

## Appendix A. East Devon Local Plan Review – Lympstone Community Response Results analysis – 62 responses April 2022

EDDC proposed sites:		Support Y/N
<p>GH/ED/72 North side of Meeting Lane (yellow)</p>	<p>*Part of existing built-up village boundary and close to existing main road.                      *But drainage and road infrastructure remains a concern.                      *As long as care taken to ensure no flooding on Meeting Lane and larger area compared to 73 to allow sports facility.                      *Close to village facilities.                      *Closest sensible large site to develop. Access from Meeting Lane to A376 is dangerous more traffic going up Nutwell.                      *Okay if preserves green space next to Meeting Lane and sports facilities.                      * Possible although it's part of Woodbury but the impact would be expanding Lympstone.                      *Possible good site although it is outside Parish boundary. Low density character dwellings with practical open public space/amenity space/facility. Better access to village than 74 which should be left as green wedge.                      *This makes some sense as this would use existing, uncongested roads with good access onto the A376. However, we would be concerned that this would evolve to 'infill' the land further South, all the way along the A376.</p>	<p>Y: 14                      Maybe 2                      Last resort:1</p>
	<p>*Greenfields not brown field site.                      *And 73 - This land should not be developed – it is all historic farmland, earliest recorded use in 1311, owned by the Dynham family. Much of the land is still in a similar state to how it was then (hedgerows e.g. are around 700 years old). Area has great historic value both nationally and regionally (involvement in events/people such as Thomas Beckett, War of the Roses, Sir Francis Drake, Lord Heathfield/Napoleonic wars). Secondly, in the water basin for the proposed sites lay not only the village (which has historic severe issues with drainage and flooding), but two important Grade II listed buildings – Gulliford and Nutwell, both will be damaged by flooding if the area is developed. Thirdly, the human fallout would be damaging to the local and wider community. As the site is closest to Lympstone, it will have to deal with the schooling (the school already being oversubscribed and lacking adequate facilities). Also the increased traffic will almost certainly result in large-scale traffic issues along the A376, and the increase in traffic will damage the numerous Grade II listed houses along the road. Not in Built up boundary plan.                      * Gulliford (all):                      - prime farming land                      - erasure of local farming culture                      - more traffic on narrow lanes                      - more traffic trying to pull out onto main road at rush hour =&gt; more accidents                      - increase flooding on lanes                      - eroding country village aesthetic will damage our tourism industry (and property prices)                      *And 73 - Greenfields and agricultural land should/must not be built on at a time when food prices are going up. The importance of our natural surroundings must be protected.                      *And 73 – Not walking distance to train or bus stations.                      *And 73 - Using farmland is heart breaking. We need our farmland. The A376 is grid locked now. Far better to infill in the village eg nursery site. Can infrastructure cope? Schools, doctors, hospital, traffic on Nutwell Lane would increase but would still feed the A376.                      *Very steep slope – run off a problem. Fields flood. Not in Lympstone. Would destroy 600+ yr old hedgerows and loss of good quality farmland.                      *And 73,11,74,75 – poor access, flooding down in the village will be caused by concreting over this area.                      *And 73 - Already floods here with what is there already.</p>	<p>N: 37</p>

	<p>*Definitely not – flooding already bad. We need to keep green fields between Lympstone and main road. No gain to Lympstone in money/housing targets. Just flooding, more traffic, overflow of old sewage system. If this is developed, the whole of Gulliford will be developed and Lympstone will double/triple in size and lose its village atmosphere.</p> <p>*Infill of field and rural nature of village – road visibility and access insufficient.</p> <p>*And 73, 11, 74 - Lympstone is already a large village with a frail infrastructure. congestion and traffic management would seem impossible with more housing. Gulliford – keep prime farming land and AONB for agriculture only. The village would lose its historic character. Existing flooding in Gulliford from the lanes already affects my house/land. Anymore would require significant flood defences for a Grade II listed building. An increase of traffic on Harefield Cross/A376 would be dangerous. Already traffic collision schemes are long overdue as traffic in/out of Meeting Lane causes a significant amount of accidents. Dangerous accident hotspot. Not within BUAB set by LNP. Woodbury would benefit from CIL funds but Lympstone would acquire all the problems.</p> <p>*And 73, 11, 74, 75 – in all areas here there is a total lack of infrastructure, no amenities, drainage or sewage outlets. Roads surrounding are already liable to flooding and further traffic on the already congested A376 would be a disaster. Already an accident blackspot St Peters crossroads is a totally ridiculous proposition and areas further into village would be much more appropriate. Not to mention the vast amount of wildlife that would be destroyed. Please, please no!</p> <p>*Being an elevated position at the primary entrance road into the village, additional buildings will disproportionately impact the amenity of the village. Flooding is already a problem on meeting lane during heavy rain, significant drainage improvements should be provided by any developer to prevent any runoff of rainwater onto the existing land and roads.</p> <p>* Heavy traffic on Exmouth Road already. This is poorly planned unsustainable expansion without the necessary infrastructure in place. Poor pedestrian access. Woodland and green spaces extremely valuable for wellbeing and village/countryside feel in Lympstone. Trees. Danger of increasing traffic into village where there is inadequate pedestrian access.</p> <p>*Gulliford-No we shouldn't be building on prime farming land. How will Lympstone deal with more houses. Such a beautiful village being overrun with houses. More flooding on lanes accessing village and more traffic on A376 which is already so busy. Also what about schools, doctors, hospital with influx of people. They are stretched already.</p> <p>* There is currently no safe walking route to Lympstone Station from this site.</p> <p>The development of land that currently absorbs rainfall, and the loss of green space is highly undesirable. This development should include sizeable green space with wild areas, trees, and possibly a community orchard.</p> <p>*And 73, 11, 74, 75 - All these sites are remote from the existing settlement and have dangerous access to the A376 which is already over trafficked.</p> <p>*Lympstone is full.</p> <p>*Grade A arable farmland. No infrastructure, dangerous walk to shop, station 3/4miles 60mph.</p> <p>*Farming land. No infrastructure. Not good roads. Open land. No employment or local shops.</p>	
<p>GH/ED/73 South Side of Meeting Lane (green)</p>	<p>Part of existing built-up village boundary and close to existing main road.</p> <p>*If it has to happen 73/74/75 appear least damaging. But Lympstone needs support to cope.</p> <p>*Close to village facilities.</p> <p>* Flooding is already a problem on meeting lane during heavy rain, significant drainage improvements should be provided by any developer to prevent any runoff of rainwater onto the existing land and roads. Exeter Road &amp; Meeting Lane junction is directly on the brow of a hill, visibility is very poor. Any additional traffic turning will result in increasing delays to the traffic travelling on Exeter Road and increased accidents at the junction due to the volume of traffic and poor visibility. Any developer should be required to provide a direct connection onto Exeter Road. (Jeff Powley)</p>	<p>Y: 11 Last resort:1</p>

	<p>*Possible  *Low density dwelling with green open space. Keep Devon banks. Dwellings well designed with character.</p> <p>*Greenfields not brown field site  *Might support if could be developed for community sports facilities (grassland for drainage). This site gets waterlogged regularly. Also concerned about increased traffic – Strawberry Hill and Meeting Lane.  *Concern about flooding on Meeting Lane which already floods, needs diversion of traffic when flooded and site already very waterlogged.  *How will increased traffic be accommodated.  *Needs safety of A376 access considered. Sports facility would need the flattest part of the area. Should preserve green space along Meeting Lane and Strawberry Hill.  *Nearer built-up area but still the issue of moving Lymptstone to main road and using farming land and increasing flooding and increase traffic on Meeting Lane.  *Possibly lesser of two evils but puts pressure on very dangerous road junction at Exmouth Rd.  * Small access. Local public owned amenities already oversubscribed. Green area in keeping with a village rather than Exeter suburbs. Green space for well-being now increasingly valuable and shared.  * I don't believe there is currently safe pedestrian access to Lymptstone Station or to the bus route from this site.  A development of this size needs some additional infrastructure.  The development of land that currently absorbs rainfall, and the loss of green space is highly undesirable. This development should include sizeable green space with wild areas, trees, and possibly a community orchard.  *Lymptstone is full.  *Sewage, utilities overloaded. No one walks 3/4miles to very limited shop on roads with no path.  Open land, last North of Lymptstone to the boundary. Open countryside. No shops all ---- no path (K Rogers)  *We would be concerned that this would evolve to 'infill' the land further South, all the way along the A376.</p>	<p>N: 40</p>
<p>Lymp 11 Field  NE of St  Peters Cross  (red)</p>	<p>*The junction of Harefield Road / Exeter Road &amp; Meeting Lane is directly on the brow of a hill, visibility is very poor. Any additional traffic turning will result in increasing delays to the traffic travelling on Exeter road and increased accidents at the junction due to the volume of traffic and poor visibility. Significant improvements (such as 4 -way traffic lights &amp; a pedestrian crossing) will be needed. A separate dedicated footpath for pedestrians should be provided, noting that many of the young children living in the new houses may attend the Lymptstone Primary school. (Jeff Powley)  *This makes some sense as this would use existing, uncongested roads with good access onto the A376.</p>	<p>Y: 6</p>
	<p>*Too small and too dangerous – crossing A376, brow of hill.  *Dangerous site – new residents will have to cross the road to get into the village – extremely dangerous spot/area of road already (with numerous accidents a year). Not in built-up area. If the council are going to build housing in the middle of nowhere, develop infrastructure and develop housing villages in lower-density areas. Again, flooding down at the Gulliford dip (drain system is already antiquated), and traffic increase.  * Proud of the accident and near miss reporting form on Lymptstone.org ? want more use out of it? Build here!  *This is already a dangerous road junction.  *Dangerous access.  *As above, access on to A376 would need attention – dangerous crossroads.  *Very difficult junction to enter A376. Hill too steep to allow traffic lights – heavy lorries would struggle.  *St Peters cross too dangerous for this development.</p>	<p>N: 47</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Wrong side of main road.</li> <li>*Already a dangerous crossing over A376, no pavement.</li> <li>*Dangerous place for bus stop, entire A376 no pedestrian pavement, no verge or room for pavement, disjointed from village.</li> <li>*Stupid idea – takes 10minutes to cross the main road now = more accidents = fatal to pedestrians.</li> <li>*Green fields in rural area and increased pressure on road network.</li> <li>*No easy access to facilities, dangerous road for pedestrians trying to get to the village. No public transport.</li> <li>* Poor access on dangerous crossroads at brow of hill. In green areas which should be protected.</li> <li>* Dreadful position on wrong side of main road (A376) with no safe access to the village.</li> <li>*Lympstone is full.</li> <li>*More cars on road, zero infrastructure.</li> <li>*Dangerous road, no infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
GH/ED/74 East Side of Strawberry Hill (yellow)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Part of existing built-up village boundary and close to existing main road.</li> <li>*Access should be directly to Exeter Road, not the narrow strawberry hill or other existing roads (Jeff Powley)</li> <li>*Possible</li> </ul>	Y: 8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Greenfields not brown field site.</li> <li>* Historic farmland, same issues with flooding, this time down at Longbrook and Pretty Corner. Oversubscription of village services. Increase in traffic on A376. Public transport system (trains and buses) are not developed enough to be able to provide a realistic alternative to cars.</li> <li>* No. farmland.</li> <li>*Unless considerable consideration/development to road infrastructure. A376 not suitable for vast volumes of more houses.</li> <li>*Would increase traffic significantly on narrow road (Strawberry Hill) and make A376 junction busy/dangerous.</li> <li>*In coastal preservation area. Difficult to make safe access on to A376.</li> <li>*Would extend across primary agricultural land.</li> <li>*And 75 – More enclosed within built up area but still on farmland and still moving built up area to meet A376.</li> <li>*And 75 – dangerous exits onto main road or adding pressure on dangerous Meeting Lane/Exmouth Road junction.</li> <li>* There is currently no safe walking route to Lympstone Station from this site.</li> </ul> <p>This development should include sizeable green space with wild areas, trees, and possibly a community orchard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Lympstone is full.</li> <li>*Should be a green wedge – gateway into village. Wildlife corridor. If developed housing would sprawl along A376/across Parish boundaries.</li> </ul> <p>No footpaths to village, poor access. Green wedge. Estuary views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*PC must consider the detrimental impact development would have if 72, 73,74,75 was approved for development would change the demographics of the village. And would be overdevelopment and connect parish boundaries, development along A376 allowing Exeter – Exmouth to almagamte; similar to Topsham. GH/ED74 kept as green wedge, important, village gateway.</li> <li>*More cars on road, zero infrastructure.</li> <li>*This is the least preferred option. It would create a large area of ribbon development along the A376, located a long way from the amenities at the centre of the village.</li> </ul>	N: 41
GH/ED/75 Rear of Grange Close (brown)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Part of existing built-up village boundary and close to existing main road.</li> <li>*Access should be directly to Exeter Road, not the narrow strawberry hill or other existing roads (Jeff Powley)</li> <li>*Possible</li> <li>*Poor access and in flood zone. Could accommodate 3-4 dwellings not to link with 74 as part of close.</li> </ul>	Y: 11 One or two houses: 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Greenfields not brown field site.</li> <li>* Farmland. Same reasons as above.</li> <li>*See 72/73, 74 above. This is productive agricultural land and grazing pasture.</li> <li>*If there is only a few sensible sized properties. Not massive houses.</li> <li>*This is rear to Meadow Close not Grange Close. No access to any roads currently. Not in village plan.</li> <li>*This area has no access, much of this area is steep sloping and along increasingly busy road so building in poor air quality zone. Also destroy views from A376 heading to Exmouth.</li> <li>*No. Keep as farmland.</li> <li>* I don't think this development should be considered GH/ED/74, but in its own right. Unsuitable access.</li> <li>*Destroys green area. A376 \traffic increase.</li> <li>*Lympstone is full.</li> <li>*Lympstone cannot take all this over development.</li> <li>*This is the least preferred option. It would create a large area of ribbon development along the A376, located a long way from the amenities at the centre of the village.</li> </ul>	<p>Last resort: 1</p> <p>N: 35</p>
<p>Lymp 04 Church Road (next to Nursery site) (brown)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Appropriate infill. Danger of increasing flooding on a historic flood plain, but if adequate systems are put in place in this area, then it shouldn't be too bad a problem.</li> <li>*Adjacent to latest development.</li> <li>*Could be small houses for elderly as near the centre.</li> <li>*Now nurseries site have been built on this makes sense. Infill okay.</li> <li>*An obvious and good area of infill with easy access to village.</li> <li>*And 01, 02, 06 – these areas are more suitable for development.</li> </ul>	<p>Y: 8</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Village green. Green wedge.</li> <li>*Have we learnt nothing from the nursery site being spoilt by vast executive homes?</li> <li>*Access to 04 is currently dangerous. This does provide community benefits shop, café, socialising, and the community will miss out from losing this site. Dangerous access from Goodmores farm. Further hedgerow destruction and loss of habitat. (Andrew &amp; Theresa Holland)</li> <li>*Already over built.</li> <li>*No realistic access to road through village.</li> <li>*Allows back garden infill sets a precedent that ends up being repeated everywhere.</li> <li>*Flood plain and poor access.</li> <li>*Not shown on map, assumed to be next to new estate being built on old nursery site. This was not presented to the village when the approvals for the new estate on the nursery were being sought, effectively extending this site will result in significant overdevelopment in the cultural centre of the village resulting in a significant detriment to the village amenity.</li> <li>*This is the village green which has to remain as part of the conditions of the new houses which have just been built</li> <li>* Can't identify on map. Recent development already taken away from countryside village feel.</li> <li>* This is 03 in dark green?? Unsuitable to infill here.</li> <li>* As it not a condition of the permission for development of this nursery site that this was to remain permanent amenity land?</li> <li>*Access still as bad as previous application was refused. Now even more traffic in Church Rd.</li> </ul>	<p>N: 44</p>

	<p>*Lympstone is full.          *Lympstone cannot take all this over development.          *Leave as amenity space.</p>	
<p>Lymp 01 Land rear of Underhill Cres (brown)</p>	<p>*Close to village.          *Other housing nearby.          *Close to village, not overlooked, easy access to amenities.          *Infill. Good for bungalows and housing for older people.          *Good infill.          *Lymp 01 is a small site approx. 1.5 acres in area located immediately adjacent to an existing defined settlement. The site is approx. 200 metres from the centre of Lympstone Village, the Village shop/post office and Lympstone railway station. Access to the Exe Trail (for cycling or walking) is adjacent to the railway station. The site is approx. 5 minutes' walk from the Village School and Village Hall. A GPs surgery is located about 2 minutes' walk from the site.          Site Lymp 01 consists of an existing house with rear garden and two approx. half acre paddocks, one to the East of the house garden and one to the West. The West paddock is level, while the East paddock has a slight slope from South to North.          The land is enclosed by existing housing located to the North, East, and West. I understand that a planning decision is pending concerning an application for part residential status relating to an agricultural field to the South of the East paddock.          Site Lymp 01 is approx. 25 metres above sea level, exceptionally well drained and not subject to flooding. An ancient earth bank and hedge exists at the South boundary; this provides nesting facilities for birds in the Spring and a burrowing facility for the occasional rabbit. For many years, during the summer months, the paddocks have been grazed by a horse, which is now 30 years old.          Each paddock has established access via a short made-up private drive, each approx. 12 feet wide. The drive to the West paddock is located at the top of Underhill Close, while the drive to the East paddock is located at the East side of the existing house from Underhill Crescent. The house has an independent access drive from Underhill Crescent.          There is a direct connection to the existing mains sewerage system in the East paddock and another direct connection to the mains sewerage system in the private drive to the West Paddock. Services (electricity, gas, water, communications cables etc.) are located adjacent to the driveway entrances. Any connection to services would result in negligible disruption to public pavement areas.          I believe that each paddock could accommodate two low profile sensitively designed bungalow type dwellings, each dwelling located on approx. a quarter of an acre of land. If a fifth dwelling is mandatory, it could be accommodated on a quarter acre plot to the South of the existing house, possibly as a small annex to the house or a separate bungalow type dwelling on its own plot.          Because of the South site location, each dwelling could be environmentally designed to be carbon neutral by incorporating solar panels, a ground source heat pump, and a rechargeable battery system. Vehicle parking, with electric charging, could easily be provided at each site, thus avoiding car parking on the Village roads. Rainwater runoff from roof areas, etc. could be accommodated by soakaways located at each individual site.          The site was adjacent to the designated Lympstone built up area boundary and within the green wedge designated area. However, in the light of the Planning Inspectorate's decision concerning a similar area of land to the West of this site and to the South of Underhill Close (Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/W/21/3282445), I understand that the categorisations may be changed?          I do not believe that the site is within a Coastal Protection Area. I believe that the Coastal Protection Area boundary is located to the South of the ancient hedge boundary at the South of site Lymp. 01.          I believe that low profile environmentally designed dwellings on site Lymp 01 are fully sustainable, would fully utilise the somewhat dead grassland land areas and I support development on this site.</p>	<p>Y: 14          Maybe:1</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*and 02 - These might be possible but access is difficult.</li> <li>*if this is the car park at the top of Underhill – think small development less than 10 would be okay.</li> <li>*Minimum development.</li> <li>*Will fill in the end of the crescent.</li> <li>*Also a good site – homes would be located close to all village amenities, in the heart of the village rather than on the periphery.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*In green wedge – need to increase green wedge, not build on it.</li> <li>*Heavy rainfall catchment zone. If developed and paved, the water would flood down to pretty corner. Water infrastructure needs addressing before development commences. Similarly public transport infrastructure needs to be improved.</li> <li>*And Lymp02 Such pockets of land maintain the pastoral character of the village – vital both for local people and visitors.</li> <li>*Again, maybe if they are not oversized.</li> <li>*In Green wedge.</li> <li>*Loss of green wedge should be avoided. Increase traffic in wrong part of the village.</li> <li>*Concerned about adding pressure to access and parking in Underhill area and on car park.</li> <li>*Unsuitable due to increased traffic at Junction of Underhill Crescent and Underhill (recent removal of double yellow lines has made this junction more hazardous due to parked cars blocking views of drives, cyclists and pedestrians). Mains drainage for Underhill Crescent is nearing capacity, increasing number of houses may require significant improvement works – a cost that should be borne by the developers. Being an elevated position in the village, additional buildings will disproportionately impact the amenity of the village.</li> <li>* Restricted access In Coastal Preservation Area In green wedge.</li> <li>* Development in the green wedge should not be allowed.</li> </ul> <p>This site is also in a coastal preservation area and should not be permitted. It is vital to keep the village separate from surrounding communities and to preserve the coastal area..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Lympstone is full.</li> </ul>	N: 34
Lymp 02 Land of Clay Lane /Church Path (brown)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*And 06, 07, 08 – All have good access roads and are large enough for development of more houses rather than many small developments.</li> <li>*Perfect site as it's a brownfield site/industrial site currently with good access within a built-up area.</li> <li>*Small housing.</li> <li>*This is the most ideal site, if we have to have development in the village – it would create homes located to all village amenities, the railway station, in the heart of the village rather than on the periphery.</li> </ul>	Y: 10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Restricted access for cars, adjacent to green wedge.</li> <li>*Poor access for cars and construction traffic.</li> <li>*Poor access for cars, traffic increase in wrong zones.</li> <li>*Infill. Traffic in lanes would increase and be a problem.</li> <li>*Concerned about pedestrian only access making it not inclusive for people with restricted mobility and car parking pressures and flood plain at bottom chicane (?Fiona Whilding) and wildlife.</li> <li>*Unsuitable due to increased traffic on Underhill (presumed the only potential access), this is a single-track lane with no passing places or pedestrian footpath. This is well frequented green area of the village; additional buildings will disproportionately impact the amenity of the village.</li> <li>* Restricted access for cars Possible flood risk.</li> <li>* Already limited walks in countryside. Village risks becoming a town suburb vs beautiful country village. This links devon way. Poor access roads to it. Bad for environment or locals well-being .</li> </ul>	N: 37

	<p>* A key green area within the village. More suitable as a community green space such as a community orchard. Development here likely to exacerbate flood risk, whereas retaining this as a wildlife area and community orchard would enhance the village.</p> <p>*Lympstone is full.</p>	
Lymp 06 Courtland Lane Nursery site (brown)	<p>*Good site – away from village so will not damage the historic beauty of the area. Brownfield site that has already been partially built-up.</p> <p>*Hasn't been a nursery in decades. Would be a good site.</p> <p>* 5- 10 properties not 30-40.</p> <p>*Using semi commercial land to turn to residential would be good.</p> <p>*Unsure – brown field site so maybe preferable but Courtlands Lane not suitable for lots of additional traffic.</p> <p>*Perfect site. Brown field site, good access, infilling but not extending village to A376.</p> <p>*Courtland lane requires improvements to accommodate the additional traffic, such as larger and more frequent passing places for cars and lorries and a permanent pedestrian only footpath. (jeff Powley)</p> <p>*Small development would be preferable than derelict unsightly greenhouses. Would not be detrimental to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>*This area is an eyesore. Small development is good.</p> <p>*Brown field fill in.</p>	Y: 18 (1) Very few houses
	<p>*Access via green wedge if built on. Gives precedent for losing green wedge.</p> <p>*And Lymp07 - Fiercely protecting and increasing the green wedge is vital to protect natural habitat and prevent ribbon development merging with Exmouth.</p> <p>*And 07 - If houses built are a normal size for normal families at an affordable price to buy.</p> <p>*Part of green wedge.</p> <p>*And 07 – explosion of green belt and separation (?Fiona Whilding) from Exmouth to retain character. Another dangerous access point onto Exmouth Road and pressure on village amenities including sewage etc.</p> <p>* Traffic would increase in Courtlands lane which is narrow with a sharp bed and not suitable for increased traffic. Green wedge, difficult access.</p> <p>* Destroy east Devon way and walk. Traffic too high already.</p> <p>* Would generate considerable additional traffic on the narrow village lanes. Should not be considered. This would be an ideal site for community wilding to maintain green space as an amenity for community wellbeing.</p> <p>* As GH/ED/72 – remote from existing settlements an green wedge.</p> <p>*Lympstone is full.</p>	N: 32
Lymp 07 North side of Courtlands Lane	<p>*Good site – away from village so will not damage the historic beauty of the area. Brownfield site that has already been partially built-up.</p> <p>*Good access.</p> <p>*Great to provide sporting facility for village sport. Footpaths linking to the village.</p> <p>*Potential access to A376 – Courtlands Lane not potential access. Would need to improve access to village centre.</p> <p>*Perfect site, all Lympstone housing needs could be here at the end of link road.</p> <p>*Yes or empty room for housing and green open spaces (K Rogers)</p>	Y: 11
	<p>Green wedge – no building.</p> <p>*Inspector said not suitable for development. Not in walking distance to train and bus stations.</p> <p>*Large site. Would accommodate a lot of houses but useful farmland which we shouldn't lose.</p> <p>*Part of green wedge, poor road access. Remote from village.</p> <p>Farmland - no. Extending village to A376.</p>	N: 37



	<p>*The local lanes would not be able to safely support an increase in traffic for these sized developments without providing a separate pedestrian only footway and widening the road to accommodate two-way traffic. This site will overwhelm the section of the East Devon Way and significantly reduce village amenity.</p> <p>* This is an expansion of Exmouth rather than Lympstone and would start encroaching on Green wedge land.</p> <p>* Destroy east Devon way scenery. Few fields separating from Exmouth. More traffic on Exmouth Road. Limited local PT.</p> <p>* Strongly opposed to this idea.</p> <p>a) this is green wedge land between Lympstone and Exmouth. Green wedge land should not be considered.</p> <p>b) Courtlands Lane is very narrow throughout, but this is especially dangerous at Courtlands Cross because of traffic unable to progress into or out of this single car width lane.</p> <p>* As GH/ED/72 – remote from existing settlements and green wedge.</p> <p>*Co-joins Lympstone to Exmouth.</p> <p>*Lympstone is full.</p> <p>*In particular we are against any development at site: lym 06, 07 and 08. Lymp 07; 10 to 8 years ago the PC along with the people of Lympstone fought hard to halt the proposed development of the fields North of Courtlands Lane. The reasons why we fought and won the battle with the developer have not changed in the intervening years. The plot of land is a green field site in open countryside and any development would be detrimental in character and appearance to the surrounding area which is designated ‘an area of great landscape value’. Any development here would bring into the green wedge and threaten the environment. Further development would no doubt follow which would engulf the village of Lympstone.</p> <p>*Important green wedge.</p> <p>*This would effectively merge the built up areas of Exmouth and Lympstone together, and result in Lympstone losing its separate physical identity.</p>	
<p>Lymp 08 Summer Lane J/W Hulham Road (brown)</p>	<p>*If small scale okay.</p> <p>*Near to Exmouth employment.</p>	<p>Y: 8</p>
	<p>*Removed from village and town centres, Dinan way extension. No infrastructure, increase traffic, no footpaths or cycle paths. No mains sewage, flooding risk area, near/adjacent to AONB, farmland, green wedge.</p> <p>*No, summer lane is already impossible to navigate. Grade I listed ALR and PIV chapel are nearby and might cause issues. In order to get to either Lymp or Exmouth residents would have to deal with either Hulham or A376. Better N developing more inside Exmouth/ more flats than building on greenfield site land and expanding the town towards the villages.</p> <p>*Dangerous access on Summer Lane.</p> <p>*Keep this a green wedge.</p> <p>*Only feasible if Dinan Way extension is implemented.</p> <p>*Site disjointed for village and transport.</p> <p>*Farmland – no.</p> <p>*Summer lane is far too narrow to safely accommodate the existing traffic, which will get much worse when the new Goodmores farm estate is completed – years before the new Dinnan way extension is built (if ever).</p> <p>* Green Belt. Sites on the other side of A376 and would have no direct link to the village centre and its amenities. Traffic is very difficult on Summer lane which is a narrow country lane. The Dinan Way link road needs to be built to reduce traffic on Summer lane and Wotton lane – currently extremely dangerous.</p> <p>*Development of countryside and fields. Important to all locals who have selected to live in the countryside.</p>	<p>N: 40</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Opposed to any development in the Green Belt. It is there to protect the village.</li> <li>Access/safety very difficult so close to this junction with not enough room for cars to pass here on this busy single car width lane</li> <li>* As GH/ED/72 – remote from existing settlements an green wedge.</li> <li>*Co-joins Lympstone to Exmouth.</li> <li>*Lympstone is full.</li> <li>*Important green wedge.</li> </ul>	
<p>Lymp 09 Hulham Road (top of Exe View Rd) (brown)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*And 10/15 – As there is the Goodmores Farm site this land would make sense.</li> <li>*Small scale okay but some concerns over addition road on road network and reliance on car.</li> <li>*Close to local facilities.</li> <li>*These make sense for large developments as they would avail of facilities in Exmouth, without destroying the scale, identity and character of Lympstone.</li> </ul>	<p>Y: 9</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Removed from village and town centres, Dinan way extension. No infrastructure, increase traffic, no footpaths or cycle paths. No mains sewage, flooding risk area, near/adjacent to AONB, farmland, green wedge.</li> <li>*Same as above. Historic farmland, with Grade II buildings along. Buildings will be visible for all around. Encroaching on Common land.</li> <li>*And Lymp10/15 – productive pasture/agricultural land. Not on main sewerage. Would increase flood risk. No footpaths, bus route, pavement etc. remote from village centre and from Exmouth. Too close and threatening to AONB. Threat to protected trees. Unustainable including excess traffic pressures, drs surgery, secondary school etc.</li> <li>*And Lymp 10/15 - Lack of infrastructure, distance from town, proximity to Woodbury common, safety on road.</li> <li>*And Lymp 10/15 – sites are wholly unsustainable – requiring car journeys for all requirements. No bus routes, away from Exmouth. Impact on countryside and are outside of development boundary.</li> <li>*And10/15 – Highly inappropriate – not sustainable. Not near ‘town’ centre.</li> <li>*And 10/15 – totally unsustainable. Volume of traffic, water from the common, lack of public transport and facilities. Trees and wildlife to be protected. Wildlife driven this way from Goodmores.</li> <li>*Neighbour unique woodland. Exe view should be protected as AONB. All types of wildlife threatened horse/bridleways. Where will development stop if North of Goodmores Farm.</li> <li>*And 10/15 – Already overdeveloped with Goodmores.</li> <li>*And 10/15 - Not connected to transport. Remote from village.</li> <li>*This is serious overdevelopment of the pebble heath general area.</li> <li>* Green Belt. Significant water runoff from the common is absorbed by these fields which would increase the risk of flooding further down the valley if built on. Sites on the other side of A376 and would have no direct link to the village centre and its amenities. Traffic is very difficult on Wotton Lane which is a narrow country lane. The Dinan Way link road needs to be built to reduce traffic on Summer lane and Wotton lane – currently extremely dangerous.</li> <li>*In countryside</li> <li>* This is close to other dwellings, on opposite side of road, but currently undeveloped. No access to village amenities as closer to Exmouth.</li> <li>*and 10/15 - remote from existing settlements - lack of infrastructure (no gas, no mains drainage) - the road is already too busy for horses, walkers and cyclists without footpaths or cycle paths - development would just make it worse - there is a risk of surface water flooding- there is already substantial run off through Logwood and Yonder Thatch.</li> <li>*Lympstone is full.</li> <li>*Important green wedge.</li> </ul>	<p>N: 39</p>

	<p>*Development here would ruin this tranquil rural area. Water run off from the common already leads to flash floods in the winter with regular ingress to out buildings.</p>	
<p>Lymp 10/15 Hulham Road North side (15 leads to 10) (brown)</p>	<p>*Adjacent to Goodmores farm so would make sense. *14/15 South of Hulham Road makes sense to join with Goodmores farm development infill of buildings along that road. *Close to local facilities. *These make sense for large developments as they would avail of facilities in Exmouth, without destroying the scale, identity and character of Lympstone.</p>	Y: 9
	<p>Removed from village and town centres, Dinan way extension. No infrastructure, increase traffic, no footpaths or cycle paths. No mains sewage, flooding risk area, near/adjacent to AONB, farmland, green wedge. *TPOs on tree line all on Hulham Rd. this is used as a 'rat-run' with drivers often exceeding 40mph. Horse signs all up road. Poor road drainage. Close to pebbled common. *Erosion of green space and impact on AONB. Poor access/transport routes. *This is serious overdevelopment of the pebble heath general area. It is noted that the large solar farms are only marked with a symbol on the map, these are large, industrialised areas and should be considered as such when further development in the vicinity is considered. *Green Belt Sites on the other side of A376 and would have no direct link to the village centre and its amenities. Traffic is very difficult on Wotton Lane which is a narrow country lane. The Dinan Way link road needs to be built to reduce traffic on Summer lane and Wotton lane – currently extremely dangerous. * Green areas. Near views of east Devon way. * This is also close to other dwellings, on opposite side of road, but currently undeveloped. No access to village amenities as closer to Exmouth. *Over – development (once Goodmores is finished). *Lympstone is full. *Important green wedge.</p>	N: 38
Additional sites/pockets of land to consider: (please add your own ideas)		
<p>Garage site in Courtlands Lane</p>	<p>*Similar to Nursery on Courtlands – using brownfield/ non- agri/parkland to develop that won't damage the nucleus of the village/ historic buildings. Issue with drainage and transport long-term will need to be considered. *Good site, brownfield site. *Very good site – already industrial. *A good site to put forward. *Would be good to use semi commercial land to change to residential. *Brown field site so makes sense. *Perfect site in amalgamation with Nursery site – brown field site, good access, flat land. *Encourage development here due to an industrial/brownfield site with good access and already within a built-up area. The existing infrastructure can withhold an increase in development here. * No more than 3 houses. * Ideal area for tree planting to create a public amenity for wellbeing as well as wit the potential to link to the East Devon Way. *With Lymp 06 – small development would enhance the area/road rather than old cars/derelict greenhouses. *This area has been spoiling Courtlands Lane for a long time, maybe a couple of bungalows. *Brownfield site.</p>	Y: 17

	<p>*Green wedge</p> <p>*If only a few for normal people. Local people not for incomers to buy.</p> <p>*Lympstone is full.</p>	N: 13
Exmouth brownfield sites eg old post office	*With significant changes of use in retail post-covid, many more suitable plots in brownfield plots.	Y: 1
Areas Exmo 07 and Exmo 14	These areas could enable a high number of houses to be built and join existing community, infrastructure and public services. Schools, transport as long as wildlife habitats and carbon neutral homes were considered and not to be determined of village and houses to the top road (Budleigh Salterton).	Y: 1
Lymp 11	Not listed above, this would have massive impacts on the listed Al La Ronde national trust house and garden directly opposite and would culturally destroy local heritage. Summer lane is far too narrow to safely accommodate the existing traffic, which will get much worse when the new Goodmores farm estate is completed – years before the new Dinnan way extension is built (if ever). (jeff Powley)	N: 1
	Almost all the sites are outside the new Built Up Area Boundary as per the Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan.	
New town somewhere else entirely which provides better work opportunities and infrastructure?	<p>*The best option near/on existing infrastructure, routes to work etc.</p> <p>*There are not the jobs in Lympstone to support an expanded population, so new occupants will be commuting out of the village along narrow lanes meant for horse &amp; carriage, and eating higher priced, less fresh food that had to be imported because you built over all the local farmland.</p> <p>*Infrastructure, closer to Junction 29 of M5 has to be put in place anyway so makes more sense to build to a more structured plan in that area.</p> <p>*Maybe a small town not a big town like Cranbrook.</p> <p>*Also near railway.</p> <p>* Cranbrook is the model for this scalable rear existing road/rail links (infrastructure again) (Michael Belotti)</p> <p>*The reason that people live and have always lived in this area is for the outstanding beauty, historic green farmland and 'quaintness' of the villages/towns and even cities. To then capitalise on this and build large housing estates in every popular village and town in the region will only line the pockets of developers, and create soulless, now unloved built-up zones. Rather than tacking on ill-thought through housing estates to historic and beautiful zones, it makes much more sense to develop new towns and communities in areas where there is nothing but old brownfield/ low quality greenfield sites. Furthermore, the council should be looking at developing the areas we already have rather than building. In most developed countries, the solution to housing crises is not to expand, but rather to redevelop the buildings they have – knock down the low-quality bungalows and houses and rebuilt 3 or 4 story apartment blocks – which have been considerably built-in traditional styles (or at least not in a brutalist 20th C manner). With care, these sites will be perfectly accessible, and will be already in the local towns so the infrastructure for amenities will already be present. Finally, there is a reason that many of these proposed sites have not been built on in the 2000+ year history of the area – they are unsuitable sites. Gulliford, for example, is made up of historic water-fields (which flood every spring to germinate the crops). Many of these reasons and historic understandings of the land around us has been lost in the last century as people moved away from the land and the world modernised. However, many of us still understand the land and understand what the councils don't – and so can see the severe issues which are being created by over-development.</p> <p>*The most sensible and strategic way forward is to provide affordable housing within a short commute to Exeter. This is where the jobs are!</p> <p>*Would need careful thought and consideration as there have been issues at Cranbrook and in Plymouth.</p> <p>*A376 is very congested at rush hours. A new development away from this road should/must have access to a mass transit system.</p> <p>*new town near Exeter along axis with Cranbrook/Honiton/Axminster. Need large town to take pressure off green fields.</p>	Y: 22

	<p>*Infrastructure in Lypstone is poor e.g. roads/pavements/drainage. Exit to main road at Meeting Lane, Strawberry Hill junction is very dangerous and needs addressing asap.</p> <p>*Agree limits need to be established for Lypstone.</p> <p>*Closer to main road and access to Exeter and M5.</p> <p>*Travel from Lypstone will be overwhelmed by more houses, trains and buses are already overwhelmed.</p> <p>*Lypstone is full. No room for any more developments. So is Budleigh or Woodbury. We are full.</p> <p>*Yes – we shouldn't be extending villages with pockets of housing or using valuable farmland. A new town near Exeter with good infrastructure for low carbon travel would be much more sensible. It would also stop the traffic issues on A376.</p> <p>*In theory this sounds more sensible if a site can be found where infrastructure can be built to make it sustainable and not add pressure to existing amenities. However, all road networks in East Devon lead to Sidmouth or Exmouth road and grid lock.</p> <p>*Keeping our existing historic villages is crucial to the preservation of Devon's villages and AONB. A new town would be better located, lose to an area with employment and a better infrastructure, such as schools, healthcare and transportation. Lypstone is already too congested.</p> <p>* I would support this if it was built with infrastructure which often seems to be missed after the approval has gone through. In Budleigh or Woodbury.</p> <p>*Near airport/science park – ideal opportunity to extend rail link to include airport/Exeter 'garden village' good design, mix of housing to include green open space – footpaths/cycle links. Better access to A30/M5.</p> <p>*A new town would solve so many problems. It will have all the things that building in Lypstone cannot provide. We can't cope with the building we have now.</p> <p>*Yes, it would make sense to build a small village with everything from school, doctors, roads and football fields.</p>	
	<p>*Would not consider unless as an alternative to suggested sites in and around Lypstone.</p> <p>* Not quite sure of this statement but I think the benefits of village life have been evident in covid times. I recognise there is a lot of opportunity with people wanting to move to these areas. However, the village life is unsustainable with the loss of green spaces and poorly planned mass expansion of housing.</p> <p>*What about enlarging Cranbrook? Also, both Lypstone and Exmouth have very limited areas for development because of the river and the sea whereas inland town/villages have 360 degree development potential.</p> <p>*It seems very unwise to be proposing such substantial development in Lypstone, Exmouth or anywhere that feeds into the A376 and would rely on it as its main route to Exeter and the rest of the country. Given that there is already much housing in Lypstone and Exmouth, it would take away green space (Unless brown field sites can be built on) and make the whole area feel more built up and less rural. I suggest a new town should be located in an area where there is ample green space, near to substantial road and railway links. I suggest the area to the West of Escot around Larkbeare, between the A30 and the railway line, with a new railway station and exit off the A30. I also recommend further development around Rockbeare/Exeter Airport area as this is particularly well supported by good transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>N: 4</p>

Please also record any community benefits/assets/facilities below that you would like the developer to consider including in return for building on land. E.g sports facilities, public car park etc.

\*This is the perfect opportunity to create a green wedge from Lympstone village to Lympstone common and create footpaths and cycle paths between the village and the AONB, adjacent to the newly purchased Woodland Trust land. Maybe a country park type area linking the village to the common (both Lympstone). A strategic alternative natural green space (SANGS).

\*Historic beauty sites must be protected and not overly developed. Similarly the great number of grade II and I sites must be protected. If some areas will be developed, the transport issue must be addressed as it is not feasible for the new residents to all have and use cars frequently on roads barely able to handle horses. If there is going to be development in Lympstone/Exmouth – the council need to act to petition GWR and sort the rail line, which is antiquated and wasn't able to handle the number of users in the 1960s (Beechings report).

\* There are no community benefits that could outweigh the costs of new developments. The only benefits are for the landowners, developers, and government quotas, not the current residents you represent.

\*We all know that this never happens. Protecting, nurturing and extending our green spaces is what's needed. Extending the green wedge from the lower part of Lympstone village right up to Lympstone common AONB. Facilitating non-vehicular access with footpaths, cycle/bridle paths would benefit local people and visitors alike. Investigate achieving 'Country Park' status or a Strategic Alternative Natural Green Space through which the East Devon Way could be re-directed.

\*None – I can't think of a benefit to the local community to.....???? (Grant something, Marley Hayes)

\*Bus stop, cycle paths, path to walk into village, football pitch, outdoor green space, internet, bungalows, self-build.

\*Footpaths, cycle paths, orchard, pond.

\*Car parking please.

\*Land for community housing.

\*Road improvements, school, GP

\*I believe that the most strategic and sustainable approach is to ensure developers provide adequate cycle and walking routes.

\*School is at capacity, doctors and hospitals too. More sports facilities needed and another public car park would be a benefit.

\*Sports facilities close to centre (with walking distance). Should extend green wedge to the common (part of wildlife corridor).

\*More sports facilities would be highly desirable to cater for all ages. We do not cater for young people – a skate park makes a great social space too – Exminster facility is a great example. Petanque for all ages and outdoor table tennis.

\*Football and cricket pitches.

\*Paths to support pedestrians and cyclists get from centre to other areas of Lympstone.

\*Any property built should have a loft tank collecting rainwater from guttering for use for flushing toilet. This will in a small way help reduce the risk of flooding. As Tesco say 'every little helps'. All land is needed for nature and to absorb water, concrete and brick does not.

\*Cycle tracks, charging points. All properties must be net zero – PV panels, ground source heating. Car parking.

\*The village would certainly benefit from purpose built sports facilities and convenience store. Careful consideration given to road infrastructure to support any increase in traffic.

Most of the roads in the village are not suited or designed for heavy flow of traffic.

\*The village needs better sports facilities in form of football and cricket pitches.

\*Sports/exercise/walking space. NB development should be strategic and focus on good transport and commuter links e.g. A303 and A35.

\*Sports/open space. Provision of new houses should be focused on better location and with good communication/transport/commuter links to Exeter and beyond.

\*Sport facility at Courtlands Lane.

\*Sports centre/fields for sports such as football, tennis, cricket and rugby. Parking area as village centre for visitors.

\*I can't see that they will do anything. Very little space for a house let alone any extra. Lympstone is full. You cannot create land to build on when there is none.

\*Preservation of views/retention of village character. Sports pitches. Improved parking. Improved footpaths/cycle paths – safety. Have to have improved infrastructure with improved traffic management on A376.

\*Cricket pitch/pavilion, football facilities, mixed sports.

\*If we consider more housing, we need to sort out the old, overloaded sewage system. Need more public parking so car park. How is the school/doctors surgery going to expand to cater for all the new families.

\*Any development must include sufficient car parking for the properties and visitor parking to prevent pressure in the village. Sewage must be sized to stand alone/not add pressure to severely undersized network. Any development should offer improvement to Exmouth Road access points.

\*Road improvements to alleviate the significant increase in traffic (this does not mean a few more cycle routes painted on the roads or a reduction in village speed limits), all new properties should have sufficient parking for the residents, 2 parking spaces for a 4 bedroom house is woefully inadequate. Multiple existing footpaths cross some of these areas, footpaths routes should not be diverted or be lengthened to suit the desires of the developers. Significant tree planting in and around the new estates (not just a few token stems, many hundreds if not thousands depending on the size of the estate) to improve aesthetics, with agreed tree types (ideally evergreen) to slightly mitigate the impacts on wildlife. Exe estuary cycle path should be routed over or away from the village. The hourly bus service to the outlying parts of the village (no 56) is insufficient for the numbers of houses being considered, developers should be required to provide long term a much more extensive service to reduce car usage an inevitable consequence of so many new houses.

\* The green wedge between Exmouth and Lympstone is important to retain definition of the two areas. More pedestrian and cycle paths would be welcome.

\* These should be built prior to the houses. Sports facilities is a consideration but large open green spaces is the biggest need eg fields/ woodland. Space for school expansion both for increasing building size and outdoor resources. Pavements all the way into village prior to additional traffic.

\*I can't think of any benefit which would compensate for the detriment. Almost all the proposed sites are remote from the existing town or village centres, are without infrastructure and encroach on existing green wedge/amenity sites.

\*Paths for walking safely needed – no pavements on most roads of (older) Lympstone and the traffic increases, quality and speed, mean risky walking (Lockdown exercise was bliss!).

\*Dedicated sports field for football – perhaps 'G5' pitch (bring in income) MUGA court, indoor badminton, table tennis, petanque/bowls. Any development must be of good character, design, green verges, green open spaces. Good footpath, cycle, bridleway links to connect with others plus to Woodbury Common. Keep village identity not sprawling along A376 towards Exeter or Exmouth, as seen with Topsham. GREEN WEDGES EXTENDED – KEEP GH/ED/74 as important green wedge and village gateway.

\*It would be nice to see sports fields and woodland put aside.

\*Most of Lympstone needs more car parking, so this is essential planning gain. Also wider roads, pavements, cycle lanes and Lympstone lacks a dedicated football pitch and cricket pitch. Depending on where most houses are built, we may need a roundabout or traffic lights on to the A376.

#### Additional comments:

- The whole exercise here seems flawed as EDDC are trying to identify sites to build on without considering existing lack of infrastructure (roads, sewage, pedestrians, cyclists etc) or other DCC policy (Devon climate emergency policy, green crisis policy - reducing cars on roads, not building on green field sites). Building in Lympstone/Exmouth will not create jobs/economy.
- I think it is very important to find out exactly how the government produces its figures. I believe Michael Gove has at last given up algorithm!
- It is absolutely vital that we stop building new houses/industrial units on Greenfield sites. If we are to save our planet with its wild and human life we must cease smothering our country with tarmac and concrete and convert empty buildings in our towns making sure that they have access to green spaces. If we are to have a healthy nation we must do what Covid has taught us – unpolluted air and unpolluted lighting and unpolluted rivers and seas are essential. We are creatures born to need beautiful places reconnected with wildlife. With ingenuity we can think of ways to ensure everybody has at least one house to live in, not two, however poor or homeless we are. There are ways already being built to cope with this. Other ways could be to put an extra flat on bungalows; convert empty shops; provide shepherds huts or similar tiny dwellings in towns with allotments and parks galore. I would like to see a moratorium on any solar farms on land needed for food. Gardens must be encouraged to grow vegetables and

flowers to attract insects. I object to any houses to be built on the Hulham Road fields. A park is an excellent idea. LPC – Thank you for giving us this opportunity to put forward our thoughts and opinions. We must have vision for our children's world.

- Clear destruction of hedgerows on Goodmores Farm. This will continue with developments 04, 12, 14, 09, 10 and 15. No public transport, infrastructure, pathways, cycle routes. Residents will require vehicles to access. We feel any development of the areas listed (previous sentence) will be severely detrimental to the unique entrance into Lympstone from the common and views of the Exe Estuary will be destroyed forever. Light pollution affecting wildlife and further danger to ecosystems and biodiversity when DCC have declared a climate emergency.
- We should not be building on productive farmland. The war in Ukraine should teach us that if we lose more farmland our food security can't be protected. We have enough infill sites to build on. Equally Exeter should be extended to reduce commuting.
- The Peninsula nature of East Devon and limited size of the arterial road network that converge on the M5 roundabout are at capacity. Any additional development will lead to unacceptable congestion. Transport links need to be addressed before any future development makes sense.
- Development will significantly impact the beauty and aesthetic of the passing tourism within Lympstone. Our farmland is essential to local industry and food sources, particularly in these uncertain times with our economy ahead. Diminishing agri-industries will negatively impact our community. Protecting a village with a rich history and community – no over development of a small village with an inadequate infrastructure. Also, with just the current village size, along the main Exmouth Road, we see numerous RTCs at Harefield cross with existing traffic. Anymore in and out of Lympstone will mean an increase in accidents.
- Lympstone is already overdeveloped, the roads are struggling with the volume of traffic, single track road in a lot of Lympstone and no room to expand. Sewage system under strain. New houses should be a separate town with work opportunities. Need to decrease travel and traffic. Need cycle route for commuters alongside A376, not through centre of the village. The green strategy for the future should be to minimise traffic and travel not create dormitory villages and spoiling them in the process. East Devon and area of outstanding beauty and EDDC could easily ruin this through over development in the wrong places
- We appreciate that more 'affordable' housing is necessary, but we are currently destroying the planet and wildlife and natural resources by building on inappropriate sites. We must protect the countryside for future generations and not just think about profit!
- We should be protecting our farmland.
- Lympstone is prone to flooding from the estuary, and also from run-off from Woodbury Common. Any development increases hard surfaces and causes additional run-off. In storm conditions this can also lead to dangerous flash-flooding.  
The creation of green area a) provides a local amenity which enhances the wellbeing of residents, b) tackles climate change by sequestering carbon c) absorbs and slows rain and storm water and d) can contribute to community in a number of ways, and initiatives such as a community orchard or community garden can benefit the whole community  
No development should even be considered on the green wedge or on protected sites (such as coastal preservation areas)  
Lympstone school is too small to cope with a big increase in numbers.  
Lympstone is a characterful village, and large developments risk turning it into a dormitory.
- This review is far too much in advance. Land (a diminishing commodity) should be used 100% for growing our own food; to enhance this countryside not destroy it. It will destroy wildlife when we are the ----- deficit county in the world. Greenery and countryside enhance both our physical and mental health. Development leads to light pollution and carbon footprint. We are killing ourselves slowly if we continue as we are; also it is not sustainable. This country is grossly overcrowded and something radical needs to be done with all the second homes, have them everywhere (?). At least tackle the council tax and buy up all the many empty unused properties. Many people in authority are crazy, nothing is thought through property at all. An increasing disaster awaits. These days people are obsessed with money and greed. (3 Grange Close).



- I would like the council to take all measures to resist land banking by big developers eg punitive council tax on underdeveloped land already approved for housing ---- meaningful stipulations ----- a percentage of relatively inexpensive homes for local folk. (Paul and Angela Douglas).
- Once the green fields have been built on that's it gone forever nothing can replace them. That's why I think any housing needs should be done in one area 1. A new village with all needs. 2. I am sure Courtlands could cover all housing needs with sports fields.

Email received 12/5/22:

I have been reviewing the ED Local Plan Review information on the village website I would like to make some comments but I don't feel that questionnaire provided is the best format to do this because the context of each option is interlinked and a number of other factors should be considered. To begin to consider each option there are a few factors which need to be considered:

1. How many houses are we meant to build in Lympstone - I think it will be important to push back on EDDC on how any proposed figure has been calculated especially given the Government's announcement in the Queen's Speech this week. I have heard anecdotally that the allocation of new builds across the district has been calculated using an outdated algorithm without any human logic to the sustainability nor impact of the allocation. If the number of new houses I have heard is true (160) then this will have a significant impact on the village. I also think EDDC should be encouraged to push back to the Government as to how the ED allocation was calculated and how this factors in sustainability and impact
2. What type of houses are meant to be built - we are being told that there is an affordable house shortage across the country, but, as we have learnt from previous developments in the village, how are EDDC going to guarantee that the houses built are any way affordable for locals (eg those who live and work in the south west) and are not bought as second homes or holiday lets? If we have to build new homes that bring new people living permanently to the village then that is will probably be of benefit (as long as the number of houses built isn't too big), what we don't want is the character, nature and beauty of our village to be changed determinately with huge housing estates that are full of second homes or holiday lets.
3. Can the infrastructure of the village and the surrounding area cope with the proposed increase - the infrastructure of our region is being brought to its knees as we see huge developments, especially around Exeter, with no proportional investment in the infrastructures (transport, GPs, hospitals, schools, jobs etc). How are EDDC and the Government going to ensure that there is adequate investment and provision in all these areas so that any developments in Lympstone and across the region are sustainable?

Looking at each of the developments I think they fall into five broad categories:

1. sites that have already been submitted for application and have been rejected - why are these even being considered again? (Lymp\_07 and Lymp\_03 (I think this is correct, behind the old dairy))
2. sites that clearly will have access issues (Lymp\_03, Lymp\_02, Lymp\_01)
3. sites that are outside or on the edge of the built up area of the village so should not be considered (urban sprawl springs to mind) (Lymp\_07, Lymp\_12, Lymp\_11, GH/ED/71, GH/ED/72)
4. sites that really impact Exmouth that Lympstone
5. sites that when looking at the map could be seen as being a sensible expansion of the village (GH/ED/73 - 74 - and 75), although they need to be considered as a whole as it is not necessary for the whole area to be developed (eg consider GH/ED/75 first, then GH/ED/74 if needed and finally GH/ED/73 if absolutely needed).

I do find it very alarming that such a huge area to the north of Lympstone has been designated HELAA - 2017 - GESP, how did this happen and how does this tie into the Lympstone Neighbourhood plan and sensible considerations of growth (eg proportion size and infill)?

As I've already I think the key at this stage is to push back to EDDC on the numbers required to be built, and potentially even consider a legal challenge - my feeling is that the numbers are being imposed on us as it is the easiest option not because it is the right option.

Best wishes

Claire Whiter

12 Highcliffe Close, EX8 5HF