

# Summary of Questions and Comments from Neighbourhood Plan Feedback Forms

Ver 1.0 28 Nov 12

## Questions

### 1b Meeting Advertising Improvements

None

### 2c Village Boundary Line and Neighbourhood Plan

1. If all development is inside VBL will all green space be lost?
2. Why only build within VBL and cause more congestion?
3. How is development south and west of village contributing to traffic problems in the conservation area?
4. How will planning envelope be affected by individual development outside it?
5. What are the timeframes? How many houses per year?
6. Why was no explanation given why Goodmore's Farm not counting?
7. Why should Goodmore's Farm be incorporated into Exmouth?
8. How are traffic and special village quality compatible to proposed development?
9. When will news be available on whether EDDC endorses/amends proposals?
10. Who decides on Village Boundary Line changes?

### 3c Criteria Missed

1. Were the criteria previously discussed at Focus Group meetings taken into account?

### 4d Why is objective not achieved

1. Why were approach roads to Jacksons Meadow not widened as required when first built?
2. Would road access be easier at Glebelands site?

### 4e Most suitable Locations Selected?

None

### 4f Another location on preferred list

None

### 4g Sites for another 10 homes

None

### 4h Any other Comments

None

### 5a Clarification Questions

1. How is affordable/social housing allocated?
2. What are the actual timescales?

3. What happens if some of preferred sites get planning rejected – will next site of 65 houses go ahead?
4. How would traffic safety on Longmeadow Road be approached?
5. Why did Parish Council reject coalescence at Courtlands but Goodmore's Farm is being allowed to be taken over by Exmouth?
6. Can there be 1 parking space per bedroom on new builds or at least 2 per property?
7. How does access to Glebelands site meet Highway requirements?
8. Can we have reassurance from the Council that smaller plots for development will continue to be sought?
9. What goes on behind the scenes – private talks with landowners etc.?

## **Comments**

### **1b Meeting Advertising Improvements**

1. Advertised sooner
2. Leaflets to individual houses
3. Posters in Londis and Post Office
4. Posters on lampposts and telegraph poles around Village
5. Express and Echo

### **2c Village Boundary Line and Neighbourhood Plan**

1. Concerns over traffic safety
2. Couldn't see all presentation data on screen as was sitting at back

### **3c Criteria Missed**

1. Previous planning issues against development at a location
2. Too many criteria selected
3. 3 criteria given to school facilities and transport but only 1 to local amenity and environment
4. First criteria conflates 2 different issues- vehicle access and congestion
5. EDDC and Govt policy do not account for village characteristics – no footpaths and narrow roads
6. Priority to brownfield sites and land with existing planning permission
7. Priority to sites with pedestrian access to key amenities
8. Impact on village parking
9. Emergency service access
10. Size of development
11. Environment – water run off from developments into Wotton Brook
12. Recreation land/parking/landscaping considered
13. Protection of green spaces considered
14. Benefit to Village other than cash from developers

### **4d Why is objective not achieved**

1. If additional 39 houses are built at Jacksons Meadow
  - Create a large estate of 71 units
  - Vehicle access would compromise safety and increase congestion
  - Would harm the characteristic setting of the church
  - Estate already cramped. More houses dangerous and unpleasant for residents

2. For a small village anything over 6 is large
3. Optimum development should be no more than 6 – 8 to keep discrete
4. Village full to capacity
5. Village can't cope with any more development – put it at Cranbrook
6. If most of 40 houses are sheltered then increase in traffic will be minimal
7. Concern that development of 65 – 80 houses will have greater priority if there is a Govt policy change
8. Stick to inside Boundary Line
9. Too much infilling
10. Lympstone Nursery, as brownfield site, should have priority
11. Seems that 2 main site (Glebelands & off Strawberry Hill) would be top of agenda
12. Bigger developments seem alarmingly close to agreement
13. Group too intense
14. Vehicle access/traffic is most important consideration
15. Does not take into account suitable roads
16. 20mph limit in Village
17. Please don't take away our areas of green

#### **4e Most suitable Locations Selected?**

1. Not Jacksons Meadow
2. As long as Glebelands isn't built
3. Glebelands most suitable and no impact on Village roads and centre
4. Nursery site should move up list as it has better access, is considered a brownfield site and would provide church parking – accepting minor flood restrictions. It's situation outside VBL is illogical and should be revisited.
5. Dairy Cottage
6. Brownfield sites should be prioritised over green areas
7. Land North of Longmeadow Road
8. Lympstone House should not be developed in order to preserve architecture and gardens
9. Behind Payne's Cottage
10. W339 ??

#### **4f Another location on preferred list**

1. Clay Lane site for 1 dwelling
2. Car repair shop at Courtlands
3. Goodmore's Farm
4. Houses built at Goodmore's Farm will cause more traffic on Wotton Lane and Summer Lane

#### **4g Sites for another 10 homes**

1. 8 & 9 from list as 1-7 will provide over 40
2. Enough sites to chose from – continue down list
3. Already 135 houses on list – why look for more
4. Glebelands with Strawberry Hill access
5. Underhill developments – close to all amenities
6. Neither of Underhill developments
7. A slight overprovision would be a sound tactical policy for the Parish Council
8. Courtlands Lane Nursery
9. Lympstone Nursery and Town Dairy

10. Strongly against Lymptone Nursery – some parking here would be OK
11. Not Jacksons Meadow
12. Small and dispersed best

**4h Any other Comments on proposed sites**

1. Consider Lymptone Nursery as additional burial ground and parking for church
2. Build new school on Lymptone Nursery site and convert old school site to sheltered housing
3. Should resist all development – even the 40 houses. Large developments in Exeter and Cranbrook were intended to preserve small villages
4. Should have been given 10 chosen sites
5. Congratulations – very thorough and painstaking process
6. Rob Longhurst presented and handled meeting excellently

**5a Clarification Questions**

1. Need more adequate infrastructure before any building starts
2. Build a new road between Harefield Drive and Malt Field
3. Shortage of retirement property to buy rather than rent. Also semi-sheltered scheme would be good