

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRESENTATION – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Friday

Liz Reynolds – Jackson Meadow – concerns about access to smaller site because of number of children in nearby houses

RL – Any planning application will need to go through standard planning application process. Please look at the Assessment document – we are aware of problems (She did)

Rob Neilson – Jackson Meadow – we want around 40 houses but liable to be far more

RL – personally I believe will go to about 50 due to the Feniton decision.

How are brownfield sites considered in comparison with greenfield sites? They are of course favoured but location vis-a-vis the BuAB line is critical.

Clive Wilson – How were the figs for each site determined? Will there be a change in the Built Up Area Boundary?

RL – SHLAA gave max/min/preferred - the preferred no was the one used in our assessment of that given by the developer. There may be changes in the BuAB if required.

He would also like to see older generation accommodation to allow for downsizing.

Antony Massingham - J Meadow What is the time scale for development

RL 40 homes by 2026

Geoff Lill Can village sustain this no of houses in terms of school/sewerage/parking

RL – yes, requirement for EDDC and service providers to meet the needs. For schooling DCC work on a Cluster Network – whilst the local school is now capped at 210 pupils - 7 classes x 30 – DCC will need to provide another school in the cluster (Exmouth?) once all schools are full.

Jill Cornish – Why are we talking about places for older people when EDDC are letting Churchill Court to younger people?

RL - I understand your concern and I will approach EDDC for an answer – and post the results.

(HD spoke to Cllr Jill Elson on Saturday - Churchill Court does not meet CQC standards for the elderly No lift to upper floor, flats not designed to accommodate people with mobility difficulties - therefore no longer suitable for elderly)

Steve Watts - What about the 2 acres of land around Lymstone House?

RL - we can only consider sites which developers or owners have told us are available – this land has now been placed on the open market and we cannot assume that it is available for development as it could be used for other purposes eg. Care home, Hotel of a single private dwelling.

C Doake - If flats qualify could we build 40 flats ?

RL – yes

Kath Rogers - Glebelands – Will money be available through 106 agreement ?

RL - Yes and also through the new Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) although much of this goes to a central EDDC pot for use within EDDC we understand that a proportion will come to the Parish Council

George Truell - Thank you for an excellent presentation and your hard work. Has **need** been taken into account – there are over 16,000 houses empty in Devon?

RL – the figure of 40 has been given to us by EDDC and was set (and agreed) sometime last summer – I forget the date (5% of existing houses in BUAB) – it is not negotiable and is based on number requirements placed on EDDC – I am not prepared to debate the appropriateness tonight.

GT - Traffic from Goodmores Farm will make problems worse down Wotton Lane

RL – Again Goodmores Farm is a “done deal” the Parish would be looking for CIL or Section 106 money from scheme. (A fuller explanation of Goodmore’s Farm is available in the Q&A)

Jill Wilson - Very concerned about road safety particularly -no pavements or very limited passing places between Pretty Corner and Strawberry Hill.

RL – Road Safety is a major issue in Lymptone and the Parish Council is working with DCC Highways to seek to make the roads safer. Any development anywhere within the parish can be argued to make the roads less safe – we are aware of this and will be looking for CIL funding to make any improvements.

John Sydenham – Agreeing with the previous question - why was traffic not more of (even a major) issue in your criteria.

RL – We did consider highway access and traffic, but Devon Highways will be consulted on all proposals and make the final decision as to suitability on traffic grounds – they are the experts.

Brian Mather – Please run through the sites again

RL – Did so

Sheila Parker – Please confirm the 9 preferred locations

RL – Did so

Bill Lake - 40 houses by 2026 is 3 a year. Is there any way that development can be phased to accord with this rate?

RL - No

Margaret - Meeting Lane/Glebelands – outside BUAB yet accepted as exception site for affordable housing?

RL – yes correct (RL went on to explain the Exception Policy)

Julie Russell – Concern that the 10 affordable houses will not be allocated to Lymptone people

RL – undertook to report back on the EDDC Policy on allocation (Contained in the Q&A)

Jill Cornish – Please clarify the 15/80 houses behind Glebelands

RL – explained why the working party had split the plot into two sections for ease of understanding

Saturday

Mike Bourne - Will Parish refuse permission for sites not identified as part of this exercise? Don’t want large scale development and concern about parking problems.

This response is posted on the Q&A – RL – all sites presented to the PC for their comments (remember they are only Statutory Consultees and not the decision makers) are considered on their merits. If sites are presented are outside the BuAB then they are unlikely to be supported as there is a presumption for non-development – unless they are on the Preferred List. If they are inside the BuAB then there is a presumption for development. BUT all applications for development are considered individually within the policies of EDDC set down in the Local Plan.

Members of the Working Party and Parish Councillors were on hand both days to answer questions one-to-one.