

From: Lynsey [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2023 14:12
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Fwd: Local plan for East Devon -Clyst St Mary preferred Options 1&3. Resident feedback

Categories: Reg.18 consultation

To whom it may concern,

I write to air my views on the proposed development for the A3052/Clyst St Mary/Oil Mill Lane area in East Devon.

From reading through the available material it immediately strikes me that little or no thought has been given to the most suitable location and that the proposed areas have been chosen as they have a range of factors that make them easy targets. This includes ease for the developer due to current single land owners and ease of delivery of materials.

Please see below for my concerns.

- I would question whether we really need a new town. I am led to believe that Government housing targets are now advisory, not mandatory.
- It appears that no other options have been identified as reasonable alternatives. I know that the 'dispersed option' of spreading houses through suitable villages has not been included and the absence of this spatial plan versus one new large area of development means the plan has no flexibility should problems occur. Have we not learnt the lessons from Cranbrook ?
- A new town does not minimise carbon emissions. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (DSAR) alludes to local lanes and low traffic volumes. This is going to be a New Town/suburb with 1000's of cars clogging up already congested single carriageway lanes. There will be increased car use in an area that already sees its roads at capacity with existing issues relation to emissions, congestion etc.
- Through looking through the available information I can see no suitable infrastructure plan for the area to support any such development. In particular there is no additional infrastructure plan for the first 2,500 houses.
- The (DSAR) mentions sustainable travel choices. This is incorrect . The only available public transport options require car usage in order to access them . (Cranbrook, Topsham or Digby)
- The (DSAR) states that 'overall a likely minor negative effect is identified for options 1 and 2.' This **cannot** be said to be 'minor'. No impact of major development of 100's of acres could ever be described as 'minor.'
- The section of the report relating to "access to services' (P228) is completely unrealistic for 8,00 homes. All access to services will require car usage and are not sufficient in size for this level of development.

- The measures in the report do not mention any improvements to the transport network at J29 or J30 of the M5 of the Clyst St Mary roundabout. These are already at a stand still during the daily commute.
- The proposed area floods badly on a regular basis . I would question where the dispersed water will go should a major development be situated on already saturated land.

I submit my comments as a resident of nearly 20 years in the expectation that East Devon District Council will take my views and the views of my neighbours into account with compassion and loyalty to it's subjects.

Lynsey and Tony Willis