In the absence of clear evidence that flood risk can be safely managed now and in the future, the Exmo_20 allocation is unsound and should be reconsidered.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Exmo_20 site forms part of a Strategic Nature Area that acts as an essential buffer between Exmouth and the Pebblebed Heaths, as well as a wildlife corridor linking the Heaths to the coast. It supports important habitats, veteran trees, ancient woodland and hedgerows, and provides key foraging habitat for the European Nightjar, a protected species and a main reason for the Heaths' international designation. Developing this site would undermine the conservation objectives of the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI by fragmenting habitats and weakening this buffer. Devon County Council is currently progressing plans to designate the area as part of a Local Nature Recovery Area, reflecting its importance for nature recovery under the Environment Act. Devon Wildlife Trust has stated that development of Exmo_20 is inappropriate and that it is unlikely the site could be developed without causing significant harm to the integrity of the protected heathlands. Given the site's recognised role in nature recovery and the availability of less sensitive alternatives, the Exmo_20 allocation is unsound and should be removed.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 would surround St John in the Wilderness Church, a Grade II* listed building of the highest significance, and would cause serious and irreversible harm to its setting. The church and churchyard sit within a rare, tranquil and dark-sky landscape that reflects its historic “wilderness” character. A large housing development encircling this site would fundamentally change that setting, regardless of any buffer left around the church. Historic England has raised strong concerns, noting that much of Exmo_20 lies within the church’s setting and that development could cause considerable harm. They also warn that the proposed access road from the B3179 would further damage the setting and increase future development pressure. Historic England advises that development should instead be limited to less sensitive areas, with the site boundary reduced or the scale of development significantly restricted. Given the importance of this heritage asset and the clear risk of harm, the Exmo_20 allocation is unsound and should be removed or substantially reduced.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation has no clear or viable access strategy. The Plan proposes that most traffic would access the site via the B3179, but making this work would require major highway alterations that are uncertain, uncostered and not confirmed by Devon County Council. Traffic from Exmo_20 would also run directly alongside the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, increasing congestion and air pollution. The Council's own Habitats Regulations Assessment states that there is insufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of the Pebblebed Heaths due to air quality impacts linked to traffic on the B3179. Despite this, Exmo_20 remains allocated, which is contrary to the precautionary principle and the legal requirement to prioritise avoidance over mitigation. The mitigation strategy itself confirms that mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence. Until it can be demonstrated with scientific certainty that access and traffic impacts can be resolved without harm to the Pebblebed Heaths, the Exmo_20 allocation is unsound and should be removed or reconsidered.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Exmo_20 site lies immediately next to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, making it highly unlikely that SANGs or on-site open space could successfully prevent increased recreational use of the Heaths by new residents. Activities such as dog walking, cycling and walking are therefore likely to increase, causing harm to protected habitats and species. The European Nightjar, a ground-nesting bird and key reason for the SPA designation, is particularly vulnerable: evidence shows that even a single disturbance or predation event can cause nesting failure. The risk of cat predation and disturbance increases the closer housing is built to the Heaths, and there is no practical way to prevent people or domestic cats from accessing the protected area. The RSPB has stated that mitigation for sites closest to the Heaths, particularly Exmo_20, is unlikely to be effective and that there is a significant risk that SANGs will not prevent damaging recreational pressure or other indirect impacts. In the absence of a proven and deliverable mitigation strategy, planning law requires a precautionary approach. Until it can be clearly demonstrated that harm to the Pebblebed Heaths can be avoided, the Exmo_20 allocation should be removed or substantially reduced.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Exmo_20 site sits immediately next to the Pebblebed Heaths, one of the most environmentally sensitive and highly protected areas in East Devon. Development here would place significant pressure on habitats and species that the planning system is legally required to protect. A 400-metre buffer has been proposed as mitigation, but strong evidence shows this is not enough. Domestic cats can roam far beyond 400 metres, particularly in semi-rural areas, and the European Nightjar, a ground-nesting bird that is a key reason for the Heaths' protected status, is extremely vulnerable to disturbance and predation. Research shows that even a single disturbance or predation event can cause nesting failure. For this reason, a much wider buffer is needed, alongside strict controls on lighting, access and recreation. At present, the Exmo_20 allocation depends on a mitigation strategy and habitat assessment that have not yet been shown to work. Current assessments openly acknowledge unresolved risks. In these circumstances, planning law requires a precautionary approach, yet the site has still been included in the Plan. Environmental organisations share these concerns. Devon Wildlife Trust has highlighted the site's important role as a buffer between Exmouth and protected land, while the East Devon National Landscape Partnership has stated that a 400m buffer is inadequate and has supported either removing the site or significantly reducing its scale and moving development closer to the existing town. Natural England has also advised that development should be pulled further away from the Heaths and that a substantial green buffer should be secured to protect the designated sites. Given the availability of alternative sites with fewer environmental constraints, and the fact that the Plan already allocates more housing than is required,

there is no clear justification for pursuing a development here that carries such high and unresolved ecological risk.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI, the Exmo_20 allocation relies on significant habitat and species mitigation that has not been demonstrated as achievable or viable. The mitigation strategy itself states that “it was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA”, while the Plan HRA confirms that “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” Despite this, the site was selected on 03.09.24 (with no option for reconsideration) and the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24 on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would subsequently be developed, prior to the Appropriate Assessment undertaken in the 30.01.25 HRA. This approach is contrary to the CJEU People Over Wind ruling and the required precautionary principle, particularly in light of the CJEU Dutch N judgment. Furthermore, where sites with known mitigation requirements are selected, the Mitigation Hierarchy in NPPF paragraph 32 requires clear justification. This stage has not been undertaken. The Exmo_20 allocation is therefore difficult to justify, given the availability of alternative, less mitigation-dependent sites and the Plan’s housing over-allocation arising from the failure to apply the latest mandatory ONS data. Devon Wildlife Trust, in its first Regulation 19 response, stated that “the allocation site currently serves an important function as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north,” and that development would result in the degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments beyond designated boundaries. Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority has failed to demonstrate compliance with its duties as Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan or deliver a mitigation strategy

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because the allocation lies adjacent to land supporting glow-worm populations, a light-sensitive species highly vulnerable to artificial night-time lighting and increased disturbance. While the policy acknowledges the need to protect tranquillity and to avoid street lighting in certain locations, it does not identify glow-worms or address the specific risks posed by development-related lighting, vehicle movements, illuminated paths or residential security lighting associated with around 700 new homes. The Plan relies on later assessments rather than demonstrating at plan stage that impacts on this sensitive species can be avoided, which is inconsistent with national biodiversity policy and undermines the effectiveness of the allocation

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because it relies heavily on imprecise and subjective wording to manage significant impacts arising from a very large allocation. Key safeguards are not defined or measurable, including the extent of the “extensive area” around St John in the Wilderness church, what constitutes “modest levels” of development for secondary access, and how far the housing number may vary from “around 700 homes”. This ambiguity reduces certainty, weakens enforceability, and increases the risk that constraints are eroded through later negotiation, meaning the policy is not effective

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because the allocation depends on the delivery of a wide range of essential infrastructure and mitigation measures that are not defined with sufficient certainty at plan stage. While the policy allocates “social and community facilities”, around 700 homes and at least 2ha of employment land, it defers key matters to a future masterplan, access strategy, cost-apportionment mechanisms across multiple land parcels, future highway mitigation, and complex ecological mitigation including SANGs and buffering/fencing arrangements. The Plan does not demonstrate that these requirements can be viably funded, phased and delivered together, creating a high risk of delay or dilution of requirements and undermining the effectiveness and justification of the allocation.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan or provide more detail

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because it is located in a highly sensitive ecological context and relies on a complex package of mitigation measures (including a 400m constraint related to the Pebblebed Heaths, buffers for nightjar foraging, restrictions on parking near the SAC/SPA, and delivery of developer-provided SANGs with buffering/fencing and restricted onward access). The Plan does not map or quantify the effect of these constraints on developable area or demonstrate at plan stage that the required mitigation is deliverable, enforceable and effective for a development of around 700 homes plus employment and community uses. This introduces substantial uncertainty and undermines consistency with national policy requiring avoidance of harm to protected sites

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because it allocates a major mixed-use urban extension in a location closely related to the East Devon National Landscape without robust plan-stage evidence that adverse effects on the National Landscape and its setting can be avoided. The policy relies on vague future measures such as “sensitive design”, screening, and avoiding street lighting, but does not demonstrate how the scale of development and access requirements can be reconciled with landscape protection, nor does it specify how “enhancement of natural beauty” will be delivered in a clear and enforceable way. This is not justified and is not consistent with national policy protections for designated landscapes.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because the transport and access strategy for a development of around 700 homes, employment land and community uses is insufficiently defined or evidenced. The policy relies on future assessments to resolve access onto the B3179, despite the sensitivity of this route adjacent to the East Devon National Landscape and the need to balance highway safety with landscape protection. The Plan does not demonstrate that the scale of traffic generated can be safely and sustainably accommodated, nor that reliance on sustainable travel is realistic at this location, undermining both the justification and effectiveness of the allocation.

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.: Rethink the access to the site

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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(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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because significant parts of the site lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel, where development is restricted unless mineral resources are proven unviable or extracted in advance. The Plan allocates a very large mixed-use development without demonstrating that these mineral constraints can be resolved in practice or without undermining delivery, heritage protection, landscape quality or tranquillity. This creates an unresolved conflict between housing allocation and mineral safeguarding policy, introduces substantial uncertainty, and undermines both the justification and effectiveness of the allocation.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is not sound because it identifies St John in the Wilderness church as a highly sensitive heritage asset requiring protection of its setting and tranquillity, yet still allocates around 700 new homes, employment land and community uses without demonstrating that this scale of development can be delivered without harm. The policy relies on future heritage assessments and an undefined “extensive area” where built development will not be allowed, rather than evidencing at plan stage that the proposed quantum is compatible with heritage protection. This approach defers fundamental conflicts to later stages, creates uncertainty, and is not justified or consistent with national heritage policy.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Mark Nicholls

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.:

Exmo_20 is not sound because the allocation of “around 700 new homes”, alongside at least 2ha employment land and community uses, is not transparently justified against the policy’s own stated constraints. The Plan requires built development to be concentrated in the southern part of the site and requires an “extensive” no-build area around St John in the Wilderness church to protect its setting and tranquillity, but does not quantify these constraints or demonstrate that the residual developable area can accommodate the stated scale. This indicates a numbers-led allocation rather than a constraints-led capacity and introduces a high risk of overdevelopment pressure or non-delivery, meaning the policy is not justified and is not effective.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Lucy Nicholls-Brice

Full name: Lucy Nicholls-Brice

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I consider that allocation Exmo_20 is not legally compliant for the following reasons: 1. Failure to comply with the Habitats Regulations: Exmo_20 includes land within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA. The Local Plan acknowledges that development resulting in unacceptable impacts within this buffer will not be permitted. However, the plan allocates approximately 700 dwellings and associated employment land without demonstrating, at plan-making stage, compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The site and its immediate environs support, or functionally support, nightjars, a qualifying feature of the Pebblebed Heaths SPA, including known and potential foraging areas. The scale of development proposed would increase recreational pressure, lighting, noise and habitat fragmentation, all of which are recognised impact pathways for nightjars. In the absence of evidence that concludes, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that the allocation will not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC/SPA, the plan fails to meet the statutory requirements of Regulation 63. 2. Failure to comply with duties relating to protected and notable species: The site and its close environs are known to support beavers, deer and glow-worms, species which are material considerations in planning and relevant to the duties under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Glow-worms are particularly sensitive to habitat loss and artificial lighting, both of which are inherent to a development of this scale. The plan allocates the site without demonstrating how impacts on these species can be avoided or mitigated, relying instead on future assessment. This approach fails to

demonstrate legal compliance at plan-making stage. The proposal also includes access works and development affecting the landscape. The policy requires development to conserve and enhance natural beauty, avoid street lighting, and ensure sensitively designed infrastructure: it is unrealistic that a development of this scale and intensity can meet these requirements without unacceptable landscape, natural and visual harm, particularly in the northern parts of the site. 3. Failure to comply with Mineral Safeguarding requirements: The northern part of Exmo_20 lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel resources, including Pebblebed geology. The Local Plan states that development within such areas will not be permitted unless supported by a robust Mineral Resource Assessment demonstrating that the resource is not of current or potential economic value, or unless prior extraction is undertaken. By allocating the site without establishing that these requirements can be met, the plan risks sterilising a safeguarded mineral resource and is not legally compliant with the adopted minerals planning framework. 4. Failure to demonstrate compliance with statutory heritage duties: The allocation affects the setting and tranquillity of the listed St John in the Wilderness Church. While the policy refers to future heritage assessment and buffers, the plan does not demonstrate how the statutory duty under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 has been satisfied at allocation stage. Reliance on future mitigation is insufficient to demonstrate legal compliance. For the reasons above, allocation Exmo_20 fails to demonstrate compliance with the Habitats Regulations, biodiversity duties, mineral safeguarding requirements, and statutory heritage duties. Insufficient work has been done and therefore the chapter is not legally compliant insofar as it relates to the Exmo_20 site.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Given the extent and interaction of the identified legal failures - in particular the inability to demonstrate compliance with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the unresolved sterilisation of a Mineral Safeguarding Area, and the failure to discharge statutory biodiversity and heritage duties at plan-making stage - modification of the policy wording alone would be insufficient to remedy the legal non-compliance. The only lawful modification is the removal of allocation Exmo_20 in its entirety from the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter. This is necessary because the allocation relies on the deferral of fundamental legal tests and mitigation to future project-level assessment, which is not permissible where there is reasonable scientific doubt as to adverse effects on an internationally protected site and where safeguarded mineral resources may be irreversibly sterilised. Retaining the

allocation would therefore continue to place the plan in conflict with statutory requirements.

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.: I consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter to be not sound because, for the reasons set out above, allocation Exmo_20 is not justified, not effective, and not consistent with national policy. In particular, the allocation relies on the deferral of fundamental constraints - including compliance with the Habitats Regulations, mineral safeguarding, biodiversity duties, landscape protection and heritage impacts - to future assessment and mitigation. This means the policy is not based on a proportionate or robust evidence base, cannot be delivered in a legally compliant manner, and fails to demonstrate that the identified impacts can be avoided or made acceptable. Accordingly, the policy does not meet the tests of soundness set out in national planning policy.

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 the reasons set out above, allocation Exmo_20 is not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy. These deficiencies arise from fundamental and unresolved constraints relating to internationally protected habitats, biodiversity, mineral safeguarding, landscape and heritage, which cannot be resolved through policy refinement or additional criteria. Accordingly, the only modification capable of making this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound is the removal of allocation Exmo_20 in its entirety. Delete all references to allocation Exmo_20 (Land at St John's, Exmouth) from the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter and the Policies Map.

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.: No. The allocation of Exmo_20 relies on unresolved strategic matters requiring cooperation with statutory bodies, which have been deferred

rather than resolved at plan-making stage, and therefore fails to demonstrate compliance with the duty to cooperate.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Heath Nickels

Full name: Heath Nickels

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?: 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.: There has been a "watering down" of the narrative in respect of this policy; For some reason, the policy has been altered to be less firm and is now open to subjective interpretation by developers.

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.: Specifically, the original text said : "As a minimum, the following features are required within new proposals:" In this latest version it says: " As a minimum, the following features or others of equivalent value are sought within new proposals:" Thus the word 'REQUIRED' has been "watered down" to 'SOUGHT' and 'others of equivalent value' is a phrase without any supporting metrics. I believe a straight forward prescription of intent is plain and easily implemented ; conversely, words such as SOUGHT just lead to more time and energy being used by both developers and District officers / Ecologists. In essence these simple biodiversity measures are easily achievable by developers and the cost is very minimal compared to the price of each dwelling. They should be REQUIRED.....

Gabriel Nother

Full name: Gabriel Nother

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?: 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 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.: I am submitting an objection to the proposed Exmo 20 Site. It is disappointing that I have to do this again after last year's submissions which I believe were in excess of 1,200 objections.

It is difficult to understand how this site could be considered when there are so many negative points relating to this area being developed such as :

- Increased flood risks from the development. There are already issues in this area and building works and new infrastructure will severely aggravate flood waters. The risks and damage will be even more exaggerated as our climate changes (extremely heavy & consistent downpours). The area will not cope.
- Wildlife and habitat destruction: The 'safety' boundary mentioned in the plan will not prevent permanent damage to the pebblebeds and surrounding woodlands. These will be destroyed forever with the loss of a beautiful English environment and it's wildlife.
- Transport routes and road traffic : The local road infrastructure is not appropriate to deal with significant increases in traffic. The roads are already falling apart as it is and

we know that national & local government have not got the funding to even resolve the current issues. This will lead to a serious deterioration in quality of life and mental health. *** This could also lead to an increase in loss of life with additional traffic on these local routes. They are not safe !

- Pollution : Increased traffic will obviously lead to higher levels of pollution which further deteriorates peoples' health and the environment.
- St John in the Wilderness : The proposed development will severely impinge on this beautiful historic church and site. It was sited here as a place of peace for worship and contemplation. This will destroy the special fabric of this holy area.
- Tourism : People from all over the UK visit Devon to enjoy the special and beautiful environment here. Supersized developments such as Exmo 20 will damage the landscapes and environment altering it forever into another suburban sprawl.
- Development size: We all appreciate the requirement for additional housing but this should be shared between areas. 700 + houses are far too many in this site for all the reasons mentioned above and more. There needs to be more controlled allocations to achieve the overall housing targets.

Lastly, and I know it is not normally used as an objection point but this development will clearly erode the fabric of East Devon's rural heritage and can never be replaced once development starts.

I sincerely hope that mine and others' objections will be seriously considered and debated.

Full name: Gabriel Nother

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?: 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 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.: I am submitting an objection to the proposed Exmo 20 Site. It is disappointing that I have to do this again after last year's submissions which I believe were in excess of 1,200 objections.

It is difficult to understand how this site could be considered when there are so many negative points relating to this area being developed such as :

- Increased flood risks from the development. There are already issues in this area and building works and new infrastructure will severely aggravate flood waters. The risks and damage will be even more exaggerated as our climate changes (extremely heavy & consistent downpours). The area will not cope.
- Wildlife and habitat destruction: The 'safety' boundary mentioned in the plan will not prevent permanent damage to the pebblebeds and surrounding woodlands. These will be destroyed forever with the loss of a beautiful English environment and it's wildlife.
- Transport routes and road traffic : The local road infrastructure is not appropriate to deal with significant increases in traffic. The roads are already falling apart as it is and we know that national & local government have not got the funding to even resolve the current issues. This will lead to a serious deterioration in quality of life and mental

health. *** This could also lead to an increase in loss of life with additional traffic on these local routes. They are not safe !

- Pollution : Increased traffic will obviously lead to higher levels of pollution which further deteriorates peoples' health and the environment.
- St John in the Wilderness : The proposed development will severely impinge on this beautiful historic church and site. It was sited here as a place of peace for worship and contemplation. This will destroy the special fabric of this holy area.
- Tourism : People from all over the UK visit Devon to enjoy the special and beautiful environment here. Supersized developments such as Exmo 20 will damage the landscapes and environment altering it forever into another suburban sprawl.
- Development size: We all appreciate the requirement for additional housing but this should be shared between areas. 700 + houses are far too many in this site for all the reasons mentioned above and more. There needs to be more controlled allocations to achieve the overall housing targets.

Lastly, and I know it is not normally used as an objection point but this development will clearly erode the fabric of East Devon's rural heritage and can never be replaced once development starts.

I sincerely hope that mine and others' objections will be seriously considered and debated.

Full name: Gabriel Nother

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?: 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 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.: I am submitting an objection to the proposed Exmo 20 Site. It is disappointing that I have to do this again after last year's submissions which I believe were in excess of 1,200 objections.

It is difficult to understand how this site could be considered when there are so many negative points relating to this area being developed such as :

- Increased flood risks from the development. There are already issues in this area and building works and new infrastructure will severely aggravate flood waters. The risks and damage will be even more exaggerated as our climate changes (extremely heavy & consistent downpours). The area will not cope.
- Wildlife and habitat destruction: The 'safety' boundary mentioned in the plan will not prevent permanent damage to the pebblebeds and surrounding woodlands. These will be destroyed forever with the loss of a beautiful English environment and it's wildlife.
- Transport routes and road traffic : The local road infrastructure is not appropriate to deal with significant increases in traffic. The roads are already falling apart as it is and we know that national & local government have not got the funding to even resolve the current issues. This will lead to a serious deterioration in quality of life and mental

health. *** This could also lead to an increase in loss of life with additional traffic on these local routes. They are not safe !

- Pollution : Increased traffic will obviously lead to higher levels of pollution which further deteriorates peoples' health and the environment.
- St John in the Wilderness : The proposed development will severely impinge on this beautiful historic church and site. It was sited here as a place of peace for worship and contemplation. This will destroy the special fabric of this holy area.
- Tourism : People from all over the UK visit Devon to enjoy the special and beautiful environment here. Supersized developments such as Exmo 20 will damage the landscapes and environment altering it forever into another suburban sprawl.
- Development size: We all appreciate the requirement for additional housing but this should be shared between areas. 700 + houses are far too many in this site for all the reasons mentioned above and more. There needs to be more controlled allocations to achieve the overall housing targets.

Lastly, and I know it is not normally used as an objection point but this development will clearly erode the fabric of East Devon's rural heritage and can never be replaced once development starts.

I sincerely hope that mine and others' objections will be seriously considered and debated.

Full name: Gabriel Nother

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?: 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 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.: I am submitting an objection to the proposed Exmo 20 Site. It is disappointing that I have to do this again after last year's submissions which I believe were in excess of 1,200 objections.

It is difficult to understand how this site could be considered when there are so many negative points relating to this area being developed such as :

- Increased flood risks from the development. There are already issues in this area and building works and new infrastructure will severely aggravate flood waters. The risks and damage will be even more exaggerated as our climate changes (extremely heavy & consistent downpours). The area will not cope.
- Wildlife and habitat destruction: The 'safety' boundary mentioned in the plan will not prevent permanent damage to the pebblebeds and surrounding woodlands. These will be destroyed forever with the loss of a beautiful English environment and it's wildlife.
- Transport routes and road traffic : The local road infrastructure is not appropriate to deal with significant increases in traffic. The roads are already falling apart as it is and we know that national & local government have not got the funding to even resolve the current issues. This will lead to a serious deterioration in quality of life and mental

health. *** This could also lead to an increase in loss of life with additional traffic on these local routes. They are not safe !

- Pollution : Increased traffic will obviously lead to higher levels of pollution which further deteriorates peoples' health and the environment.
- St John in the Wilderness : The proposed development will severely impinge on this beautiful historic church and site. It was sited here as a place of peace for worship and contemplation. This will destroy the special fabric of this holy area.
- Tourism : People from all over the UK visit Devon to enjoy the special and beautiful environment here. Supersized developments such as Exmo 20 will damage the landscapes and environment altering it forever into another suburban sprawl.
- Development size: We all appreciate the requirement for additional housing but this should be shared between areas. 700 + houses are far too many in this site for all the reasons mentioned above and more. There needs to be more controlled allocations to achieve the overall housing targets.

Lastly, and I know it is not normally used as an objection point but this development will clearly erode the fabric of East Devon's rural heritage and can never be replaced once development starts.

I sincerely hope that mine and others' objections will be seriously considered and debated.

Kayleigh Ojaim

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

ALLOCATION OF Exmo_20 is in conflict with policy TR03 in the Local Plan. The proposed location on Exmo_20 and it's distance from amenities means that there are no viable options to create sustainable travel alternatives to using cars. Research findings around the distances from the site to local services show that using cars will be by far the preferred choice of transportation for residents which directly contradicts Policy TR03. Due to Exmo_20's restricted access arrangements, the development would generate significant amounts of vehicle movements just to access services within Exmouth and the neighbouring settlements using the B3179. Due to the site's steep topography and remote location from services, any walking or cycling routes will provide limited viable alternative options to using a car. The local plan notes that congestion is a particular issue in Western East Devon, and with this site having no direct access to Dinan Way and the A376, the significant amounts of vehicle movements from this site will be on rural B roads, locally notorious for being congested and substandard.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

ALLOCATION OF Exmo_20 is in conflict with the LPA assertion that Exmouth has the necessary infrastructure in place. Despite being a tier 1 settlement Exmouth does not have sufficient infrastructure and services for the existing population. With the increased population resulting from Exmo_20 there will be excessive strain on an already bowing services. Even if the proposed development brings financial contributions towards infrastructure etc it will not add another Doctors surgery or dentist – the current provisions of which are already insufficient for the existing population of Exmouth. GPs in Exmouth are already facing wait times of 3+ weeks to acquire an appointment. Similarly Exmouth does not have enough Police resource to cover the current requirements of the town without extending the size dramatically. The proposed development on Exmo_20 does not include provision for another primary or secondary school - within the last 3 years numerous Exmouth children have had to travel 30-40 mins to attend school in Cranbrook due to there being no capacity at Exmouth Community College. The original plans for the nearby Goodmores development included a primary school which has yet to even begin development, further increasing strain on local schools. The existing sewerage system in Exmouth is so inadequate that sewage is discharged into the sea on a very regular basis and the beach is often closed for swimming. Exmouth's problem with sewerage has been featured on national news several times, highlighting the scale of the problem it has. Other developments have added significantly to the sewerage problem in recent years. The Goodmores Development (off Dinan Way in Exmouth) is not anywhere near finished so the impact that will have on the town, in the short and long term, is unknown. However, increased flooding and sewerage issues have increased since the build went

ahead. Maintaining access to essential amenities and services is crucial for the well-being and quality of life of existing residents.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan or at least reduce the number of houses in line with the corrected figures.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Exmo_20 states that “vehicular access, to accommodate modest levels of development, will be allowed for southern site parts from the road ‘Southern Wood’.” No information is given as to what exactly forms the ‘southern site parts’, how many houses this comprises, nor the measures that will prevent the entire site using an access point via Southern Wood. It should therefore be assumed that any entrance to the site via Southern Wood would be available to the entire site of 700 homes. The Government Centre for Social Research published a study in June 2024 on Car Ownership that stated amongst its key findings under 1.1.1. that “the proportion of households with one car has remained at around 45% and the proportion with two or more vehicles has increased from 8% to 34%.” So it is safe to assume that with 700 homes there will be around 1000 vehicles on the proposed site of Exmo_20. It is also worth noting that the average cars per household in Southern Wood currently is more than 2 cars per household which supports the likely quantity of cars in Exmo_20. While Southern Wood is a quiet cul de sac, the road connecting it to the nearest main route is Meadow View Road which is constantly full of parked cars and at numerous points it is only passable for one vehicle at a time. Vehicles have to regularly stop and give way, sometimes reversing to create space, and cars will regularly be stuck on Dinan Way, unable to even turn in to Meadow View Road. It’s also worth noting that Meadow View Road on which had regular scheduled bus services cancelled due to lack of accessibility. It is ludicrous to think that 1000 vehicles taking an average of 2 trips per day, would not make the situation considerably worse than it already is. Any properly conducted assessment that took place around school pick up times and rush hours would see how unfeasible Southern Wood is as an access point. Furthermore, any access via Southern Wood would

necessitate a bridge being built over Withycombe brook at the end of Southern Wood. We have not seen the plans for a potential bridge at the bottom of the road yet and so do not know the infrastructure behind it but given the positioning of the brook it would need to be substantial and inevitably seriously negatively impact Southern Wood and its residents as well and the woodland habitat surrounding the bridge. Once the bridge is in place the precious parking spaces at the bottom of Southern Wood will be removed forcing more cars to park on the road, adding to the parking and road accessibility issues already faced by existing residents. When access off the Salterton Road or through the ready built Liverton Business Park via B3178, or the B3179 is easier, more practical and most importantly safer.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel as it has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. It is clear to anyone who knows this area that walking or cycling will not be the first choice of transport from the proposed site of Exmo_20 for people to do their shopping/ work/ school run etc because the distance is too great and the LPA have failed to prove otherwise. Studies cited in the Local Plan show that most people prefer to walk if their destination is within 0.5 miles, that beyond the distance of 1 mile cars are the dominant mode of travel and that beyond 2 miles trips on foot are few. Exmo_20 is significantly further than 0.5 miles or even 1 mile from essential infrastructure and services therefore walking or cycling as first choice of transport is unviable. Providing walking routes, cycle paths or public transport will do little to reduce the amount of car journeys this development would generate because the steep local topography and distance to access essential infrastructure and services is too far. It will also be a difficult location for those without car access and cause social exclusion. It is also worth noting that the existing infrastructure of the surrounding roads is not capable of accommodating the increased demand that Exmo_20 would cause. Access for buses, which would have an increased demand, would also be very difficult. A bus service through Meadow View Road (next to the proposed site) was cancelled several years ago

for this very reason proving this is not a sustainable option. From a safety concern Emergency Vehicles such as Fire Engines and Ambulances would without doubt have access issues.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property. Turning the natural drainage the site current provides through trees and grassland into a concrete jungle invites a huge flood risk, particularly to all of the existing houses and businesses bordering Withycombe Brook. The proposed site of Exmo_20 sits upstream of Exmouth on the main rainwater catchment area of Withycombe Brook. The subsoil is heavy clay, the impermeable nature of which makes soakaways ineffective and the land is often waterlogged. Building on this steep site would significantly exacerbate the already identified flood risk through the lower lying land at the bottom of the site and down through Withycombe. In addition there will be the potential pollution added to flood waters from construction activities. A site entrance via Southern Wood has been included in the plan for Exmo_20 that would require a large bridge to be built over Withycombe Brook that runs along the end of Southern Wood (it would NOT be possible to access the site from Southern Wood without a bridge being built). Withycombe Brook regularly floods and there has been land erosion as a result of flooding to the area at the bottom of Southern Wood where the bridge would need to be built and surrounding homes. The bridge itself could also cause a build up of debris causing further flooding. A nearby development, Goodmores,

is still under construction and we are already seeing swathes of mud and flood water covering areas of the main access road that is Dinan Way. Water run off from Exmo_20 would inevitably compound this issue due to the location of the proposed site.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging(a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26)aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that “The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon’s Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate t consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm." A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St. John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote and tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard, drastically altering the peaceful setting for worship which currently exists for the congregation.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Kayleigh Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA has completely disregarded their duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Julia Ojaim

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

ALLOCATION OF Exmo_20 is in conflict with policy TR03 in the Local Plan. The proposed location on Exmo_20 and it's distance from amenities means that there are no viable options to create sustainable travel alternatives to using cars. Research findings around the distances from the site to local services show that using cars will be by far the preferred choice of transportation for residents which directly contradicts Policy TR03. Due to Exmo_20's restricted access arrangements, the development would generate significant amounts of vehicle movements just to access services within Exmouth and the neighbouring settlements using the B3179. Due to the site's steep topography and remote location from services, any walking or cycling routes will provide limited viable alternative options to using a car. The local plan notes that congestion is a particular issue in Western East Devon, and with this site having no direct access to Dinan Way and the A376, the significant amounts of vehicle movements from this site will be on rural B roads, locally notorious for being congested and substandard.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

ALLOCATION OF Exmo_20 is in conflict with the LPA assertion that Exmouth has the necessary infrastructure in place. Despite being a tier 1 settlement Exmouth does not have sufficient infrastructure and services for the existing population. With the increased population resulting from Exmo_20 there will be excessive strain on an already bowing services. Even if the proposed development brings financial contributions towards infrastructure etc it will not add another Doctors surgery or dentist – the current provisions of which are already insufficient for the existing population of Exmouth. GPs in Exmouth are already facing wait times of 3+ weeks to acquire an appointment. Similarly Exmouth does not have enough Police resource to cover the current requirements of the town without extending the size dramatically. The proposed development on Exmo_20 does not include provision for another primary or secondary school - within the last 3 years numerous Exmouth children have had to travel 30-40 mins to attend school in Cranbrook due to there being no capacity at Exmouth Community College. The original plans for the nearby Goodmores development included a primary school which has yet to even begin development, further increasing strain on local schools. The existing sewerage system in Exmouth is so inadequate that sewage is discharged into the sea on a very regular basis and the beach is often closed for swimming. Exmouth's problem with sewerage has been featured on national news several times, highlighting the scale of the problem it has. Other developments have added significantly to the sewerage problem in recent years. The Goodmores Development (off Dinan Way in Exmouth) is not anywhere near finished so the impact that will have on the town, in the short and long term, is unknown. However, increased flooding and sewerage issues have increased since the build went

ahead. Maintaining access to essential amenities and services is crucial for the well-being and quality of life of existing residents.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.: The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan or at least reduce the size drastically described in 3(b).

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA(6) Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Exmo_20 states that “vehicular access, to accommodate modest levels of development, will be allowed for southern site parts from the road ‘Southern Wood’.” No information is given as to what exactly forms the ‘southern site parts’, how many houses this comprises, nor the measures that will prevent the entire site using an access point via Southern Wood. It should therefore be assumed that any entrance to the site via Southern Wood would be available to the entire site of 700 homes. The Government Centre for Social Research published a study in June 2024 on Car Ownership that stated amongst its key findings under 1.1.1. that “the proportion of households with one car has remained at around 45% and the proportion with two or more vehicles has increased from 8% to 34%.” So it is safe to assume that with 700 homes there will be around 1000 vehicles on the proposed site of Exmo_20. It is also worth noting that the average cars per household in Southern Wood currently is more than 2 cars per household which supports the likely quantity of cars in Exmo_20. While Southern Wood is a quiet cul de sac, the road connecting it to the nearest main route is Meadow View Road which is constantly full of parked cars and at numerous points it is only passable for one vehicle at a time. Vehicles have to regularly stop and give way, sometimes reversing to create space, and cars will regularly be stuck on Dinan Way, unable to even turn in to Meadow View Road. It’s also worth noting that Meadow View Road on which had regular scheduled bus services cancelled due to lack of accessibility. It is ludicrous to think that 1000 vehicles taking an average of 2 trips per day, would not make the situation considerably worse than it already is. Any properly conducted assessment that took place around school pick up times and rush hours would see how unfeasible Southern Wood is as an access point. Furthermore, any access via Southern Wood would

necessitate a bridge being built over Withycombe brook at the end of Southern Wood. We have not seen the plans for a potential bridge at the bottom of the road yet and so do not know the infrastructure behind it but given the positioning of the brook it would need to be substantial and inevitably seriously negatively impact Southern Wood and its residents as well and the woodland habitat surrounding the bridge. Once the bridge is in place the precious parking spaces at the bottom of Southern Wood will be removed forcing more cars to park on the road, adding to the parking and road accessibility issues already faced by existing residents. When access off the Salterton Road or through the ready built Liverton Business Park via B3178, or the B3179 is easier, more practical and most importantly safer.

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.: Do not access the Exmo_20 site via Southern Wood.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel as it has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. It is clear to anyone who knows this area that walking or cycling will not be the first choice of transport from the proposed site of Exmo_20 for people to do their shopping/ work/ school run etc because the distance is too great and the LPA have failed to prove otherwise. Studies cited in the Local Plan show that most people prefer to walk if their destination is within 0.5 miles, that beyond the distance of 1 mile cars are the dominant mode of travel and that beyond 2 miles trips on foot are few. Exmo_20 is significantly further than 0.5 miles or even 1 mile from essential infrastructure and services therefore walking or cycling as first choice of transport is unviable. Providing walking routes, cycle paths or public transport will do little to reduce the amount of car journeys this development would generate because the steep local topography and distance to access essential infrastructure and services is too far. It will also be a difficult location for those without car access and cause social exclusion. It is also worth noting that the existing infrastructure of the surrounding roads is not capable of accommodating the increased demand that Exmo_20 would cause. Access for buses, which would have an increased demand, would also be very difficult. A bus service through Meadow View Road (next to the proposed site) was cancelled several years ago

for this very reason proving this is not a sustainable option. From a safety concern Emergency Vehicles such as Fire Engines and Ambulances would without doubt have access issues.

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.: Do not access the site of Exmo_20 via Southern Wood. Also reduce the size of the site drastically so that the additional traffic in surrounding areas is manageable

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District.

Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property. Turning the natural drainage the site current provides through trees and grassland into a concrete jungle invites a huge flood risk, particularly to all of the existing houses and businesses bordering Withycombe Brook. The proposed site of Exmo_20 sits upstream of Exmouth on the main rainwater catchment area of Withycombe Brook. The subsoil is heavy clay, the impermeable nature of which makes soakaways ineffective and the land is often waterlogged. Building on this steep site would significantly exacerbate the already identified flood risk through the lower lying land at the bottom of the site and down through Withycombe. In addition there will be the potential pollution added to flood waters from construction activities. A site entrance via Southern Wood has been included in the plan for Exmo_20 that would require a large bridge to be built over Withycombe Brook that runs along the end of Southern Wood (it would NOT be possible to access the site from Southern Wood without a bridge being built). Withycombe Brook regularly floods and there has been land erosion as a result of flooding to the area at the bottom of Southern Wood where the bridge would need to be built and surrounding homes. The bridge itself could also cause a build up of debris causing further flooding. A nearby development, Goodmores,

is still under construction and we are already seeing swathes of mud and flood water covering areas of the main access road that is Dinan Way. Water run off from Exmo_20 would inevitably compound this issue due to the location of the proposed site.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, or at the very least reduce the size of Exmo_20 and ensure that it is not accessed through Southern Wood.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging(a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26)aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that “The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon’s Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate t consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm." A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St. John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote and tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard, drastically altering the peaceful setting for worship which currently exists for the congregation. This is taken from a quotation from the Gospel of St John: 'I am the voice of one calling in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord. ' – St John will now be calling god from a housing development of 700 homes instead of the current wilderness surrounding this Grade II* listed 14th century church.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Julia Ojaim

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA has completely disregarded their duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Anna Oldroyd

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.: STOP EXMO_20

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging(a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26)aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that “The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon’s Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate t consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Stop exmo_20

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging(a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26)aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that “The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon’s Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate t consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to

be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan". I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly

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.: STOP EXMO_20

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.: Stop exmo_20

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.: STOP EXMO_20

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Stop exmo_20

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: STOP EXMO_20

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Stop Exmo_20

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Stop exmo_20

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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(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.: Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Green space is precious. Once lost, it can never return. Exmo_20 is one of those developments where, in 20 years time, people will say: "Who on earth let this happen". Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that "just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt" [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that "In the RSPB's view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John's (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development". "The RSPB is very concerned that the St John's allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change

of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heath" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation

and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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: Anna Oldroyd

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.:

There's a multitude of reasons why this proposed development is a ridiculous idea: It is too close to our precious pebblebed heaths. Exmouth and Budleigh have struggling sewage disposal facilities already. ECC is massive already and in some years has to bus pupils who live within catchment to Cranbrook. The roads are already ridiculously busy. A development will just add to this and increase accidents. The Ting Tong bend is particularly notorious. Why is a development necessary with a declining birth rate? Is this really the best place to put a development? Rockbeare has already been ruined by the advent of Cranbrook with The Jack in The Green now surrounded by houses. it should be re-named Jack in the Housing Estate. St John's in the Wilderness would need to be re-named if the absolute destruction of Exmouth's green belt is allowed to go ahead. Once it's gone, it's gone. Building should be on previously developed sites and we should be looking at existing unoccupied buildings.

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.: Scrap the idea of carving up the green belt. Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Judith Oliver

Full name: Judith Oliver

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Para109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Para 11.6 of the Local Plan and Policy TR01. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is just over 2 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4 miles from the centre of Exmouth. The site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. The topography of the local area and the siting of this project makes the potential cycling and walking options much less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps. There will therefore be a huge increase in the volume of cars in the area

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.: Remove Exm_20 from the Local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Judith Oliver

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

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.: The size and location of this proposed development is ludicrous; the access road B3179 is already busy with traffic to and from Budleigh, Exmouth and Exeter and this increases considerably during holiday seasons. The peace and tranquility of yhis area, adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths and Bystock, will be ruined forever plus all the pollution from the building and extra vehicles will disrupt and destroy wildlife.

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.: Reduce the size of Exmo_20 and remove it from our Pebblebed Heaths

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Naomi and Lionel Osborne

Full name: Naomi and Lionel Osborne

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.: SD24

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.:
Payh_03a

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.: We object most strongly to any development of this site for the following reasons –

1. EDDC Development Plan survey 2022. At that stage the site was designated as being unsuitable for development. Nothing has changed, and it is still unsuitable.
2. The Environment Strategy published by Devon County Council states: One of Devon County Council's roles is to support the protection, management and enhancement of the County's rich and varied landscape, its unique wildlife and important historic and geological features. This development would completely contradict this policy.
3. This field is unsuitable for development because of the ground conditions. Local people know that this field contains many springs, some feeding the two ponds and others forming marsh areas. There is an underground spring running east-west and discharging through the bank onto the road in the northwest corner. This spring runs 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, even during the drought period last summer.
4. The treatment plant cannot accept any more surface water.
5. All the trees and hedges have protection orders.

6. Exit from the field will necessarily be onto the single-track road with blind summit and bend, on a road of speed limit 60 mph. Any visibility splays will destroy long lengths of protected hedgerow. A previous application from Glebe Farm to convert outbuildings was rejected because of highway exit dangers. The number of cars exiting would have been far fewer than those of the proposed development. The road there is also much wider with good visibility in both directions. It is now apparently permissible to exit more cars onto a narrower road next to a blind bend.

The overall picture is a development on land which is unsuitable both geologically, geographically and socially, the very reasons that it has not been developed before. Serious consideration should be given to stopping any development.

Mr S.J. Padbury

Full name: Mr S.J. Padbury

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.: SD04

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.:
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council’s own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to:

a) Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane.

b) Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle.

c) Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure.

The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including:

a) SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries.

b) AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity.

c) OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists.

The Council's own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan's objectives for protecting East Devon's rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving:

a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints

The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies:

- a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre,
- b) High car dependency.
- c) Narrow approach roads, and
- d) Limited junction capacity.

Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks

Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that:

- a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development.
- b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity.
- c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit.
- d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents.

Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need

There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8). Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density

The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Julia Padbury

Full name: Julia Padbury

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.: SD04

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.:
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council’s own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to:

a) Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane.

b) Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle.

c) Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure.

The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including:

a) SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries.

b) AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity.

c) OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists.

The Council's own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan's objectives for protecting East Devon's rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving:

a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints

The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies:

- a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre,
- b) High car dependency.
- c) Narrow approach roads, and
- d) Limited junction capacity.

Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks

Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water's Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that:

- a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development.
- b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity.
- c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit.
- d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents.

Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need

There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8). Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density

The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence

Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary.

I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Ivan Parker

Full name: Ivan Parker

Other party name (if relevant): Richard Parker

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with par. 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St. John in the Wilderness Church (Grade 2* listed) will have significant adverse affects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the Church and Churchyard. The area around the Church and surrounding buildings, a medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a wilderness setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. Historic England state in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the East and Northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade 2* listed Church of St. John in the Wilderness and its Churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b).....we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the North. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the South of the site should be explored.....Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the South then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those

which can be justified" Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with Para 165 of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with Para 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3; Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 and 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the tow, having tributaries and run-off directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Richard Parkyn

Full name: Richard Parkyn

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.: SD04

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Otry_21

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.:

Evidence Document Ref: EDDC Local Plan 2020 – 2042 Regulation 19 Second Consultation Request for the removal of Site Selection for Otry_21 from the plan.

I hereby request your assistance in correcting a suspect decision contained within the emerging local plan. The area in question is the inclusion of the site known as Otry_21 within land included for potential development. It is quite clear that as demonstrated by the vast body of evidence and adverse public opinion that the inclusion of this site within a new local plan would be an extremely poor planning decision. The inclusion of Otry_21 is in direct conflict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, Emerging Local Plan, Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan, and conservation requirements for the River Otter as further highlighted: - Conflicts with NPPF: Para.11

‘Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change. d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless: ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land.’

Para. 15 ‘The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for meeting housing needs and addressing other economic, social, and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings.’

Para. 77 ‘The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes). Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:

a) consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area’s economic potential, and the scope for net environmental gains. b) ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment), or in larger towns to which there is good access.’

Para.109 Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable, and popular places. This should involve:

a) making transport considerations an important part of early engagement with local communities. b) ensuring patterns of movement, streets, parking, and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places. c) understanding and addressing the potential impacts of development on transport networks. d) realising opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure and changing transport technology and usage – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated. e) identifying and pursuing opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use; and f) identifying, assessing, and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure – including appropriate

opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains.

Para. 110 The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan- making and decision-making.

Para. 115 ‘In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location. b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach. Para. 116

Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Para. 124 Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or ‘brownfield’ land.’

Para. 125 ‘b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage, or food production. c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land.

Para. 170 Inappropriate developments in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Para 171. Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.

Para. 172 . All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property.

Para. 187 Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan). b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland. c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate. d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats, and hedgehogs. e) preventing 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.

Para. 198 Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impact resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life. b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes, and nature conservation.

Conflicts with East Devon District Council Regulation 19 Draft Plan:

Para. 2.6. Rural East Devon will retain its outstanding charm and character with modest and sensitively planned development to meet the needs of local communities. Farming and rural activities will still dominate the use of land. Where possible we will retain high quality land in agricultural production as we move towards more environmentally sustainable farming practices into the middle decades of the 21st century.

SP05 Within the settlement boundaries defined on the Policies Map development will be supported in principle. This does not mean that all development will be acceptable within settlement boundaries: proposals will be considered on their own merits having regard to other policies in this plan and any made neighbourhood plan.

SP06: 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. AR02 To minimise impact on protect, manage and improve water quality in all water bodies affected by development in East Devon: A. Planning permission will not be granted for any proposal which, because of inadequate provision of water services or inadequate or untimely provision of foul water and surface water drainage and disposal, would

1. cause pollution to the water environment, including coastal waters
2. result in the deterioration of the ecological status of a water body
3. overload the sewer network, or
4. result in an increase in flood risk at the site or elsewhere.

DS01 Proposals will only be permitted where they:

A. Respect the key characteristics and special qualities of the area in which the development is proposed. B. Ensure the appearance of buildings, including scale, massing, density, height, fenestration, and materials, relate well to their context. C. Do not adversely affect:

1. The distinctive rural, historic or architectural character of the area.
2. The urban form, in terms of significant street patterns, groups of buildings and open spaces.
3. The amenity of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.
4. The operation of existing uses outside of the proposed development.

OL01 East Devon's landscape, countryside and rural areas (including rivers, watercourses and waterbodies) will be protected against harmful development. Development will only be permitted where the applicant is able to demonstrate through a proportionate Landscape Appraisal that it will protect and enhance valued landscape attributes and special features and qualities that contribute to the character of East Devon's landscapes, in particular where it would not harm the distinctive landscape, amenity and environmental qualities within which it is located, including: A. Landform and water forms and patterns of settlement. B. Important natural and manmade features which contribute to the local landscape character, including topography, traditional field boundaries, trees and woodlands, areas of importance for nature

conservation and rural buildings. C. The adverse disruption of a view from a public place which forms part of the distinctive character of the area or otherwise causes significant visual intrusions; and

D. Aesthetic and perceptual factors such as tranquillity, wildness and dark skies.

All development in the countryside should have regard to the most up to date Landscape Characterisation Assessments as a basis for understanding, maintaining and enhancing local distinctiveness and landscape character as well as up to date strategy and guidance for trees and woodlands. OL04 Development proposals will only be permitted where they preserve the visual integrity, identity and scenic quality of the district, in particular by conserving and enhancing key views and views of local landmarks, including those identified in Neighbourhood Plans.

The following view types are considered to be particularly important: A. Landmark views to and from viewpoints and tourism and recreational destinations, including the coast, woodland and open countryside. B. Views from publicly accessible areas which are within, to or from settlements which contribute to the viewers' enjoyment of the local area. C. Views from public rights of way and other publicly accessible areas. D. Night-time views of dark skies, particularly where lighting is to be introduced in areas of low existing light pollution; and E. Views which include or otherwise relate to specific features relevant to East Devon and its special qualities, such as key landmarks, heritage assets (either in view or the view from) and biodiversity features. Development proposals should conserve and enhance sequential views and not result in adverse cumulative impacts within views.

OL09 Permission will not be granted for development which would result in pollution that cannot be adequately mitigated. This will include: A. Pollution of the environment by gas or particulates, including smell, fumes, dust, grit, smoke and soot.

B. Pollution of surface or underground waters, for example by untreated sewage, including discharges to:

1. Rivers, other watercourses, water bodies and wetlands.
2. Water gathering grounds including water catchment areas, aquifers and groundwater protection areas.

3. Harbours, estuaries or the sea

OL10 Unless allocated for development under another plan policy, planning permission for development affecting the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will only be granted exceptionally if:

- A. Sufficient land of a lower grade (Grades 3b, 4 and 5) is unavailable, or available lower grade land has an environmental value recognised by a statutory wildlife, historic, landscape or archaeological designation outweighing the agricultural considerations; or
- B. The benefit of the development justifies and clearly outweighs the loss of high-quality agricultural land.

If there is a choice between sites in different grades, land of the lowest grade available must be used except where other sustainability considerations, including intrinsic nature conservation value of a site, outweigh land quality issues.

Conflicts with Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2031

Para. 6.3 The countryside of the Neighbourhood Plan Area is a highly valued asset with special character provided by the rolling farmland, wooded hillsides, winding lanes and the open river valley. The countryside is important for its aesthetic and leisure value, its essential farming role and its wildlife habitat value. The balance of the historic town, villages and smaller settlements surrounded by nature and countryside views is considered by the community to be a vital part of the character of the area. It makes the Parishes a special place to live and visit. It is of utmost importance that these characteristics are protected for current and future generations.

Para. 6.4 National and local planning policy restricts development in the countryside. The adopted East Devon Local Plan does not identify the need for the Neighbourhood Plan to make any strategic or other housing development allocations due to the large number of new homes consented in recent years and the desirability of preserving the settlement pattern and character. As a result, no significant new

developments whether within or outside of the existing settlements are needed during the Local Plan period.

Para. 6.14 The unique pattern of settlements within the Neighbourhood Plan Area, each with their own distinctive character, is a valued part of its nature. This, coupled with developer pressure, particularly for new housing sites in and around the main settlements raises concerns about creeping development undermining and degrading the special character of the area over time. This must not be allowed to occur, and a major role of the planning system is to prevent and control this.

Para. 6.15 In most cases, new development on land outside of the defined built up area boundaries of Ottery St Mary and West Hill will not be allowed in line with Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies protecting the countryside.

Inconsistency within Site Selection reports for Otry_21 The whole area surrounding Gerway Farm has been subject to repeated attempts by the landowner to promote development on this area of pristine agricultural land. It has been rejected in its entirety in the past and should continue to be rejected.

Otry_21 first appeared in the emerging plan as a Potential 2nd best option with an allocation for 40 homes, Stating:

‘Allocation would need to be subject to satisfactory highways and archaeological/heritage assessment as the smaller section would need to be accessed through an existing estate and it is very sensitive in heritage terms, being a historic field enclosure with pre-historic and medieval finds nearby.’ The site made a re-appearance in September 2024, however had increased in density to now allocate 70 houses, with confusing statements, including: ‘Ottery St Mary has limited jobs, lacks a train station and accessibility is constrained by narrow roads, lack of pavements and a historic town centre,’

‘Site is a significant greenfield site.’

It should be questioned, that why in the total absence of any change in the landscape, highway access or local housing need this area has risen from unacceptable to a density of 70 houses.

Ottery St Mary – Transport and Public Realm Study 2022

2.3.13 The nature of the road network, as well as the land uses in the area, means that Ottery St Mary suffers from traffic travelling through the town centre, especially for the east/west movement. This can have a detrimental social and environmental impact on the streets especially in the narrow streets of the historic town centre.

2.3.14 The town also has a high demand from car traffic. This is apparent from the parking pressures and limitations on space for pedestrians and cyclists. Although the quality of the built heritage is very good, the public realm and streetscape is now dominated by vehicular traffic and suffers from blind bends, pinch points, narrow footways, poor cycling infrastructure and a lack of public space for social interaction.

2.3.21 Land use and transport are inextricably linked. It is the land uses that act as trip attractors or trip producers that give rise to the trip generation across the road network. Collectively the residential areas generate high levels of trip movements.

3.3.13 The East Devon local Plan is the emerging planning policy document for the district. It sets planning policies and proposals for new development in the district for the period 2020-2040. The emerging local plan strategy establishes Ottery St Mary as a Tier 2 settlement and as such an appropriate location for future growth and development.

3.3.14 However, the plan also acknowledges constraints on development including the extensive Conservation Area and setting of Grade 1 and 2* listed buildings, narrow

approach roads to the historic centre which create traffic issues and significant congestion to the north, east and south, and the flood

plain of the River Otter. Expansion of the town to the north, east and south would exacerbate existing traffic issues. Hence, the plan favours development options to the west of the town, recognising that a green wedge has been designated to prevent coalescence between Ottery St Mary and West Hill village.

The East Devon Water Cycle Study – November 2025 Key findings of the WCS are:

Commissioned by East Devon District Council, this report was required to enable a clear understanding of the problems within the Otter catchment area resulting from wastewater treatment. The report also informs the areas where future development should not occur without prior improvements to the wastewater treatment process, failure to prevent development (in particular residential development) will result in further unacceptable pollution in the River Otter.

Three critical areas are identified as being at high risk from nutrient loading due to the increases in wastewater production from proposed housing developments: the River Exe Estuary, the River Axe, and the Otter Estuary. These areas are vulnerable due to direct effluent discharges or cumulative effects from multiple sources, exacerbating existing problems like phosphate pollution. Infrastructure enhancements and continued rigorous planning are recommended to handle the increased wastewater and sewage loads expected from new developments. Policy recommendations: To ensure sustainable growth and compliance with environmental standards, EDDC must embed water efficiency and water quality safeguards into the emerging Local Plan. The East Devon WCS outlines the essential considerations for managing water resources, wastewater, and environmental conservation considering projected development across the district. Its evidence-based observations and recommendations aim to steer East Devon towards a future where growth and sustainability coexists equally, ensuring that water management practices enhance rather than compromise the natural and built environment.

The current existing flows, without proposed growth, are shown in Table 5.5. Using the 3-year average Q80 flow as the Actual DWF provided by SWW, four of the 15 WwTW that

are expected to have development growth are currently exceeding, including Feniton, Fluxton, Honiton and Woodbury

Summary

New development in East Devon will increase demand on the sewerage network & WwTWs, resulting in higher treated discharge flows. This growth may exacerbate flood risk and reduce network capacity, requiring mitigation measures and infrastructure upgrades.

Where WwTWs operate at or above 90% of their permitted capacity, further investigation is needed to assess environmental impacts and compliance with

pollutant limits. Using RQP modelling for riverine discharges and load standstill calculations for tidal systems, capacity analysis shows that seven WwTWs, including Colyton, Countess Wear, Honiton, Fluxton, Feniton, Seaton South and Woodbury will exceed permitted flow headroom post-growth.

Policy recommendations Based on the analysis presented in Sections 4 to 6 of this WCS, the following high level policy recommendations should be considered by EDDC in the development of the Local Plan: Potential developments that may adversely affect green infrastructure assets and water quality should not be permitted.

South West Water - Strategic Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan – Otter May 2023 This plan as published by SWW is their strategy to cover the period up to 2030 for Level 2 Catchments. Included within this strategy is a plan area for the Level 2 Catchment area of Ottery St Mary and shows that NO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT is allowed for within Ottery St Mary.

It also states that Fluxton WwTW is overwhelmingly in either the Immediate moderate risk or Immediate high-risk category for many pollution incidents. A recent, 2018, upgrade to Fluxton WwTW costing £5m was completed and it is stated that this will meet all requirements to 2031. It is not anticipated that any further investment will come forward,

Storm Overflow's

The Pumping Station and Storm Overflow below and serving the Gerway Farm area is currently greatly exceeding its permitted spill rate. The latest figures confirm that in 2024 it spilled a total of 13 times, which is compared to a permitted rate of 3 per year. SWW state their plan aims to reduce the number of spills to 3 by 2030/50.

Surrounding Area Ottery St Mary is within Zone 2 influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths. The town takes its name from the River Otter, which flows through the area, linking the surrounding landscape and having the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths running along an escarpment towards it. As a significant local settlement, Ottery St Mary faces ongoing pressure for new housing development. These developments are a concern due to their potential to increase recreational use and thus disturb the sensitive ecology of the heaths, which are a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA). Local planning decisions, such as those by the East Devon District Council and the Ottery St Mary Town Council, must consider the "Habitats Regulations" to ensure no adverse effects occur on the heaths' protected habitats and species.

The proposed site Otry_21 is in direct line of site from the Historic England site of Belbury Castle Heritage List No: 1017774, this should be considered a protected view.

Due to its physical characteristics Otry_21, has a direct link to The River Otter through the stream flowing at the base of the site. It will prove impossible due to the nature of the ground to prevent the runoff of contaminated surface water and wastewater overflows from entering the river. Development should be precluded from this area. There is no demonstrable evidence of the need for additional housing within Ottery St Mary, in fact, there is currently a large surplus of housing for sale. The site in question is home to a large number of species both with and without protected status, including, Bats, Dormice, Buzzard and Merlin and is in extremely close proximity to Badgers and the newly introduced Beaver groups.

I trust in consideration of all the preceding objections in particular the major traffic congestion and additional danger to parents and children that would be caused at the Winters Lane and Longdogs area of the town and your responsibility to safeguard the water quality within the River Otter you are able to request the removal of Otry_21 from the emerging local plan.

Otry_21's inclusion in this plan has already provoked an attempt to increase the proposed development area and will no doubt encourage this speculative nature in pursuit of further undesirable development destroying rural landscapes and pristine agricultural land.

The inclusion of this site would be an exceptionally poor and unjustified planning decision.

Full name: Richard Parkyn

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.: SD04

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Otry_21

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 whom it may concern,

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associate technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council’s own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to: a) Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane.

b) Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle.

c) Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure. The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: a) SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries.

b) AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity.

c) OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council’s own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan’s objectives for protecting East Devon’s rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving: a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b) High car dependency. c) Narrow approach roads, and d) Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water’s Strategic Drainage Plan (2023) make clear that: a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity. c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the

permitted limit. d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents. Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heath SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate. 8).

Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary. I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Chrissie Parrott

Full name: Chrissie Parrott

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District.

Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.: Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Chrissie Parrott

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:
Remove Exmo_20 from the local plan

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? *Ibis*, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John’s (Exmo_20)) that “new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths” there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Chrissie Parrott

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(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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: REMOVE EXMO 20 FROM THE LOCAL PLAN

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Chrissie Parrott

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: REMOVE EXMO 20 FROM THE LOCAL PLAN

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Chrissie Parrott

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.:

Objection 4. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.: Do not access exmo 20 from the B3179 and do not access the site via Southern Wood. Reduce the size of this development.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Tim Parrott

Full name: Tim Parrott

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.:

There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncosted highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: Because as a resident of this area I am very concerned & would like to be present.

Philip Parsons

Full name: Philip Parsons

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.: OL02

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

2. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The text in Policy in OL02, National Landscapes, follows the wording in the Countryside and Rights of way act that was recently updated in 2023. The council should be congratulated for documenting their responsibilities. It states that “development in a NL will only be permitted where it avoids harm and contributes to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the special qualities , character and natural beauty of the National Landscape”. In putting together the local plan the council has clearly not followed this policy, and taken steps directly opposed to the policy. I am most familiar with the land at Sidbury Sid_34 which is entirely inside the National Landscape, but the council has proposed over 40 houses on an agricultural field - no mention was made in the sessions of it avoiding harm or contributing positively to the landscape. The council records all their sessions, and it is informative if one views the sessions where Sid_34 was debated. On youtube the Strategic planning committee meeting Sept 11 2024 (starts at 1hr 34m) and Nov 1 2024 (starts 2hr 6m) is where Sid_34 is debated. During the discussion there is no mention from anyone on the committee about how the proposed development would enhance the landscape; in fact in the discussion the only mention is about how to minimise harm by different locations of the new houses on the existing green fields. I simply can not understand how a council can write clearly down their responsibilities and then totally ignore them when putting the plan together. I am sure Sid_34 is not the only site in the National Landscape be earmarked for new developments. There might be a real need for extra housing in East Devon, but the council should follow the law in where it plans to locate these new houses.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 wording is OK in the document. However to be legally compliant they need to demonstrate that they are following the Countryside and Rights of way act that was recently updated in 2023. To do this they would need to revisit all the sites in the National Landscape that are in the current emerging plan and either explain how they re enhancing the landscape, or remove them.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter is sound?: Yes

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

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: They have not cooperated with the National body that looks after the National Landscapes, as when they saw one of the sites included reached planning application stage they complained vigorously.

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.: To ensure the council understands that they have to behave differently and act in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of way act that was recently updated in 2023

pamela parsons

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process, not the December 2024 amended version, presented in the 1 st Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, 11.2 & 11.6 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20's limited access arrangements would significantly increase the need for car travel from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services, being 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road, therefore an unsustainable location for development. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. Policy TR01 now states that walking/cycling must be the natural first choice for transport, which cannot be achieved for Exmo_20. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 165 of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath SAC/SPA/SSSI. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contrary to the precautionary approach and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation. The Exmo_20 allocation is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk, it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that just one event leading to predation is enough to end a nesting attempt. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the Nightjar but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: pamela parsons

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind”. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Philip Parsons

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.: SD26

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.:
Sidm_34

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I have always believed that the council has not followed the law, in that they have suggested building in the National Landscape without the requirement of explaining how their decision enhances or conserves this part of the National Landscape. I looked at a planning application for this site. I just realised that this plan for over 40 houses is in fact a “major” development. The policy states “Major developments in a NL will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest”. During the process of putting together the local plan the council has never articulated, discussed, or published what exceptional circumstances or public interest would be in building 40 new houses in agricultural fields entirely within this part of the National Landscape. It should be stopped immediately. As a note: The developer has added a cycle route as a red herring, as it’s only a few hundred metres and the rest of the route, several miles, is unfunded and without planning permission, so should be discounted completely as a reason to support their plan. Background: The text in Policy in OL02, National Landscapes, follows the wording in the Countryside and Rights of way act that was recently updated in 2023. The council should be congratulated for documenting their responsibilities. It states that “development in a NL will only be permitted where it avoids harm and contributes to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the special qualities , character and natural beauty of the National Landscape”. In putting together the local plan the council has clearly not followed this policy, and taken steps directly opposed to the policy. the council has proposed over 40 houses on an agricultural field - no mention was made in the sessions of it avoiding harm or contributing positively to the landscape. The council records all their sessions, and it is informative if one views the sessions

where Sid_34 was debated. On youtube the Strategic planning committee meeting Sept 11 2024 (starts at 1hr 34m) and Nov 1 2024 (starts 2hr 6m) is where Sid_34 is debated. During the discussion there is no mention from anyone on the committee about how the proposed development would enhance the landscape; in fact in the discussion the only mention is about how to minimise harm by different locations of the new houses on the existing green fields. I simply can not understand how a council can write clearly down their responsibilities and then totally ignore them when putting the plan together. I am sure Sid_34 is not the only site in the National Landscape be earmarked for new developments. There might be a real need for extra housing in East Devon, but the council should follow the law in where it plans to locate these new houses.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove this site from the emerging local plan, and possibly other sites that they have included which sit in the National Landscape.

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.: The council have not respected the legal necessity to treat National Landscapes with respect. In addition the site has many technical issues which would make the site highly unattractive to develop (no drainage solutions, local flooding, ancient sites would need a thorough dig and investigation , nearby listed building, sensitive protected animals and highly suspect safe access).

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.: Remove the site Sid_34 from the plan.

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.: If they had cooperated with the body that over sees the National Landscape they would not have made the mistake of including Sid_34.

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.: I have been to many council planning meetings, making a public comment in the 3 or so minutes they give. I have no confidence the council ever listens and acts on the public contributions. I would like to participate in the hearing session to build some confidence that the process is a fair one and legally compliant.

Full name: Philip Parsons

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.: SD26

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::
Sidm_34

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: In putting this site into the emerging plan the council and officers did not follow their duty and is not legally compliant with the designation of National Landscapes, Specifically, section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. On 11th September 2024 the council voted to accept Sid_34a but not 34_b to limit the extent of the development and to reduce the harm to the landscape. Surprisingly the developer persuaded the planning team to propose at the next meeting, Nov 1st 2024 to combine 34a and 34b (now called just Sid_34). Although the committee seemed surprised to have the proposal in-front of them it did get accepted, arguing that a less dense development spread across the whole site would cause less harm to the landscape than a similar number of buildings in just 34a. The discussion was always focused on mitigating the harm of the development. At no point did the committee ever discuss how to enhance and conserve the National Landscape in this sensitive location, next to an Iron Age fort and listed farm buildings. There was no evidence that the planning department or committee were following their legal duty of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. In fact their actions were demonstrably acting against this legislation. At the first consultation many pointed to this error, and belatedly the council planning team have realised their mistake. Instead of revisiting the validity of proposing development on this agricultural land they have tried to save face by adding a clause to the document which is putting the onus on the future developer of this site to “enhance” the landscape. Simply adding a clause to the document does not get them over the fact that they put the plan together with a non legally compliant process. It also appears to make no sense how a rural landscape can be enhanced by building over 40 houses on green fields, and joining two existing conurbations together.

As a local authority, you must make sure that any proposals in the local plan seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the (AONB) National Landscape. This was not done, and has still not been done in putting the plan together.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove this site from the emerging plan.

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.: The site selection followed a flawed process. In addition to not following the law regarding National Landscapes the site also has huge issues with drainage, and access to the main road. A developer has already submitted an application for this site, and one year later they still have not come up with an acceptable drainage plan. It was not a sound decision to include this site which has so many constraints that make a potential development very difficult.

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.: Remove this site from the plan

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.: There is no evidence of any cooperation between the council and other national bodies, for example the body that oversees the National Landscape. When the body responsible for National Landscapes saw this site in the plan they objected to it in the strongest terms, an action demonstrating no previous cooperation.

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.: To ensure the council is held to account for not following the law in putting the plan together and Ignoring their duty to enhance and conserve the National Landscape

Full name: Philip Parsons

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.: SD26

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::
Sidm_34, Sidm_34a, Sidm_34b

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

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: In putting this site into the emerging plan the council and officers did not follow their duty and is not legally compliant with the designation of National Landscapes, Specifically, section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. On 11th September 2024 the council voted to accept Sid_34a but not 34_b to limit the extent of the development and to reduce the harm to the landscape. Surprisingly the developer persuaded the planning team to propose at the next meeting, Nov 1st 2024 to combine 34a and 34b (now called just Sid_34). Although the committee seemed surprised to have the proposal in-front of them it did get accepted, arguing that a less dense development spread across the whole site would cause less harm to the landscape than a similar number of buildings in just 34a. The discussion was always focused on mitigating the harm of the development. At no point did the committee ever discuss how to enhance and conserve the National Landscape in this sensitive location, next to an Iron Age fort and listed farm buildings. There was no evidence that the planning department or committee were following their legal duty of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. In fact their actions were demonstrably acting against this legislation. At the first consultation many pointed to this error, and belatedly the council planning team have realised their mistake. Instead of revisiting the validity of proposing development on this agricultural land they have tried to save face by adding a clause to the document which is putting the onus on the future developer of this site to “enhance” the landscape. Simply adding a clause to the document does not get them over the fact that they put the plan together with a non legally compliant process. It also appears to make no sense how a rural landscape can be enhanced by building over 40 houses on green fields, and joining two existing conurbations together.

As a local authority, you must make sure that any proposals in the local plan seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the (AONB) National Landscape. This was not done, and has still not been done in putting the plan together.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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.:

Remove this site from the local plan.

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.: The site selection followed a flawed process. In addition to not following the law regarding National Landscapes the site also has huge issues with drainage, and access to the main road. A developer has already submitted an application for this site, and one year later they still have not come up with an acceptable drainage plan. It was not a sound decision to include this site which has so many constraints that make a potential development very difficult.

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.: Remove this site from the local plan

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.: There is no evidence of any cooperation between the council and other national bodies, for example the body that oversees the National Landscape. When the body responsible for National Landscapes saw this site in the plan they objected to it in the strongest terms, an action demonstrating no previous cooperation.

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.: To ensure that the council are held to account for their disregard of the National Landscapes.

M.J.F Pash

Full name: M.J.F Pash

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.: SD04

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.:
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Offy_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020-2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection. I. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to: a) Sustainable transport - Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane. b) Environmental and landscape protection - The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle. c) Flood risk and water quality - Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure. The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: a) SP06 - which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. b) AR02, OLOI, OL04, OL09 - which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity. c) OLL0 - which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council's own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan's objectives for protecting East Devon's rural character.

Steve and Terri Passenger

Full name: Steve and Terri Passenger

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?: 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 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.: I would like to register my objection to EXMO_20 to East Devon District Council (EDDC).

The impact locally, and particularly to Budleigh Salterton, would be catastrophic and irreversible. Key points are:

- The extra traffic during and after the build would be a nightmare
- Our medical surgery, fire service, ambulance service and primary school are struggling to cater for with the existing population with no contingency / capacity for any increase

The impact on wildlife on this special and beautiful greenfield site would be appalling and again irreversible. Surely focus and developers' primary energy should be on brownfield sites.

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.: I am horrified that EDDC have not already dismissed this proposal. I am therefore objecting strongly to EXMO_20 for environmental and conservation reasons.

Ali Pawson

Full name: Ali Pawson

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?: 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 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.:
Dear EDDC,

I'm objecting to the housing development proposal for the local plan site Exmo-20 on several grounds:

As a keen birdwatcher and nature lover, I'm very concerned about damage to the Special Site of Scientific Interest (heathland in Exmo_20) and loss of habitat for wildlife including hedgerows and ancient trees. There will be a loss of feeding ground for birds and other wildlife linked to our protected coastline. As you know we are one of the world's most nature depleted countries already. Housing developers will often make promises to plant more trees and hedgerows, but these are invariably not looked after properly and don't thrive, as is the case with thousands of trees planted along the A14 in East Anglia, which have mostly died. But the developers were allowed to tick a box and not follow through with aftercare. Also saplings can't replace ancient or mature trees and hedgerows, it takes years for them to establish.

We will lose good agricultural land, leading to increased food miles because we will have to import more food instead of growing it in the UK, there will also be an increased

risk of flooding caused by run-off because of concreting over fields. We are already experiencing increased flooding due to winter storms, and this will be exacerbated.

The narrow roads will experience more traffic jams with increased cars in the area, all leading to a gigantic bottleneck on A376 road to Exeter from Exmouth; there is insufficient infrastructure (and there will be more and more potholes because of increased traffic including HGVs going to industrial sites).

Our already insufficient sewerage systems won't be able to cope with more sewerage from houses, this will lead to polluted beaches which damages our tourism reputation in Exmouth. I'm a keen sea swimmer and many of the group I swim with feel very frustrated at how limited we are with the times we can now swim, due to the amount of sewage being dumped in the sea.

Please consider my objections, whilst I appreciate we need more housing, our SSI's need protecting, as does our farmland and nature and we need to be supporting nature recovery more urgently.

Many thanks *** Personal details have been removed ***

Judith Pearce

Full name: Judith Pearce

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?: 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 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.: I would like to object to this proposal as I have concerns about what infrastructure, public services, etc there is in place to cope with the increased population. We need more doctors, nurses, medical practitioners, pharmacy's, etc, as currently these are over stretched to cope with the current population, getting to see a physio takes months and months, waiting lists at the RD&E hospital is increasing to a ridiculously long time. I am also concerned about the landscape and that building on it will increase flooding in the area.

Mr Tom Pearson

Full name: Mr Tom Pearson

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.: TR07

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

2. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Policy TR07 fails to meet legal compliance requirements in several key areas: Failure to Adequately Consider Health and Equality Duties: The policy does not sufficiently address the Council's statutory duties under the Equality Act 2010 to consider the needs of vulnerable groups, including individuals with medical devices, electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS), and other health vulnerabilities. Case law, such as Thomas v Cheltenham Borough Council [2024], establishes that planning authorities must consider health impacts on vulnerable populations even when ICNIRP guidelines are met. Inadequate Risk Assessment Framework: The policy lacks provisions for comprehensive risk assessments that would identify and address risks to individuals potentially affected by electromagnetic field (EMF) levels below ICNIRP thresholds. ICNIRP guidelines address only thermal effects, whereas biological effects can occur at much lower exposure levels, as documented in peer-reviewed literature (Henshaw and Philips, 2024). Insufficient Public Consultation Requirements: Policy TR07 mentions consultation but does not mandate specific consultation requirements with residents, schools, and care facilities within proximity to proposed installations, contrary to best practice guidance in the Code of Practice for Wireless Network Development in England. Absence of Cumulative Impact Assessment: The policy fails to require assessment of cumulative EMF exposure from multiple installations, which is essential for protecting public health and complies with precautionary planning principles.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter legally compliant, 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 legally compliant. 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 achieve legal compliance, Policy TR07 should be amended as follows: Insert new subsection E after current subsection D: "E. Submission of a satisfactory risk assessment that includes: i. Documented consultation outcomes with residents, businesses, schools, colleges, and residential institutions within 500 metres of the proposed installation; ii. Identification and mitigation of risks to individuals potentially affected by EMF levels below ICNIRP thresholds, including those with medical devices, electromagnetic hypersensitivity, or other vulnerabilities; iii. Assessment of cumulative EMF impacts from existing and proposed wireless infrastructure; iv. Application of exclusion zones where appropriate, particularly near schools, hospitals, care homes, and residential areas with high concentrations of vulnerable individuals." Amend subsection B to read: "B. Mandatory public consultation with the local planning authority, local communities, schools, care facilities, and other stakeholders within 500 metres of the proposed site, conducted prior to submission of any planning application and in accordance with the Code of Practice for Wireless Network Development in England;" Insert new subsection F: "F. Application of the precautionary principle where scientific uncertainty exists regarding potential health impacts, with planning decisions guided by independent scientific evidence in addition to ICNIRP thermal limits." Justification: These modifications are necessary to ensure the policy complies with: • The Equality Act 2010 duties to consider vulnerable groups • Established case law regarding health considerations in telecommunications planning • The precautionary principle recognised in planning law • Best practice as demonstrated by Castle Point Council's Policy Infra6

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 TR07 fails the tests of soundness on the following grounds: Not Positively Prepared: The policy does not adequately plan for the health and wellbeing needs of all community members, particularly vulnerable groups. Independent research and community evidence, such as the Wishaw mast cluster in Sutton Coldfield, demonstrate that residents living within 500 metres of telecommunications installations have reported serious health concerns including cancer clusters. The policy fails to proactively address these documented risks. Not Justified: The policy's reliance solely on ICNIRP guidelines is not justified by the available evidence. ICNIRP guidelines address only thermal effects, whereas numerous peer-reviewed studies document biological effects at much lower exposure levels. The PHIRE Medical Consensus Statement (2020) and extensive independent scientific literature demonstrate that biological effects occur below current regulatory limits. The policy does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, such as the Castle Point Council approach. Not Effective: The policy lacks

enforceable mechanisms to: • Ensure meaningful public consultation before installations proceed • Assess cumulative EMF exposure from multiple sources • Protect vulnerable populations including children, pregnant women, and individuals with medical devices or EHS • Implement exclusion zones around sensitive locations • Monitor and respond to community health concerns post-installation

Not Consistent with National Policy: While national policy supports telecommunications development, it also requires consideration of health and environmental impacts. The policy fails to adequately balance telecommunications needs with the precautionary principle and protection of public health, particularly given growing scientific evidence and community concerns.

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.:

To make Policy TR07 sound, adopt the following modifications based on Castle Point Council's Policy Infra6 (pages 154-155 of the Castle Point Plan): Replace current subsection D and add comprehensive health protection provisions: "D. Compliance with biologically-based safety recommendations that consider both thermal and non-thermal effects of electromagnetic radiation, with ICNIRP public exposure levels serving as a minimum baseline rather than sole criterion; E. Submission of a comprehensive risk assessment demonstrating: i. Outcomes of mandatory consultation with all residents, businesses, educational institutions, and care facilities within 500 metres of the proposed installation site; ii. Detailed analysis of risks to individuals who may be affected by EMF levels below ICNIRP thresholds, including: - People with medical devices (pacemakers, insulin pumps, etc.) - Individuals with electromagnetic hypersensitivity - Children and pregnant women - Elderly residents and those with pre-existing health conditions iii. Assessment of cumulative electromagnetic exposure from all existing and proposed wireless infrastructure within the assessment area; iv. Justification for site selection demonstrating that alternative locations with lower impact on residential areas and vulnerable populations have been considered; F. Implementation of appropriate exclusion zones applying the agent of change principle, with minimum separation distances from: i. Schools, nurseries, and educational facilities - 500 metres ii. Hospitals, care homes, and medical facilities - 500 metres iii. Residential areas with high concentrations of vulnerable individuals - as determined by risk assessment iv. Areas of high residential density - as determined by cumulative impact assessment; G. Establishment of a clear, accessible process by which residents can raise health concerns and receive formal consideration prior to approval, with written responses to all substantive objections; H. Post-installation monitoring and complaint response

procedures, including provisions for equipment relocation or modification if adverse health effects are reported and substantiated." Amend the supporting text to include: "The Council recognises that scientific evidence on electromagnetic field health effects continues to evolve. In accordance with the precautionary principle, the Council will give weight to independent peer-reviewed research in addition to regulatory guidelines. Where credible scientific evidence suggests potential health risks, the Council will err on the side of caution in protecting public health, particularly for vulnerable groups." Justification: These modifications make the policy sound by: • Positively prepared: Proactively protecting all community members, especially vulnerable groups, based on documented evidence and best practice • Justified: Drawing on independent scientific evidence, community experience (e.g., Wishaw cluster), and the successful Castle Point model as the most appropriate strategy • Effective: Providing clear, enforceable criteria with specific consultation requirements, exclusion zones, and monitoring procedures • Consistent: Balancing telecommunications development with health protection in accordance with planning law's precautionary approach and equality duties The Castle Point precedent demonstrates these provisions are deliverable and legally robust while still enabling necessary telecommunications infrastructure development.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: The policy demonstrates insufficient evidence of cooperation on the strategic cross-boundary issue of electromagnetic field exposure and public health protection. Lack of Evidence of Engagement: There is no evidence that East Devon Council has engaged with neighbouring authorities, health bodies, or relevant stakeholders on the strategic approach to telecommunications infrastructure and health protection. Given that EMF exposure affects populations across administrative boundaries, this represents a strategic planning matter requiring cooperation. Failure to Learn from Best Practice: The Council has not demonstrated engagement with authorities such as Castle Point Council, which has developed leading practice in this area (Policy Infra6). Learning from and coordinating with councils that have adopted precautionary, evidence-based approaches would strengthen the plan and demonstrate effective cooperation. Inadequate Health Authority Engagement: There is no evidence of cooperation with public health authorities, NHS trusts, or health organisations serving the East Devon area regarding the health implications of telecommunications infrastructure siting and the protection of vulnerable populations.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

annette pearson

Full name: annette pearson

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.:

Remve exmo_20 from the plans. This is an area of outstanding beauty, greenland, and home/breeding grounds to countless indigenous wildlife. Exmouth has already lost countless miles of nature to housing and roads and we need to support the wildlife as well as our natural scenery which brings in visitors that help support the town and surrounding areas.

Full name: Mr Tom Pearson

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.:

First point On page 392, the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) states: “The 400m buffer from the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC coincides with the higher, more prominent parts of Exmo_20, meaning built development will not be permitted in this area and so reducing adverse landscape effects to a minor negative.” The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has repeatedly refused to reflect this wording in the Local Plan, stating that development including buildings can be located within the top 400m. The Local Plan should accord with the assessment in the SA by clearly stating “No Built Development” within this 400m buffer. The viability of the site allocation should be reassessed in light of this constraint, which further compounds the significant and material reduction in the developable area arising from the falsely claimed 85ha site boundary approved for allocation in the draft Local Plan on 3 September 2024. Second point On page 396, the SA states: “The north eastern part of Exmo_20 is in a mineral safeguarding area, but this largely coincides with the 400m buffer from the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC where development will not be allowed in any case.” Again, the LPA refuses to reflect this wording in the Local Plan, instead stating multiple times that development, including buildings, can be located within the top 400m. The Local Plan should accord with the SA, removing the 400m zone adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI from the site allocation and revising the settlement boundary accordingly. The viability of the allocation should be reassessed due to the inability to construct the proposed access road without directly conflicting with the SA’s conclusions, in addition to the further reduction in site area caused by the 400m constraint that compounds the material reduction from the falsely claimed 85ha site boundary approved on 3 September 2024. Third point On page 399, the SA states, in relation to mitigation measures: “Mitigate impact upon Exe Estuary and Pebblebed Heaths SPAs – to be considered in the Habitats Regulations Assessment, though for areas of Exmo_04 and 20 within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths mitigation would not be seen as possible. Exmo_04 can be amended to exclude the most sensitive area, resulting in Exmo_04a.” There is no justification or consistency in excluding part of Exmo_04 but not Exmo_20. The Local Plan should accord with the SA by removing the 400m zone adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI from the Exmo_20 site allocation and revising the settlement boundary accordingly. The viability of the site allocation should again be reassessed due to: the inability to construct the proposed access road without contradicting the SA’s conclusions, and the additional reduction in site area resulting from the 400m constraint, further compounding the material reduction from the falsely claimed 85ha approved on 3 September 2024.

Janet Penrose

Full name: Janet Penrose

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?: No

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:
Exmo_17

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.:

Dear Sirs

I write to object in the strongest terms, to the proposal to build on this land.

National Landscapes should never be built upon. They are priceless assets for all wildlife therein, and to the people who enjoy these areas as an amenity.

Once the land is lost it cannot be regained. Nor can the nature and wildlife be relocated. We live in one of the most nature depleted countries in the Western World. Do not make it even worse.

Exmouth does not need more homes on its outskirts. It needs affordable central housing.

In addition there will be increased traffic chaos, and stress on the water/sewage infrastructure, which cannot cope with the current situation.

Yours faithfully

*** Personal details have been removed ***

Julie Pepper

Full name: Julie Pepper

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.: SD06

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.:
Sidm_06a

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.:

would like to strongly object to the proposal for land 6a and the future 6b. As an academic with a research interest in environmental regulation as well as a homeowner I am concerned about the Green Wedge Policy and the National Landscape Policy being over ridden.

Nick Pepper

Full name: Nick Pepper

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.: SD06

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.:
Sidm_06a

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.:
Good Evening

As a resident and homeowner (4 Higher Brook Meadow) I would like to formally lodge my objection to the proposal for development land 6a and the future 6b under the Second Regulation 19.

The reasons for objection are extensive and summarized well below. Additionally the lack of transparency with local residents on these proposals is also a concern.

1. Impact on National Landscape (formerly AONB) The proposed allocation falls within the East Devon National Landscape. Under the National Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 189, "great weight" must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of these areas. I am concerned that once this site is approved, this sets precedent for others such as 6B to follow with a further development potential of 238 houses. o Major Development: Building a housing estate here constitutes "major development" in a protected landscape. National policy dictates such applications should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and

where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. o Irreversible Harm: The introduction of high-density housing, street lighting, and associated infrastructure will permanently degrade the character of this statutory protected area, which provides significant value to the local economy through tourism and wellbeing.

2. Violation of Green Wedge Policy

This site is currently designated as a GREEN WEDGE. The primary purpose of East Devon's Green Wedge policy is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and protect the individual identity of our towns and villages. Settlement Identity: Development here would erode the physical and visual gap between Sidford and Sidbury, leading to urban sprawl. Precedent: Allowing development on this site undermines the integrity of the Green Wedge designation across the entire district, making it impossible for the Council to defend other sensitive gaps in the future such as site 6b.

Linda Perry

Full name: Linda Perry

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.: SD04

1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council’s own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to: a) Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane. b) Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle. c) Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure. The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: a) SP06 –

which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. b) AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity. c) OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council’s own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan’s objectives for protecting East Devon’s rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving: a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b) High car dependency. c) Narrow approach roads, and d) Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water’s Strategic DrainagePlan (2023) make clear that: a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity. c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit. d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents. Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and highrisk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8. Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary. I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Chris Perry

Full name: Chris Perry

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.: SD04

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::
Otry_21

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.: I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed allocation of Site Otry_21 within the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020–2042. Having reviewed the evidence base, associated technical studies, and relevant planning policies, the inclusion of this site would represent a fundamentally unsound, unjustified, and unsustainable planning decision. The allocation conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Emerging East Devon Local Plan, and the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. It is also at odds with the Council’s own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety, and landscape protection.

1. Failure to Meet National Policy Requirements Otry_21 cannot be considered a sustainable location for growth. The site fails to meet core NPPF tests relating to: a) Sustainable transport – Ottery St Mary already suffers severe congestion, narrow approach roads, limited pavements, and poor cycling infrastructure. Development south and east of the town would intensify existing pinch points, particularly at Winters Lane and Longdogs Lane. b) Environmental and landscape protection – The site comprises high-quality agricultural land, forms part of a valued rural landscape and lies within direct view of the Scheduled Monument at Belbury Castle. c) Flood risk and water quality – Runoff and groundwater flows from the site drain directly into the River Otter, an ecologically sensitive system already under pressure. The NPPF is clear: development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. Otry_21 does not meet these criteria.

2. Conflicts With the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Numerous policies within the emerging Local Plan directly contradict the allocation of Otry_21, including: a) SP06 – which restricts development outside settlement boundaries. b) AR02, OL01, OL04, OL09 – which require protection of water quality, landscape character, views, and biodiversity. c) OL10 – which protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. The Council’s own landscape assessment identifies this as a significant greenfield site, sensitive to both visual impact and heritage settings. Its allocation is incompatible with the Local Plan’s objectives for protecting East Devon’s rural character.

3. Conflicts With the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan The Neighbourhood Plan places strong emphasis on preserving: a) The distinctive countryside setting, b) The historic settlement pattern, and c) the rural landscape between communities. It also states that no significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Allocating Otry_21 would contradict these locally endorsed policies, undermining community-led planning.

4. Severe Transport and Highway Constraints The Ottery St Mary Transport & Public Realm Study (2022) identifies: a) Chronic congestion in the historic town centre, b) High car dependency. c) Narrow approach roads, and d) Limited junction capacity. Any expansion to the east, north, or south of the town is expected to substantially worsen traffic conditions. Otry_21 sits in precisely the area where growth would be most damaging. Access through residential roads would significantly raise existing safety concerns for children and parents travelling to nearby schools. A very high percentage of people drive from Ottery St Mary to Exeter or the north and east of the town for employment, therefore, Otry_21 sits in a position that would be the most damaging to the towns traffic flow.

5. Wastewater, Drainage, and Environmental Risks Both the East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and South West Water’s Strategic DrainagePlan (2023) make clear that: a) Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. b) The Fluxton Wastewater Treatment Works is already at, or over, permitted capacity. c) The storm overflow below Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than four times the permitted limit. d) Multiple treatment works within the catchment are in high-risk categories for pollution incidents. Further housing in this location would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance with environmental standards, and directly threaten the ecological health of the River Otter and its protected habitats.

6. Harm to Biodiversity and Protected Habitats The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including Bats, Dormice, Buzzards, Merlin, Sparrowhawk, Badger, and nearby Beaver populations. It also lies within Zone 2 of influence for the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA, where increased recreational pressure must be strictly controlled

under the Habitats Regulations. The ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and highrisk location for development.

7. No Demonstrable Housing Need There is no evidence of local need for additional housing allocations in Ottery St Mary. Available market housing already exceeds demand, and recent development has delivered significant housing growth. Allocating further greenfield land in this context is neither justified nor proportionate.

8. Unexplained Increase in Proposed Density The site originally appeared as a “second-best option” for approximately 40 dwellings, subject to significant heritage and highway concerns. Its sudden re-emergence at 70 dwellings, with no change in local infrastructure, landscape conditions, or housing need, raises earnest questions about the soundness of the assessment process. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the allocation of Otry_21 is:

- Unsustainable
- In conflict with national, local, and neighbourhood policies
- Environmentally harmful
- Infrastructure-constrained
- Unjustified and unsupported by evidence Its inclusion would represent a failure of the plan-led system and risk irreversible harm to the landscape, environment, and character of Ottery St Mary. I therefore respectfully request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Roy & Margaret Peters

Full name: Roy & Margaret Peters

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.: SD04

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::
Otry_21

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.:

Dear Sir/Madam

Request the removal of Otry_21 from the EDDC Emerging Reg. 19 Local Plan

We want to formally object to the inclusion of site Otry_21 in the Reg. 19 Local Plan. It is an unjustified and unsustainable planning decision. It is out of line with the Council's own evidence regarding environmental constraints, infrastructure capacity, highway safety and landscape protection.

The NPPF states that development must be directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally harmful locations. OL10 protects the best and most versatile agricultural land unless exceptional justification exists. Other sections protect water quality, landscape character and biodiversity.

Otry_21 conflicts with the Ottery St Mary Neighbourhood Plan. No significant new housing allocations were required due to high recent growth. Available market housing already exceeds demand.

There are severe transport and highway constraints in Ottery St Mary. A study carried out in 2022 identified:

- Chronic congestion in the historic town centre
- High car dependency as many people commute to work outside of Ottery St Mary, particularly to the Exeter area
- Approach roads are narrow, especially Sidmouth Road
- Junction capacities are limited Living locally, we know that the junction of Sidmouth Road, Longdogs Lane and Winter Lane at the top of Tip Hill is particularly dangerous for drivers and pedestrians. The town's primary school is on Longdogs Lane. There are no pavements leading onto Tip Hill from Longdogs Lane. This is particularly dangerous for adults and children at the beginning and end of the school day. The mandatory crossing of Sidmouth Road at the top of Tip Hill adds to the risk at any time of day.

There are also environmental risks from waste water drainage. The East Devon Water Cycle Study (2025) and the South West Water's strategic drainage plan (2023) made it clear that Ottery St Mary has no capacity for additional residential development. Storm overflow at Gerway Farm spilled 13 times in 2024, more than 4 times the permitted limit. Further housing would increase nutrient loading, risk non-compliance of environmental standards and directly threaten the ecological health of protected habitats. Ecological sensitivity of the surrounding area makes Otry_21 an inappropriate and high-risk location for development.

We request that Site Otry_21 be removed from the Emerging East Devon Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

Amanda Peters

Full name: Amanda Peters

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.: SD06

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.:
Sidm_06a

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.: My comments here refer to land in Sidford ie. land 6A which is included in the second regulation 19 for house allocation and I include my concerns for the possibility of future allocation of 6B. This site is unsound and not legally compliant with national protection for National Landscapes.

I outline my reasons below and formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6A (allocated) and 6B (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan.

East Devon deem this land to be a 'green wedge' so building here would not adhere to the council's own policy or the National Landscape policy.

You state in your site selection report that the ‘overall landscape susceptibility is high’, that ‘landscape harm is likely’, ‘that ecologically significant moderate adverse effect is predicted’ and ‘steep slopes are likely to require significant earthworks’. These are very negative reviews and illustrate that any development on this land is going to impact biodiversity, wildlife corridors, hedgerows, the ‘dark sky’ (observatory close by) and increase the risk of flooding. The local infrastructure is not suitable to support such a proposal; services would be compromised, the increase in traffic will create congestion and reduce safety. There is already a large area of land north/east of this site across Two Bridges road, only a road width separates them; that land is also proposed for housing. Sidford and Sidbury are two small villages which should retain the ‘green wedge’ between them. The historic environment site assessment concludes that ‘significant effect is predicted; the cultural heritage would be compromised and unable to be resolved through mitigation’.

I understand that the Council have not yet exhausted all urban regeneration opportunities or lower quality ‘grey belt’ sites. Development on the site proposed would conflict with the Council’s commitment to Biodiversity Net Gain and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. I ask that you adhere to your own policies. I strongly object to these sites going into the 2020-2042 Local Plan.

I have been assured by staff in the planning dept. at Blackdown House that my comments within this email, if sent prior to the closing deadline at 12midday on 26.1.26, will be included in the final draft of the Local Plan and duly submitted to the Planning Inspector for independent examination.

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.: I formally request that the Planning Inspectorate remove sites 6A (allocated) and 6B (not currently allocated) from the final Local Plan

Alison Phillips

Full name: Alison Phillips

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.: If you're finding it too difficult to navigate the site please do get in touch SU Objection 1. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states "It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA" and the Plan HRA states "there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks." This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU "People over Wind" ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU "Dutch N" ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st

Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result in degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly. Objection 2. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" *Ibis* 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land.

Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.” I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly. Objection 3. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? *Ibis*, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to

use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly. Objection 4. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncostered highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is "currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)", due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states "Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)". The Exmo_20 site's inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly. Objection 5. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that

“Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified”

Objection 6. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that “The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon’s Nature Recovery Strategy; these areas should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to be subject to development...We do not believe that it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan”. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly. Objection 7. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 170b of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of

the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property. Objection 8. Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

Objection 9. Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st & 2nd Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be, with no record of the May 2022 version. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected since the site failed the HELAA stage, being not suitable or achievable. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2. Objection 10. Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF

December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps. Objection 11. The Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the "most recent data published at the time" ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan's housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states "Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals". -----

----- LIST OF POLICIES REFERRED TO IN SUGGESTED
OBJECTIONS (FOR YOUR REFERENCE ONLY) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2023 Paragraph 16c states that plans should be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities...local organisations and statutory consultees. Paragraph 16d states that Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. Paragraph 25 states that Strategic policy-making authorities should engage with their local communities... relevant bodies including Local Nature Partnerships. Paragraph 32 states that Local Plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives...Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures

should be considered). Paragraph 73b states that sites should be on land which is adjacent to existing settlements, proportionate in size to them and not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance. Paragraph 92 states that when considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre. Paragraph 109 states that Significant development should be focussed on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine need of transport modes. Paragraph 114 states that In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans...it should be ensured that; b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, and d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. Paragraph 170b states that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere Paragraph 180 states that Planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to.... unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution. Paragraph 181 states that Plans should distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites and allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Paragraph 185a states that plans should identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation. Paragraph 186a states that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Paragraph 186b states that development within or outside a site of special scientific interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it should not normally be permitted. Paragraph 186c states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons. Paragraph 188 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site. Paragraph 191 states that Planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on the ...natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on...intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. Paragraph 206 states that any harm to the significance of a designated

heritage asset from development within its setting should require clear justification. Assets of the highest significance, notably....grade I and II * listed buildings should be wholly exceptional. 2nd Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy PB01 states that international followed by nationally designated sites must be given uppermost protection. Where assessment fails to rule out effects on integrity development proposals will not be permitted unless mitigation measures are established that can be shown to be effective with clarity provided in respect of means and assurance of implementation. Where avoidance of adverse impacts cannot be achieved proposals will only proceed if there is no alternative and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest. Policy PB02 states that development proposals that would cause an adverse effect upon Regionally and Locally important wildlife sites will not be permitted unless they cannot be located on alternative sites that would cause less or no harm, and the public benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the impacts. Policy PB03 states that development proposals which would result in the degradation or degradation of irreplaceable habitats will be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists: this includes impacts through direct, adjacent, or indirect pathways, including lighting and pollution. Policy PB04 states that proposed plans must not adversely affect the integrity of sites protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 Policy OL01d states that development will only be permitted where it will not harm the aesthetic and perceptual factors such as “tranquillity, wildness and dark skies”. Policy OL02 states that development in a NL, or outside but affecting its setting or appearance, will only be permitted where it avoids harm and contributes to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the special qualities. Policy OL09 states that permission will not be granted for development which would result in pollution that cannot be adequately mitigated. Policy TR01 proposes that walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport are the first natural choice for short local journeys, or as part of a longer journey. Policy TR03 states that where development is likely to generate significant amounts of people and/or vehicle movements, planning permission will not be granted unless they can identify measures to secure new sustainable travel arrangements, taking into account...the scale of the development and the availability of public transport, and walking and cycling opportunities. Where there are severe cumulative adverse impacts associated with additional traffic demand and it is not possible to address such impacts planning permission should be refused. Policy HE02 states that proposals for development will be expected to be sympathetic to listed buildings and their settings. Policy AR01b states that development should be safe for its lifetime without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere. Paragraph 3.6 promotes a sustainable pattern of development that balances development needs with environmental constraints. It prioritises development in sustainable locations while protecting the district’s outstanding open countryside. Paragraph 11.2 promotes focussing significant development at locations which are, or can be Made sustainable through offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 11.6 states that most

people prefer to walk if their destination is within 1.6km (1 mile), typically 800m (0.5 miles). Factors such as topography also influence walking choices. Paragraph 13.10 aims to protect irreplaceable habitats and important features. Paragraph 13.11 states that some habitats, including ancient woodlands and veteran trees are irreplaceable due to their age, uniqueness and biodiversity. Paragraph 13.24 states that East Devon has diverse but fragmented habitats and aims to enhance biodiversity by increasing habitat areas and connecting isolated habitats.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Do not access the site via Southern Wood.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

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.: Voices should be heard

Colin and Christine Pilcher

Full name: Colin and Christine Pilcher

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.:
Exmouth and Budleigh Salterton are town settlements each with distinctly different characteristics much valued by their respective residents and visitors. The proposed development will serve to inappropriately link the two to the detriment of both. It would put strain on existing public services of both towns and lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic on the the B3179 which is the main and only realistic route from Budleigh Salterton to Exeter, the M5 Motorway and A30.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Philippe Planel

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Exmo_20 allocation is in conflict with paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 and is unsound and not legally compliant. The Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the “most recent data published at the time” ONS data, as is mandatory (MHCLG Housing and economic needs assessment). The 1,188 figure quoted in 3.11 was calculated in February 2025 prior to the 2024 ONS data being published and is therefore invalid. This figure should be reduced to 1,156 with 80% being 925 and with a 22-year plan requirement of 20,342 (not incurring rounding errors). This is a reduction of 567. Many policies within the plan rely on an overriding need to justify impact or harm and since the Plan figures are incorrect, there is no justification, not least in the Mitigation Hierarchy assessment. Exmo_20 must be removed from the plan due to the multiple mitigation strategies required with regarding its impact on the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heath SPA/SAC/SSSI. Further numerical and mathematical errors are found in evidence documents HOU-002 October 2025 and HOU-001 November 2025. These need to be corrected and reconsulted upon as these figures are the foundation of the Local Plan’s housing policies. Furthermore Paragraph 16(d) of NPPF December 2023 states “Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20.

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with Policy TR01 and Paragraph 11.6 of the Local Plan. The main vehicular access point for Exmo_20 is 2.3 miles from the centre of Budleigh Salterton by road and 4.0 miles from the centre of Exmouth by road. This site allocation would overwhelm Budleigh Salterton and conflict with the settlement hierarchy. Budleigh Salterton has not been taken into account by the LPA when considering the Exmo_20 allocation. The site's and the local area's topography makes the potential cycling and walking options less viable, which is not apparent on the policy maps.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179,

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Exmo_20's allocation is in conflict with paragraph 32 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound. The LPA has tried to retrospectively change the Site Selection Methodology (SSM) to justify Exmo_20. The SSM dated May 2022 is the one used for the Regulation 18 process. After 11th December 2024 (the date the draft local plan was approved to proceed to Regulation 19 publication) it was altered and a December 2024 amended version, not in fact used for site selection, but presented in the 1st Regulation 19 evidence library falsely claiming to be. This behaviour is potentially in conflict with the Nolan Principles. The original May 2022 version, used for the Regulation 18 stage, has wording that does not allow Exmo_20 to be selected. Extracts below: Stage 2: Site Sifting 1.8 Following the 'long list' of sites identified in Stage 1, a 'sifting' process will be carried out to ensure that only 'reasonable alternatives' are considered further. Only sites which meet criteria a), b) and c) are carried forward to Stage 3. These criteria are shown in figure 2 below. criteria a) Site is assessed as 'suitable, available and achievable' in the HELAA6 Subtext point 6 states: It is assumed that sites within 400m of the Pebblebed Heaths SAC will be ruled out as being unsuitable in the HELAA but, if not, such sites should be sifted out at Stage 2.

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.:

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Name

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan,

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 92 & 109 of the NPPF December 2023 and policies TR01 and TR03, and therefore unsound. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6 & 11.2 of the Local Plan. Exmo_20 would significantly increase the need for car travel, resulting in more car journeys via a convoluted route from the main access point proposed on the B3179 to access facilities and services. It has not been demonstrated that sufficient regularly needed local services can be accessed by cycling/walking and changes to Policy TR01 increase the conflict between the Local Plan policies and the Exmo_20 allocation as walking/cycling being a likely first choice for transport is now considered mandatory rather than desirable. The isolated location and Exmo_20's B3179 access arrangements would provide unsustainable development, generating significant amounts of vehicle movements for residents to access services within Budleigh Salterton & Exmouth. With housing proposed at the southern part of the site, using the B3179 as the access point would require a minimum of 1km on-site driving every time residents went anywhere and returned home.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179.

Full name: Philippe Panel

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?: 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 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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 165 of the NPPF December 2023. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policy AR01(b) of the Local Plan and therefore unsound. In the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 Withycombe Brook appears is only mentioned as a footnote in Table 5-3: Watercourses in East Devon District. Exmouth is noted as having numerous and significant flood risk pathways, with fluvial flooding in 1960, 1983 & 2012 recorded. Withycombe Brook currently has significant flood risk areas without yet considering current and future impacts from climate change. The greenfield Exmo_20 site sits above the town, having tributaries and runoff directly flowing into Withycombe Brook which flows through the most populous wards in East Devon. The LPA have not employed the required sequential, risk-based approach to site selection so as to avoid flood risk to people and property.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20,

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 25, 180d, 181, 185a, 186a, 186c, 188 & 191 of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound. It also conflicts with Policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and paragraphs 3.6, 13.10, 13.11 & 13.24 of the Local Plan. The Exmo_20 site is part of the Strategic Nature Area 368, identified as an important buffer between Exmouth and the Internationally and Nationally designated Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI, supporting habitat for Nightjar foraging (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species), and a wildlife corridor between the Pebblebed Heaths and the Coast. Development of Exmo_20 would undermine the conservation objectives of the internationally designated SPA. Devon County Council are in the final stages of designating this site as a Local Nature Recovery Area as part of their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be published in March '26) aimed at combining existing wildlife sites and extending habitats, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. The site contains many veteran trees, ancient woodlands, and hedgerows which are at risk of becoming fragmented habitats. Devon Wildlife Trust states in their response to Regulation 19 that "The entirety of the proposed Exmo_20 allocation lies within a Strategic Nature Area...identified for its nationally important habitats and woodlands and diversity of species including birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. SNAs are a key part of Devon's Nature should be targeted for enhancement and it is not appropriate to consider allocation of this land for development....It is beyond the scope (of this letter) to detail the range and diversity of sensitive habitats and species which are supported by NNRS/SAC/SPA/SSSI designations, which would be exposed to significant detrimental effects were the site to be subject to development...We do not believe that

it is feasible to develop this site without causing significant adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. We strongly urge East Devon District Council not to include this proposed allocation within its Local Plan”. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Do not access the site via Southern Wood. -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraph 206 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound. It is also in conflict with Policies HE02 and OL01(D.) of the Local Plan. A development the size of Exmo_20 surrounding St John in the Wilderness Church (grade II* listed) will have significant adverse effects on the remote, tranquil surroundings of the church and churchyard. The area around the church and surrounding buildings, a Medieval Saxon settlement site, is characterised by dark skies and a sense of remoteness; a 'wilderness' setting which would be irreversibly harmed by having a housing development encircling it, regardless of a buffer zone being left around it. HISTORIC ENGLAND state in their response to the regulation 19 consultation that "Exmo_20 currently covers a very large area to the east and northeast of Exmouth. Much of this falls within the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St John in the Wilderness and its churchyard. Development could result in considerable harm to the setting of this building, which the NPPF identifies as an asset of the highest significance (Paragraph 206b) we are concerned by the proposal to bring a long access road from the B3179 to the north. This could itself result in significant harm to the setting, while opening up the area to future pressure for development and associated harm. Alternative access to the south of the site should be explored...Should this evidence demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated in less sensitive areas to the south, then the site boundary should be amended accordingly. If this is not possible then the range and quantum of proposed uses should be restricted to those which can be justified"

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Do not access the site via Southern Wood. -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths -Revert to 20b as previously proposed

Full name: Philippe Panel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 92, and 114b, 114d, 180e & 181 of the NPPF Dec 2023 and therefore unsound and not legally compliant. It also conflicts with policies TR01, OL09 and PB04 and Paragraphs 3.6 and 11.2 of the Local Plan. There is no viable access to the site. The current proposal is to have the majority/bulk of the access onto the B3179, but to make this viable would require major, uncertain and uncoded highway works, not confirmed by Devon County Council. Cumulative and in-combination effects on B3179 must be considered, both in terms of traffic congestion and air pollution affecting the Pebblebed Heaths. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (18.11.25) confirms there is “currently not sufficient certainty to rule out adverse effects in integrity in relation to...air quality (EAST DEVON PEBBLEBED HEATHS SAC/SPA)”, due to the primary access to Exmo_20 being onto the B3179 which would send traffic along the boundary of the Pebblebed Heath. Allocation of Exmo_20 is contradictory to the precautionary approach which must be demonstrated and goes against the Mitigation Hierarchy of avoidance over mitigation (made mandatory by the Environment Act 2021). The Mitigation Strategy states “Mitigation cannot be assumed without evidence (People over wind; Sweetman)”. The Exmo_20 site’s inclusion in the plan is unlawful due to there being no reasonable scientific certainty presented for mitigation. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 181, 185, 186b, & 188 of the NPPF December 2023 and therefore unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Due to the Exmo_20 site being adjacent Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI it would be difficult to provide suitable SANGS of adequate characteristics and geographic convenience to dissuade residents from substantial recreational activities on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI such as dog walking, cycling & walking, thereby causing harm to the highly designated protected habitats and species. It should be noted that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R.H.W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E. & Clarke, R.T. (2007) What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*? Ibis, 149, 27–36.] In the absence of information relating to this, a precautionary approach should be applied by the Competent Authority, the LPA. The RSPB state in their response to the 1st Reg 19 consultation that “In the RSPB’s view, mitigation measures for those allocations closest to the designated heathlands (particularly Land at St John’s (Exmo_20) are less likely to be effective to avoid damaging impacts on the SPA/SAC heathland habitats and species, and additional nitrogen deposition from the increase in traffic emissions arising from new development”. “The RSPB is very concerned that the St John’s allocation in particular will have damaging impacts on the designated heathland SAC/SPA (direct and indirect loss of potential foraging habitat to development or change of use of existing farmland to green infrastructure/public open space for the proposed development, increase in cat predation on ground nesting birds that are a designated

feature of the heathland SPA, increase in damaging recreational use of the designated heathland, including dogs off leads, if residents of the proposed new housing choose to use the designated heathland for daily recreational purposes. In the RSPB view, there is a significant risk that SANG provision and public open space for the proposed development will not be sufficient to prevent damaging increase of recreational usage of the designated heathlands arising from the new residential population. Whilst SD01 explicitly states (in reference to St John's (Exmo_20)) that "new homes and other development that would result in unacceptable impacts will not be permitted within 400 metres of the Pebblebed Heaths" there is no means of preventing people or domestic cats from accessing the heathland and the risk of that happening is increased the closer new dwellings (which increase the local resident cat population as well as new residents in need of land for daily recreational needs, including dog walking) are built to heathlands." I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186a, 186b, 188 & 191c of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. A minimum of 400m adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI must be excluded from the Exmo_20 site. As this is mitigation for potential cat predation (amongst other urban effects) and in more rural areas cats can roam over 2km [Hall et al., 2016; Metsers, Seddon, & van Heezik, 2010] [HRA 4.10], and considering the ground nesting Nightjar is a qualifying feature of the SPA, so a clear and significant predation risk; it would seem precautionary for this distance to be significantly more than the pragmatic 400m [Underhill-Day, 2005] currently proposed as it is recognised that “just one event leading to predation is enough to end that nesting attempt” [Langston, R. H. W., Liley, D., Murison, G., Woodfield, E., Clarke, R. T. "What effects do walkers and dogs have on the distribution and productivity of breeding European Nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ?" Ibis 149.s1(2007)]. Exmo_20's current inclusion is reliant on a yet to materialise mitigation strategy and HRA, the current versions cannot support the Plan. In the absence of these, it is imperative that a precautionary approach is employed, which would at the very least be to remove a minimum of the 400m of the site adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI. Not only is it functionally linked supporting foraging habitat for the ground-nesting European Nightjar (a key qualifying species for the SPA designation and a Section 41 Principle Importance species) but a significantly greater buffer will also be required to mitigate for recreational use, with direct impacts noted as dogs off leads, cycling & walking, which is also yet to be assessed at a site level and therefore a

precautionary approach must be applied at strategic level. This view is reflected by multiple ecology professionals from various bodies such as DWT and RSPB, with East Devon National Landscape Partnership stating in their response to the 1st Regulation 19 consultation that “A 400m buffer to the protected site does not seem significantly large enough to protect the site from disturbance and damage caused by increased visitor numbers, traffic and other associated access issues. It also further fragments the surrounding habitat making the priority habitats contained within the protected site vulnerable to degradation and erosion, which would be in conflict to the new targets set by government to East Devon National Landscape.... As such, East Devon National Landscape supports the non-adoption of this site as development land. Or if non-adoption is not possible due to other demands, such as housing, we support significant reassessment of the scale and boundary of the development, including a reduced housing number and concentration of development closer to the existing town settlement thus preserving a greater rural boundary between the site and Pebblebed Heaths”. The Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. NATURAL ENGLAND state in their response that “the policy is not yet clear where employment uses would be located and understandably offers developers some latitude. Natural England therefore recommends that the policy should require a natural buffer in the northeast of the site along the B3179 road...there may be opportunity to pull the settlement boundary away from the SAC/SPA and secure a green buffer area via S106 outside of it. This would appear to be clear, sound planning which more effectively communicates the planning restrictions approach around the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

Full name: Philippe Planel

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.:

Allocation of Exmo_20 is in conflict with paragraphs 16c, 32, 73b (specifically footnote 38 & 7) 180d, 180e, 181, 185a, 186b, 188 & 191c, of the NPPF December 2023 and is unsound & not legally compliant. It also conflicts with paragraph 3.6, policies PB01, PB02, PB03, PB04 and OL02 of the Local Plan. Being adjacent to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA/SSSI the allocation relies on significant habitats and species mitigation, which has yet to be shown as achievable and viable; the mitigation strategy states “It was not possible to screen out a Likely Significant Effect for other units within the EDPH SAC and SPA” and the Plan HRA states “there is inherent conflict in that the growth proposed in the Plan would exceed threshold levels and there is, as yet, no means to mitigate or address the risks.” This site was selected on 03.09.24 (without option to reconsider), with the draft local plan approved on 11.12.24, on the assumption that a mitigation strategy would be forthcoming, prior to undertaking an appropriate assessment in the 30.01.25 HRA, contrary to CJEU “People over Wind” ruling and the required precautionary approach, particularly relevant considering the CJEU “Dutch N” ruling. Furthermore selecting sites with known mitigation requirements requires clear justification when assessing allocations against the Mitigation Hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 32, the LPA has not undertaken this stage and the Exmo_20 allocation would be hard to justify since there were multiple other viable & less mitigation-reliant sites to select and that the Plan has an over-supply of housing allocations, due to not using the latest ONS data, as is mandatory. DEVON WILDLIFE TRUST stated in their 1st Regulation 19 response that “The allocation site currently serves an important function of acting as a buffer between the urban area of Exmouth and the highly designated land to the north. Development within the proposed allocation would result

in degradation and loss of ecologically supportive environments outside the designated site boundaries”. The LPA demonstrates a cavalier attitude and widespread failings in its duties as the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. I reserve the right to comment further if, and when, a supporting HRA and supporting mitigation strategy can be provided for the Local Plan and request that I be notified accordingly.

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.:

-Remove Exmo_20 from the Local Plan, -Reduce the size of Exmo_20, -Do not access the site via B3179, -Move the settlement boundary away from the Pebblebed Heaths

Fern Purchall

Full name: Fern Purchall

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?: 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 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.: I

and my husband strongly oppose to this plan, because this is destroying natural beauty, affecting peoples lives who live in the area and just really badly affecting this beautiful area.

My Mum, Nan and Great Nan are also buried at the church yard at St John's In The Wilderness, the fields and the general area surrounding it and the natural beauty around it is a very beautiful space to see, I love seeing the horses in the fields when I visit them at the church yard and it's just genuinely a very beautiful area. This church and fields are very peaceful and putting in so many houses will distrubt visiting being a nightmare to travel to as it's so narrow to drive though and not making it peaceful for someone like me to visit a loved one at the church yard the fields and natural beauty is always so calm and lovely and quiet when I go up to the cemetery. Many of us are very upset with this plan because of how this is going to affect everything and how much more busier things are going to be. It will be a nightmare putting in these so many houses in this beautiful area, meaning there will be so much traffic and destroying the natural peaceful feeling.

I understand people need houses but please just consider everything who is opposing their thoughts and feelings, especially with people who live there and the wildlife and how this will affect someone like me going to visit loved ones and gow this will interrupt

the peaceful feeling of this beautiful old area, please find it in your hearts to consider everyone who opposes the plan because there are many of us who want to keep this beautiful area and protect its future and preserve it much as we can.