

From: Matthew Dickins
Sent: 11 January 2023 14:53
To: Planning Policy
Subject: FW: Local Plan 2022-2040

From: jamescarthy@btinternet.com
Sent: 11 January 2023 14:11
To: Matthew Dickins <MDickins@eastdevon.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Local Plan 2022-2040

Hi Matt,

Happy New Year to you and your team.

As you know I consider the process deeply flawed so have had little input on the 2020-40 Local Plan, frustrated that so many of the issues I raised in the last 25 or so years were not taken on board but are now proving to be borne out by fact.

My main concern is that there has been no objective needs assessment carried out for the individual Settlements and once again the main housing allocation is going to the west of the district Much like Cranbrook this of course will continue to help Exeter with its shortfall and continue to deprive East Devon of the development it needs for local people, and I am sure increase the housing stock lost to purchasers from out of the district and many as second homes.

On matters of detail, I would mention a few matters concerning Colyton and Colyford where I of course have history.

1. Disappointing that you are sticking with the Green Wedge which is drawn to prevent any development and indeed covers some developed areas.
2. I appreciate that Colyford does not have a Primary School, but it is definitely Sustainable so believe the criteria for sustainability should be reviewed.
3. I am no longer working for the owners but surely it cannot be right to reject the site Coly 06. On two appeals the Inspectors have stated that it is a sustainable location and now that you do not have a 5-year land supply surely an application ought to be successful. I know the Parish Council would like the Primary School to be relocated there and that is a major factor behind their objection, but I imagine the site is unlikely to be allocated for a school within the plan period and therefore much needed housing would be an appropriate allocation.
4. I cannot understand how Coly 02a and 02b can be considered for development, as both should have Landscape and Highway objections. Before your time, the 200ft (60m) contour was considered sacrosanct and that determined the extent of Burnards Field Road.
5. The exception site of Seaway Head should never have been granted and I think backs up my earlier argument that the Exception Policies have been wrong. This development will of course weaken the Landscape Objection for Colyton, but two wrongs do not make a right!
6. On the Inset Map for Colyton the Flood Zoning colours do not seem to be correct and the extent shown is exaggerated. I appreciate that Global Warming has been acknowledged, but if the flooding was to reach the levels indicated we would need Noah and his Ark to return. I am sure that there is much work to be done on this and as Colyton is well above any tidal influence, there is no real justification for raising the flood risk levels other than predicted by the J Flow calculations.

I would be grateful if you will log this e-mail so that I am in the loop when the Plan gets considered by the Inspector.

Very many thanks.

Kind regards,

Jim