

Filtered Data Export

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

1. Introduction

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

Paragraph

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

1.1

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

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.: Pegasus Group have prepared this representation to the Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) consultation (2025) on behalf of Co-op Estates.

5.2. Co-op welcome the production of the EDLP and wish to support the Council in its ongoing preparation.

5.3. Co-op have previously prepared representations to the East Devon Local Plan in relation to the site. The Council have been made aware that Co-op were considering the future of the store and have subsequently taken the decision to close the store in Axminster. In light of this, the evidence base is therefore not sufficient up to date to reflect this and the implications this would have.

5.4. Following this, the EDLP, as prepared, would not be considered sound. But it is the view of Co-op that modifications, as suggested in the representation above and updates to the evidence base could ensure a sound local plan can be delivered.

5.5. Co-op trust that the Council will find these comments useful as it continues to progress its Local Plan and would be happy to discuss these issues in greater detail in order to assist the Inspector and the Examination in Public

5.6. Co-op and Pegasus Group would also like to be kept informed of all forthcoming consultations on the Local Plan and any associated documents.

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: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

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(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.: This policy has been amended to specify that a design code is required for developments of more than 50 dwellings. This is a change from the first Regulation 19 consultation which simply referred to this as a requirement for major development. We object to the requirement for a design code for all developments of over 50 dwellings as this is considered to be excessive and request that the threshold is upped to at least 500 dwellings. Such a low threshold of 50 would place an unnecessary burden on developers. Good design is not dependent on a design code and whilst a design code would be appropriate for the largest of schemes (500+), it is an unnecessary burden for anything under this threshold. This additional burden is at odds with the current NPPF consultation document which seeks to deliver a more proportionate and streamlined planning system to help bring competition and diversity to the market, and support faster build out.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal: 10. High Quality Design

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

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

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

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.: Co-op generally support the requirement to make the best use of land by maximising the number of homes and density of development. This is best achieved in highly sustainable locations, such as town centres.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal: 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

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

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This policy seeks to secure for residential development, electric vehicle charging that exceeds Building Regulations requirements. We object to this point of policy TR04. This policy should only align with Building Regulations requirements.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

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

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.: Whilst Taylor Wimpey supports the overall principle of this policy

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Whilst Taylor Wimpey supports the overall principle of this policy, and the importance for new development to deliver ecological enhancements, we have concerns regarding the lack of flexibility within the policy wording. Additional flexibility should be provided within the policy wording to allow ecological enhancement features to be determined on a case-by-case basis and to be influenced by site context and ecological opportunities for example one bat box or bird box per dwelling.

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.: Additional flexibility should be provided within the policy wording to allow ecological enhancement features to be determined on a case-by-case basis and to be influenced by site context and ecological opportunities for example one bat box or bird box per dwelling.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal: 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

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

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

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

3(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.: The requirement for all major housing developments of 10 or more homes to deliver a BNG of at least 20% is onerous and will add costs to developments. All developments should only be required to deliver the national minimum requirement of 10% BNG. The provision of in excess of 10% BNG is a benefit of development that can be weighed in the planning balance but this should not be translated into a policy requirement. 10% Biodiversity Net Gain is now mandatory for all major developments (as of 12th February 2024) and all non-major developments (as of 2nd April 2024) as required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) at Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214, confirms that plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory 10% for BNG on an area wide or site wide basis unless justified and considering viability and implementation. The consultation document does not set out a robust justification for this and a BNG requirement exceeding 10% could give rise to issues relating to viability and implementation in some cases.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal: 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

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

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: PB06

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.: This policy sets out a series of statements relating local nature recover and also BNG. Given the wording of Policy PB05, PB06 does not appear to be particularly effective, they should be deleted as a policy.

4.54. As set out above, Local Nature Recovery Strategies are a legal requirement from the Environment Act 2021. There is no need to repeat their requirements within the emerging Development Plan and the NPPF notes at para 201 that “Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively”.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal: 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

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

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

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: It is noted that this policy seeks a 20% net gain in biodiversity for major developments. Non-major developments are only expected to deliver the mandatory requirement of 10%.

4.50. The supporting text refers to ENV-025 - Nature Recovery Declaration (2023), but this does not provide any justification or evidence to pursue a 20% gain in BNG. It appears to address the need to prepare a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), which reads to be a legal requirement of the Environment Act (2021).

4.51. PPG2 states that "Plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the stator objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified."

4.52. Without any evidence to support the 20% position, this policy as worded does not comply with NPPF para 36 as it is not positively prepared as it will place a significant burden on development which is not justified and is not aligned with wider legislation in the form of the Environment Act 2021.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

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

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?: Yes

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.: Co-op is in general support of the strategic objectives, certainly promoting significant development within Axminster (element C).

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Policy

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

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

3(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.: This policy seeks to secure appropriate infrastructure to support the needs of new development via direct provision or financial contributions. We note that this policy should be amended to allow consideration of viability on a case-by-case basis. Provision of infrastructure whether via direct provision or financial contributions can, in some cases, have significant implications for the viability of a scheme.

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.: Building in additional flexibility to this policy by allowing viability to be considered would prevent these requirements becoming a barrier to the delivery of much needed housing and economic development where financial viability barriers exist. We note that this approach has been adopted for other policies relating to heat networks (CC05), affordable housing (HN02), housing to meet the needs of older people (HN03), accessible and adaptable housing (HN04), self and custom build housing (HN05), hostels and houses in multiple occupation (HN08) and biodiversity net gain (PB05). Applying the same approach to SP07 would ensure EDDC are being consistent across local plan policies.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

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

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.: Second Regulation 19

Consultation, November 2025 – January 2026 I write pursuant to the current East Devon District Council (EDDC) second Regulation 19 consultation on behalf of my client Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land. Most of the submitted comments relate to general points however some are relevant to the Land at Colestocks Road, Feniton site which is being promoted by Taylor Wimpey. Outline consent was granted on the 11th July 2025 for the following development on part of this site under appeal ref. APP/U1105/W/24/3357849: “Up to 86 dwellings with access from Colestocks Road; the provision of public open space, landscaping, drainage, and associated highways improvements and infrastructure. All matters to be reserved except for access.” For reference, the EDDC reference for this application was 24/0431/MOUT. Strategic Policy SP01 Spatial Strategy The settlement boundary for Feniton has been amended to include the Land at Colestocks Road site within it following the granting of outline planning permission for up to 86 dwellings under appeal ref. APP/U1105/W/24/3357849. The Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper Evidence Base Document, ref. KSD-010(rev) confirms this. This change is supported with the site contributing towards the delivery of much-needed homes in Feniton and East Devon more widely. We note that reference to the role and function of settlements document in the footnotes is incorrect. This is referred to as KSD-012 however the correct reference is KSD-011 as per the Evidence and Examination Library.

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.: We note that reference to the role and function of settlements

document in the footnotes is incorrect. This is referred to as KSD-012 however the correct reference is KSD-011 as per the Evidence and Examination Library.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Policy

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

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

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.: It is confirmed that “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”.

4.14. Co-op do not consider that the second sentence is necessary, as it simply confirms the legal requirements to consider all policies within the Plan. This element is not included within all policies, so why this specific policy?

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.: In order to be sound, the second sentence needs to be removed from this Policy.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Policy

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

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

3. 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.:

4.10. Axminster was designated as a Neighbourhood Area in October 2013, however no Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared.

4.11. This strategic policy establishes minimum housing requirements for the 42 currently Designated Neighbourhood Areas (DNAs), including Axminster. The table within the Policy sets out the requirements, for which 1,391 dwellings (minimum) are proposed to be directed towards Axminster to 2042. It reads like no homes are projected to be delivered through emerging/future neighbourhood plans within Axminster.

4.12. It would be expected therefore that allocations capable of delivering the full needs of Axminster are identified through this Plan, not waiting for any future Neighbourhood Plan to progress to identify and facilitate this.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

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

Policy

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

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 period is set to 2020 to 2042. As the Council will be aware, the NPPF1 states strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption and that where larger scale developments form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take in account the likely timescale for delivery.

4.8. Given the stage of the Plan preparation and the anticipated lead in times for the potential submission, examination and adoption of the Plan, in order to ensure that the Plan covers the full 15 years on adoption, the Plan period may need be extended until least 2043. This needs to be monitored against the EDLP's progression through these stages.

4.9. This Policy sets out that provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042.

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

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

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SD02

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

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

Axmi_23

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Para 5.4 sets out the approach to development in Axminster. It is noted that proposed residential allocations are identified, totalling 1,086 homes. Some sites are also small, with the smallest looking to deliver just 6 dwellings.

4.17. In light of this, Co-op object to the wording of this policy. The proposed allocations provide for up to 1,086 dwellings which appears to fall short of the minimum housing requirement in Axminster (1,391 in Policy SP03). There is also insufficient detail within Appendix I of HOU-003 to support the decisions of the Council. Furthermore, this evidence and certainly the trajectory needs to be fully updated to support the upcoming Examination in Public to ensure that East Devon can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply at the point of adoption and sufficient homes across the Plan Period.

4.18. Currently, it cannot be considered positively prepared, and it is not considered compliant with the NPPF in this regard.

4.19. In addition, it does not include the Co-op site for alternative uses, despite it being submitted as a residential opportunity in 2022 and it now includes the vacant former Co-op foodstore.

4.20. Included in those sites that are proposed to be allocated is Axmi_23 – Websters Garage which is allocated for 10 dwellings as part of an unspecified 'mixed use' development. No specific requirement is set out for the provision of retail or

commercial floorspace despite the fact that the site is located in the heart of the proposed TCA and PSA.

4.21. At the time it was assessed, there was an undetermined application for the redevelopment of part of the site to provide a convenience store with 9 no. dwellings above (ref. 22/2322/OUT), however this application was never determined and the site has since been occupied by the relocated Co-op store following the approval of planning permission ref. 24/0157/FUL for alterations and extensions to the existing building.

4.22. It is considered, therefore, that the potential for the site to come forward for residential development is therefore limited. The Axminster Site Selection Report (SAL-005) does not set out how it is intended to reconcile the conflict with the current proposed wording of Policy SE06 to deliver dwellings on this site, nor is it apparent why a different approach has been taken in the consideration of this site to the Co-op site. For Axmi_23, the reasons for allocating note the site's proximity to services and facilities as a positive consideration which is markedly different to the approach taken in the consideration of Axmi_16 (the Co-op site).

4.23. To ensure that this policy is positively worded and complies with para 36 of the NPPF, the full development needs should be addressed, the trajectory fully updated which will likely require the identification of more residential sites in Axminster.

4.24. As part of this, given the evidence of the Council confirms there are no technical issues it is just the draft plan's change to the town centre boundary, the Co-op site needs to be formally identified as a residential allocation, capable of accommodating at least 10 dwellings (but could contribute 20, if an apartment scheme is taken forward) towards the minimum housing requirements to be delivered in Axminster.

4.25. Given the immediate availability of the site, this could be brought forward at an early stage in the Plan Period, making an important contribution to help to address the identified shortfall of approximately 300 dwellings in Axminster.

4.26. However, if it is decided not to allocate the site, then it should be removed from the Primary Shopping Area to ensure that there is the maximum flexibility in policy to allow the site to come forward for housing as an unallocated site in the event that this is determined to be its best option for redevelopment in the future.

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: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

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: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

6. Mitigating Climate Change

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

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy CC02: Net-zero carbon development Part A of this policy requires the following for all new residential development: 'To meet energy efficiency requirements set out in the building regulation Future Homes Standard (FHS) 2025 or successor standards. If the FHS 2025 is not incorporated into Building Regulations by the date of Local Plan adoption, the draft standards as set out in - The Future Homes and Buildings Standards: 2023 consultation²⁹) will be required in developments;'. We object to this point of policy CC02. This policy should align with Building Regulations already in force and not draft standards which are potentially subject to change. This policy also requires all developments to demonstrate at the application stage that the relevant standards set out in policy CC02 will be achieved. As a general comment on policy CC02, it is important that net-zero carbon policies do not dominate the wider objectives of the plan to the detriment of delivering a balanced, sustainable strategy that achieves the viable delivery of development to meet identified needs within the plan period. The Written Ministerial Statement Planning: Local Energy Efficiency Standards - 13th December 2023 informed councils that the government expects examiners to reject local plans that go beyond current national policy and legislative provisions. This has recently been tested in the Court of Appeal, which concluded that local authorities may set higher requirements exceptionally, subject to there being strong justification for such. Thus, there is an implicit evidential bar for doing so which we do not consider applies to East Devon. That evidential bar should also reflect real-world considerations including ensuring that development remains viable, having regard to other factors in this respect, and the impact on housing supply and affordability remains in accordance with the National Planning Policy 3 Framework. This should be taken into consideration by the Council regarding this specific need, which, without substantive evidence

otherwise, should not seek to push local standards beyond those established through Building Regulations.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

7. Adapting to Climate Change

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

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy AR02: Water efficiency This policy seeks to secure for all development, the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres per person per day for water efficiency. We object to this point of policy AR02. 5 East Devon is not a water stress area so the justification for limiting water usage for new development is questionable. Water consumption is a matter covered by the Buildings Regulations regime. This limits water consumption to 125 litres per person per day. A local plan policy on water efficiency is unnecessary.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

8. Meeting Housing Needs

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

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

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

3(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.: HN05: Self-build and custom build housing Objection is raised to the requirement for 'At least 5% of dwellings on sites planned to accommodate 20 or more homes must be delivered as serviced custom and self-build plots.' Including 'at least' introduces uncertainty around what the requirement will actually be in any individual case – it is vague and imprecise. 5% of dwellings on all sites over 20 dwellings appears to provide more than the required number of plots as evidenced in the self-build register data. In addition, the marketing period should be reduced to 12 months. Any longer than this and sites may have completed and the construction contractors left site making it potentially challenging and unviable for these to be brought back to build custom plots if these have not been sold. Some people on the self-build register will not want a plot within a larger housing scheme, as shown from the evidence base. The Council has already delivered self-build opportunities without requiring larger developments to put aside land for this type of use, predominantly on small individual sites. It would be preferable for this policy to encourage this type of provision so that larger sites can concentrate on delivering affordable housing, open space, community facilities, and other infrastructure which smaller schemes cannot provide.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The Council has already delivered self-build opportunities without requiring larger developments to put aside land for this type of use, predominantly on small individual sites. It would be preferable for this policy to encourage this type of provision so that larger sites can concentrate on delivering

affordable housing, open space, community facilities, and other infrastructure which smaller schemes cannot provide.

Full name: Laura Grimason

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

8. Meeting Housing Needs

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

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

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

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Part A of this policy seeks to secure a percentage of dwellings built to Building Regulation M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings). The percentage requirement has been reduced to 50% from 100% at the first Regulation 19 consultation stage and this is a step in the right direction. We note however, that there should be flexibility built into the policy to allow for negotiation on this where technical or financial viability prevent this requirement being met in full. Part C of this policy seeks to secure at least 15% of all new affordable housing for rent or affordable home ownership built to Building Regulation M4(3)(2)(a) or (b) requirements (wheelchair adaptable). This is an increase on the 5% included in the first round of Regulation 19 consultation. We object to this increase and note that a 15% requirement is overly prescriptive, particularly when there is no flexibility in the policy for an alternative approach to be agreed in the case that technical or financial viability prevent this requirement being met in full.

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.: there should be flexibility built into the policy

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

Proposal:

8. Meeting Housing Needs

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

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

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

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.:

4.27. This policy requires at least 50% of residential schemes to be built to the 'accessible and adaptable' standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. There is no flexibility in this requirement.

4.28. The PPG identifies the type of evidence required to introduce a policy requiring the M4 standards, including the likely future need; the size, location, type, and quality of dwellings needed; the accessibility and adaptability of the existing stock; how the needs vary across different housing tenures; and the overall viability. The PPG also identifies other requirements for the policy including the need to consider site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography and other circumstances, and the ability to provide step-free access.

4.29. The evidence supporting the Plan (HOU-002) seems to support the minimum need for only 17% of dwelling to be adaptable in Figure 59 of the 2025 Housing Need Assessment.

4.30. Co-op therefore considers that the Council have not yet provided sufficient evidence for this policy to be considered justified or consistent with national policy.

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

Full name: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

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. 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.: Put simply, this policy needs some significant re-writing to be considered sound, as it is not consistent with Section 7 of the NPPF. It is not positively prepared, it is not justified and it will not be effective in supporting the vitality and viability of defined centres.

4.37. Town Centre Areas (TCA) and Primary Shopping Areas (PSA) are defined within the EDLP for the tier one and two towns. As set out earlier, Co-op have significant issues with the definition of the town centre area and the primary shopping area for Axminster. In and around the former Co-op, there are a large number of residential dwellings included within the defined PSA and TCA.

4.38. In essence the PSA, as drafted, does not define where retail development is concentrated (our emphasis). The TCA, as drafted, does not accurately define the primary shopping area and areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. This is a requirement to comply with the NPPF.

4.39. This is most obviously displayed within the Council's 2022 survey of Axminster, in and around Church Street. There is only one shop in a circa 160m run and the other town centre use within the run is a surgery. Town centre uses are not the pre-dominant land use and retail uses are not concentrated here.

4.40. Given the passage of time between the surveys and the drafting of evidence (Ref:ECN-007), the Co-op store no longer trades from this location. In order to reflect the actual position on the ground, this area of the town centre needs to be removed

from both the TCA and PSA. In order to accurately reflect the area reflected by town centre uses concentration of retail development and Co-op have provided our view on the extent of the this in the attached at Appendix 1. The second paragraph of the Policy seeks to arbitrarily constrain the acceptable uses within centres, limiting those uses to retail and leisure. This is not compliant with the NPPF Annex 2 which defines main town centre uses. The Council should focus on supporting a wide range of town centre uses across the centre, to capture the benefits that flow from this such as street level activity, pedestrian movements, and vitality and viability improvements, as opposed to constraining main town centre uses within the defined centres. As such Co-op recommend that this second paragraph is amended as follows: Proposals for main town centre development (as defined in the Annex to the NPPF) within the Town Centre Areas (and excepting Cranbrook which is subject to the policies of the Cranbrook Plan), as defined on the Policies Map, will be permitted. (where they improve the quality and/or broaden the range of retail and leisure facilities, enhance the role of the town centres as sustainable shopping and leisure destinations and strengthen their vitality and viability.) Within the second paragraph, the first sentence is broadly acceptable, subject to correctly defining the PSA.

4.43. The third sentence needs deleting, as this seeks to restrict residential uses within the PSA. This is relevant, as if the Council do not intend to correct the PSA to properly reflect the concentration of retail uses, this could constrain development. It is also a curious approach against a context where the Council are currently seeking to include many residential dwellings within the proposed PSA – most obviously and as raised before along Church Street.

4.44. This also feeds back to sentences two and three in the second paragraph which seeks protect the PSA for predominantly retail and leisure uses. Just on this point, Para 90f of the NPPF is relevant, which states that: Planning policies should: recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites.

4.45. Therefore, there is no support in the NPPF for a more onerous ‘test’ for residential uses within centres. It is recommended that the middle sentences of the second paragraph are amended to state: Development proposals for other town centre uses within the Primary Shopping Areas will only be permitted where the majority of the total ground floor units are facilitating retail or leisure uses. Unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a retail or leisure demand, other town centre uses (including residential) will not be permitted on the ground floor within the Primary Shopping Areas. Unless it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for any town centre use residential uses will not be permitted on the ground floor within the Primary Shopping Areas.

4.46. Co-op note the need for a marketing exercise, with the detail enclosed within footer 78 on Pg 185. Co-op do not have any particular concerns on the requirements at this stage, but do reserve the right to make comments in due course.

4.47. In relation to the support text to the Policy, there will be a need to make various consequential changes including: Para 9.37 – supporting wider town centre uses in town centre locations and accepting residential uses can be acceptable;

- Para 9.39 – reflecting the NPPF's support for residential uses as appropriate in town centres

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.:

-

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: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

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.: SE06

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.:

This sets out the retail hierarchy, although the hierarchy is not within the main body of the Policy, but within the supporting text. Although not a point of soundness, it is recommended that the hierarchy in para 9.32 is moved into the policy itself for clarity. January 2026 | PR/EM | P25-3363 16

4.32. The opening paragraph of the Policy sets out the overall strategy for the centres. A further point of clarity should be added, as per the underlining below, so it is consistent with the NPPF para 90b and its Annex which confirms the uses appropriate in town centres, as set out below: Tier one and two towns form focal points of activity in East Devon towns and will be the preferred location for the development of new retail, leisure and other [Town Centre] uses that attract and are used by people for commercial or community activities.

4.33. The supporting text similarly needs to be updated, specifically para 9.31, as it confirms “that the NPPF promotes competitive town centre environments and growth management”, but this also needs to include the support for diversification, to be consistent with NPPF para 90a.

4.34. This also needs to be reflected in Para 9.33, as it is not only shops that are crucial to maintaining vitality and viability of centres, but all uses within the centre.

4.35. Finally, the fourth paragraph of the Policy and the sequential text within para 9.33 needs to be deleted, as these elements are covered in Policy SE07.

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: Emma Morrison

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): The Co-op Group Food Ltd.

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. 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.:

3.1. Given the stage of the process of the EDLP, there is a reasonably well-developed evidence base to support the plan. An overview of this is provided below: ECN-011 - Greater Exeter Town Centre and Retail Study Part One (September 2017)

3.2. This Study was jointly commissioned by East Devon District Council (EDDC), Exeter City Council (ECC), Mid Devon District Council (MDDC), Teignbridge District Council (TDC) in partnership with Devon County Council. The objectives of this study, as identified in the brief issued by the Councils, are as follows:

- A review of salient retail and town centre trends across the UK in order to set the context for developing a retail and town centre strategy in the GESP;
- A series of town centre health checks covering all of the main town centres in the MDDC, TDC and EDDC administrative areas;
- An updated survey of household shopping patterns covering an area which is sufficiently wide to gather data on convenience and comparison goods;
- Assessments of quantitative and qualitative retail floorspace need for each of the main settlements in the ECC, EDDC, TDC and MDDC administrative areas

3.3. Axminster is covered in this Study, albeit the findings of this are now considered out of date and should not be used to inform decisions over the upcoming Plan period.

3.4. Nevertheless, and as context Axminster's health is covered in Section 6, Pg 118 onwards. It sets out at para 6.168 that "the defined Town Centre Shopping Area covers West Street, Castle Street, Chard Street, Victoria Place, Lyme Street, Victoria Place, South Street and Church Street, along with the Tesco supermarket (and car park) at Shand Park. There is also a defined primary frontage which runs along West Street, Silver Street, Trinity Square, Chard Street and the southern end of Victoria Place".

3.5. The healthcheck is summarised at para 6.196 confirming that "Axminster is a reasonably healthy town centre. The current land use profile identifies the town has an above average proportion of convenience goods retailers including a large Tesco supermarket and a number of independent convenience goods retailers. However, the centre only attracts under half of first choice main food shopping trips from the local area, and just over half of top-up food shopping trips".

3.6. There is no assessment of need within the part one study, despite the overview set out above claiming it would. January 2026 | PR/EM | P25-3363 8 ECN-012 - Greater Exeter Town Centre and Retail Study Part Two - Retail Needs Assessment and Retail Strategy (December 2019)

3.7. It is clarified in the introduction that the part one Study did not cover needs, as initially anticipated, so this part two study sought to provide an assessment of the quantitative and qualitative retail floorspace need for each of the main settlements. This includes Axminster within East Devon District Council area.

3.8. It also makes recommendations regarding the various tiers of the 'town centre' hierarchy in the Greater Exeter area and a recommended strategy for each town.

3.9. It is also supported by a new shopper survey, although there is no date to confirm when this was undertaken and the raw results are not available for any detailed interrogation.

3.10. Specifically in relation to Axminster, the Part Two Study sets out:

- Para 3.12 – "Table 9g in Appendix II indicates that existing convenience goods stores attract £21.4m of expenditure which can be compared with a much higher benchmark turnover for these stores of £42.7m. This suggests a significant over-supply of convenience goods floorspace in the town, to the tune of -1,780sq m net. The stores contributing to this situation are the two largest stores in the town centre – Tesco and the Co-op store on West Street – which are both trading well below their respective company average performance levels" (Pegasus Emphasis).

- Para 3.13 – "Table 10g indicates that the current study area derived turnover of the town [for comparison goods] is higher than the benchmark turnover of the town (which has been brought forward from the most recent East Devon retail study and updated to a 2019 base level). This suggests an indicative capacity of 930sq m net at 2019, rising to

1,167sq m net at 2024 and 1,546sq m net at 2029. We do not consider that there is an overriding need to plan for this modest uplift in comparison goods floorspace in Axminster bearing in mind the size of the town, the state of the comparison goods sector and the likelihood that any significant comparison goods in this part of Devon is likely to be directed towards Exeter."

3.11. Axminster was confirmed, at the time, of accommodating around 14,600sqm of floorspace.

3.12. In respect of the proposed hierarchy, it was recommended to be identified as a smaller centre. ECN-007 - Evaluation of Town Centre and Retail Policy Boundaries and the threshold for the Sequential Test (September 2023)

3.13. This topic paper is prepared to consider the current retail situation in East Devon and seeks to justify the policies within the emerging Local Plan. Para 1.3 sets out that it provides an assessment of boundaries for town centre and retail policies and explains why the national sequential test threshold is inappropriate and a lower threshold is justified in East Devon. .14. For the avoidance of doubt, national policy does not include a threshold for sequential assessments, only impact assessments.

3.15. The topic paper confirms that the NPPF 2018 removed the expectation for local authorities to define primary and secondary frontages within their town centres. In light of this, it used the December 2023 NPPF definitions, which was the most up to date iteration of the NPPF at the time.

3.16. The definitions within the 2024 NPPF are largely unchanged, except for the addition of concert halls, hotels and conference facilities within the definition of main town centre uses.

3.17. The paper also sets out various reviews as to the role of town centres, including the report (parliament.uk) around high streets and town centres in 2030 which helpfully sets out a vision for town centres which will act as:

- Activity-based community gathering places;
- Retail is a smaller part of a wider mix;
- Green space, leisure, arts/culture, health & social care services, housing; and
- Space for social & community interactions

3.18. The paper also references the Build Back Better High Streets Paper which identifies five priorities for centres, including "Planning flexibilities around change of use; enabling vacant commercial premises to be demolished and a new development right to convert empty shops, restaurants and offices into homes".

3.19. To support the paper, town centre assessments were undertaken in September 2022 (Table 3, para 3.18). Town centre areas are covered from para 4.7 onwards and confirm that “The policy approach advocated is one of defining Town Centre Areas to encompass broad central areas in towns where there is existing retail and commercial activity and potential to accommodate more activity”.

3.20. Para 4.8 sets out that “Primary Shopping Areas are the areas within the town centre where most retail activity is concentrated”, going on to set out that “Other uses, including residential, that would undermine the shopping and leisure function of the Primary Shopping Areas will be resisted as non-active use and ‘blank’ frontages will lessen the offer and appeal to visitors”.

3.21. It also confirms that “In most cases the town centres are relatively compact and are focussed around the concentration of retail/leisure uses. In these cases, the Town Centre Areas and Primary Shopping Areas will be the same and the boundaries will be concurrent.” this appears to be the case for Axminster.

3.22. The survey results for Axminster are discussed on page 19 and the associated survey plans are provided thereafter. For ease, the area around the former Co-op store is extracted below:

3.23. At the point in time of the survey (September 2022), the Co-op store was occupied and correctly noted above as a foodstore. Accordingly, this Paper (September 2023) recommends that as part of the emerging development plan, the centre should be extended in the location of the now former Co-op. Site Allocations – SAL 005 – Axminster (February 2025)

3.24. The Co-op site was assessed as part of the site allocations assessment paper. The site starts on Pg 11, identifying the site and then assessing its suitability for residential development. The site is acknowledged to be brownfield in nature.

3.25. Looking into the matters considered, it sets out that it “may be difficult to extend primary provision to accommodate housing levels beyond those set out in current local plan”. It’s a strange response to the development of a site within what is probably the most sustainable location of Axminster, especially as the site is proposed to be promoted through and seeks to be allocated as part of the plan process. In any case, the site is modest in scale, would not have such an impact on education capacity in the wider area. It is also noted that this comment has been made against all Axminster sites which have been carried forward to allocation and therefore should not be considered sufficient reason to disregard the residential potential of this site.

3.26. There does not appear any overarching technical reason why this site should be retained as a retail site and not allocated for housing.

3.27. The reason given that the site not been allocated is as following; The site is located within the proposed town centre and primary shopping area, where development should enhance the range and quality of town centre, shopping and leisure facilities. Redevelopment of the site for housing would be incompatible with this as it would result in the loss of a supermarket.

3.28. The fact is that the site is currently outside of the defined town centre boundary. As set out above the proposed town centre boundary has been drawn in a location which can no longer be considered appropriate given the evidence on the ground. This is covered in detail throughout these representations.

3.29. In addition to this, the foodstore at the site has already been lost, and was earmarked for loss when the Council undertook their Call for Sites. It seems strange that the Council is seeking to protect the site as a foodstore and extend the town centre boundary when the Council's own evidence confirms that there is a significant over supply of convenience goods floorspace such that existing stores were significantly underperforming.

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)