LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council: Miss L Tyrrell
c/o Minnows,
Longmeadow Road,
Lympstone, Devon EX8 5LF
Tel: 07890717081

Email: lympstonepc@gmail.com
www.lympstone.org

Chairman: Cllr Lisa Staddon
Email: lstaddonlympstonepc@gmail.com

29th December 2026

To All Members of the Parish Council

You are summoned to attend a meeting of Lympstone Parish Council**,** to be held **7.00pm** on **Monday 5th January 2026 in the Meeting Room at the Village Hall.** ***NB The amended start time of 7pm***
The business to be transacted is set out below.

Members of the Public are cordially invited to attend.

The agenda and all attachments can be found online at www.lympstone.org.
Occasionally, new material has to be added to the Agenda after the publication date – for the latest version please visit the website lympstone.org

Miss L Tyrrell
Clerk to the Parish Council

AGENDA

	Public session: *POLITE NOTICE - To all Members of the Public,* *There are 15 minutes at the start of the PC meeting for a public session. This is where members of the public can raise questions and queries to the Cllrs, you have up to three minutes to speak. Once this session has closed, the PC meeting begins and any further points, questions and queries from the public must be emailed to the Clerk after the meeting for Cllrs attention. Thank you.*	**7.00**
25/119	*INFORMATION:* **Apologies**	**7.15**
25/120	*ACTION:* **Minutes** To confirm the minutes of the PC meeting held on 1st December 2025 (attached pgs 3-12) and Planning and Transport Committee meeting held on 15th December 2025 (attached when available).	**7.20**
25/121	*INFORMATION:* **To receive any Declarations of Interest**	**7.25**
25/122	**Clerk's Report:** *ACTION:* **i) Correspondence received** – Pétanque pitch (attached)	**7.30**

	INFORMATION: **vi) Casual vacancies** – There are two vacancies on the PC and no election has been called. It is up to the PC to co-opt a new member. **vii) Finance** – November Payments / Financial summary / Budget report (December postponed to Feb 2026 due to time constraints) (attached) **viii) Clerk's Action List** including master correspondence list (attached).	
25/123	*DISCUSSION:* **Future planned and ongoing drainage works** – Specifically working with DCC, flood risk team and contractors regarding works at the junction of Hulham Rd/Exe View Road and the Dinan Way Extension project to reduce water flow rates and water pollution.	
25/124	*INFORMATION:* **Reports from the Chairman, East Devon District Councillors and Devon County Councillors** if any.	**7.35**
25/125	*ACTION:* **Planning applications** **25/2493/LBC-** Removal of existing extension and conservatory and the construction of new single storey extension on rear at 3 Bakers Cottages *(expires 8th Jan).*	**7.40**
25/126	*INFORMATION:* **Planning decisions** (attached)	**7.50**
25/127	*ACTION:* **Reports of Committees** **Assets and Amenities Committee** – Signage for Front Meadow car park. **Community Committee –** To receive an update on the Hub rebuild project, if any. **Planning and Transport committee** – To receive a report from Cllr Francis regarding EDDC EDLP webinar held on 16th December 2025. To receive an update on Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan, if any.	**8.00**
25/128	*DISCUSSION:* **Items for the next Agenda**	**8.05**

MINUTES OF A LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 7.00PM ON MONDAY 1ST DECEMBER 2025.

PRESENT:	
Councillors	R Coleman (RC), S Culhane (SC), S Francis (SF), R Gale-Hasleham (RGH), K Hill (KH), J Payne (JP), A Roberts (AR) and L Staddon (LS) (LPC Chair)
Clerk	Miss L Tyrrell
County Councillors	J Trail (JT)
District Councillors	B Ingham (BI) and G Jung (GJ)
Public	9 members

The Chair welcomed all present and explained that Cllr Atkins had asked for all members to remember Mr Bill Edworthy who had recently passed away and had previously worked for the PC for many years.

Public session

A resident highlighted the state of overgrown hedges around the village and the danger posed for all pedestrians and road users. Hedges were forcing pedestrians out onto the highway and blocking road users' visibility. He had tried to report it on DCC 'report a problem' page online but his device was not compatible with the system. LS explained that it was up to the private homeowner to be responsible for cutting back their roadside hedges. LS suggested that a reminder was added to the PCs Facebook page and to let the Clerk know of exact hedge locations for the PC to investigate.

Another resident complemented the wild meadow area in Front meadow and how much better it looked now it had been cut. She asked if it could be cut every time the contractor mowed the lawn area to keep on top of the docks. She felt regular mowing would weaken the docks to reduce their spread and encourage other plants to grow. She felt hand weeding could not remove docks. The resident added that the hedge in Front meadow also needed topping to thicken it up. LS explained that there was a working group being formed and management plan created to look after the area. The resident also asked who gave LFC permission to play on Cliff field after the heavy rain as the field had now been churned up. LS explained that the muddy areas had been taped off and there would be no further play while the field recovered. The resident also asked why LFC had still not replaced their old storage container. LS added that the new container was in storage and the club were trying to locate a vehicle to be able to transport it safely over the railway bridge and into the field.

Another resident highlighted the fact that the 'no cycling' sign in Cliff Field was still missing, people were using their bikes in the field which was ruining the field surface. LS added that the PC would follow this up with the National Trust again.

25/110 Apologies

Cllr Atkins due to other commitments.

RESOLVED that the apologies were accepted.
LS proposed. KH seconded. Unan.

25/111 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the PC meeting held on the 3rd November be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
LS proposed. RGH seconded. Unan.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Finance and Advisory Committee meeting held on the 6th November 2025 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
KH proposed. LS seconded. Unan.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the PC Part B meeting held on the 6th November 2025 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
LS proposed. SF seconded. RC, RGH, KH, JP and AR supported. SC abstained.

25/112 To receive any Declarations of Interest

SF declared a personal interest with item 25/113.4
KH declared a personal interest with item 25/113.4

This was recorded in the book.

25/113 Clerk's Report:

25/113.1 LPC precept 2026/27

The Clerk explained that the proposed Parish precept for 2026/27 was £60,000. As of current rates 1st December 2025, this would be just under a 7.5% increase from the last financial year. The Clerk explained that for a typical Band D property, this would approx. be an annual increase £4.52, weekly increase of approx. £0.09.

RESOLVED that LPC would apply to EDDC for a Parish precept of £60,000 for 2026/27.
LS proposed. RGH seconded. Unan.

25/113.2 LPC budget

The Clerk had previously presented the PC budget for 2026/27 at the Finance and Advisory committee meeting held on the 6th Nov. There had been no further amendments.

RESOLVED that the PC budget for 2026/27 was agreed and approved by Cllrs.
LS proposed. KH seconded. Unan.

25/113.3 LPC internal auditor

RESOLVED that Devon Auditing Partnership was approved to be used for the PCs internal audit for 2025/26.
LS proposed. KH seconded. Unan.

25/113.4 Grant received

RESOLVED that a grant of £200 was awarded to the LVHCIO.
LS proposed. JP seconded. Unan.

LS also suggested that LVHCIO could consider applying for additional funding in the new financial year when there was more funding in the budget available.

25/113.5 Correspondence received

25/113.5.1 Responsible use of fireworks

LS highlighted the prolonged use of fireworks this year on and around Nov 5th. She suggested advising members of the public the responsible use of fireworks with the

upcoming Christmas and New year celebrations. SC felt residents could be signposted to a voluntary firework code on the website.

RESOLVED that a recommended firework code was added to Lympstone website. KH proposed. LS seconded. Unan.

25/113.5.2 The River Otter and EDDC water cycle report

SC hoped that the water cycle report would be added to the Regulation 19 consultation. AR felt that planning was not concerned with water quality. GJ explained that the water cycle report would be used in the consultation and was going to committee to discuss issues raised. The public consultation was running for 8 weeks, from 28th November 2025 – 26th January 2026. A resident explained that it was important to note that the consultation was only for comment on the changes since the last public consultation.

25/113.6 Casual vacancies

The Clerk explained that there were two vacancies on the PC and no election had been called. It was up to the PC to co-opt a new member.

25/113.7 Finance – Payments / Financial summary / Budget report

Postponed to Jan 2026 due to time constraints.

The Clerk explained that the PC had successfully opened an instant access saver account and had transferred £50,100 into it.

25/113.8 Clerk's Action List including master correspondence list.

RESOLVED that the Council received and noted the Clerk's action list.

25/114 Reports from the Chairman, East Devon District Councillors and Devon County Councillors.

JT explained that DCC cabinet members had sent a letter to the Government regarding Unitary Council changes and why Plymouth and Torbay would be excluded. He added that the reasoning for Unitary Councils was to improve and strengthen services and finances, it should simplify access to one service. Each Unitary council would cost millions to set up. Debts for each area would also be a shared responsibility. The outcome of the debate would be due March 2026. The elections due in May 2027 would be requiring names for the Unitary authority. JT updated all present that 3West would start work on the Meeting Lane development from February 2026. He highlighted the issue of Wales and West utilities starting work along Meeting Lane a week late and an enforcement officer had been out and visited this afternoon. LS highlighted the fact that the utility company was storing all their equipment on a PC parcel of land without permission. JT asked the Clerk to send him all the details, and he would pass on all information to the enforcement officer. The proposed work due on Strawberry Hill still required a highway inspection for weight restrictions, vegetation cut back and possibly include a one-way system. JT went on to explain that there were five planning applications coming in on land opposite Kings Garden Centre. DCC had only received the recent outline planning development application last Thursday. He felt frustrated with DCC and EDDC planners for a lack of joined up thinking and focus on viewing just one application at a time rather than the area as a whole. He felt there was a lack of infrastructure and roads to cope with future development. He added that Sowton needed dealing with first before coming this way. JT explained that regarding overgrown hedgerows, the PC had the power to send out letters and potholes must be

submitted to the DCC online page individually. JT finished by wishing everyone a very happy Christmas.
GJ read his report (See Appendix 1).
A resident asked if Regulation 19 had a five-year land supply? The resident felt that EDDC only had a 2.9 year land supply at this moment. GJ felt it should have a five-year land supply, but EDDC could not demonstrate it at this time. SC asked if windfall sites would be included to which GJ felt they should be. JT highlighted that windfall sites did not come under policy and therefore did not count.
BI felt that part of the problem with the local plan was the fact that towns and cities were trying to adapt to current infrastructure and this floored the system. There had been an opportunity for one new town development which would have covered a housing need for the next 20-30years and then the position could have been reviewed thereafter. The change to Unitary councils was reasoned to save money and support but was worried it would grow and equal more spending and more debt.
The Chair read her report (See Appendix 2).
KH asked to speak and read his statement regarding the part closure of EDDC car park in Underhill (see Appendix 3).
Chris Wilmoth (CW) from the EA was present and explained that alternative parking was being sought for residents. LS reminded all present that the EA were holding a public meeting to discuss this issue on the 9th December at 6pm in the village hall. GJ explained that this was the first he had heard of this closure and would be taking it up with the parking officers tomorrow. BI thanked CW for coming and asked him to feedback to the EA that communications had been very poor with Cllrs. The Clerk asked CW what format the public meeting on the 9th Dec would take, CW explained there would be a presentation, Q&A session then time for individuals to informally speak with EA staff.

25/115 Planning applications

25/115.1

25/2137/FUL - Replacement rear extension with first floor accommodation, replacement side extension, changes to fenestration with addition of cladding and construction of detached carport at The Retreat, Church Road.

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of support based on full compliance with the flood risk assessment and ecology appraisal recommendations from LPC to EDDC.
SC proposed. RC seconded. Unan.

25/115.2

25/2246/VAR - Removal of condition 2 (Removal of Permitted Development rights), of planning permission 98/P0587 (Permission for Retention of Use of Land as Garden), to reinstate permitted development rights available to residential gardens at Garden Of 6 Bakers Cottages.

It was unanimously agreed that no comment would be made by LPC.

25/115.3

25/2323/FUL - Hip to gable roof alterations including rear first floor extension, removal and replacement of front dormer, removal and replacement of garage, installation of front decking and the addition of cladding at Byfield, Longmeadow Road.

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of support from LPC to EDDC.
LS proposed. SC seconded. Unan.

25/116 Planning decisions

RESOLVED that the EDDC decisions were noted.

25/117 Reports of Committees

25/117.1 Environment Committee

CW explained that the EA Bio net gain project in Candys Field had changed due to issues with the S106, time restraints for construction and funding. Therefore, the EA were taking their bio net credits elsewhere but remained keen to gift twenty trees with a five-year funding support for creation and maintenance. CW added that once LPC had received tenders and chosen a contractor, the EA would provide funding upfront to the PC to ring fence for the trees over five years. SC gave an update of the project from the very start to date and added that trees were necessary in Candys field for succession planting, areas which were underutilised, improve boggy areas and the all-round benefits of trees. CW added that if the trees were not accepted then construction would be delayed. SF read her statement (See Appendix 4).

CW highlighted the point that this was a five-year plan with no further commitment to the EA thereafter. JP liked the idea of planting trees but was concerned with the planting of more trees along the tennis courts. KH highlighted that Candys field was an open space, but he felt a few trees in the N-W boggy corner of the field was of benefit. CW explained that having fewer trees would be acceptable but having no trees would change the plans for the work. AR asked if LPC could phase plant a fewer number of trees. RC felt LPC accepted the trees and planted as and when LPC decided.

RESOLVED that the trees would be accepted with an initial five planted in the N-W corner of Candys Field and the remaining trees to be phased planted as, when and only where LPC decides.

LS proposed. JP seconded. Unan.

Mr John Brewer (JB) from Lympstone Flood Resilience Group (LFRG) was present and spoken about the SWW AMP8 meeting held on 24th Nov. He explained that in essence, SWW wished to reduce water pumped from Lympstone to Exmouth. SWW agreed to stay in regular contact with key stakeholders and report back in March 2026 after modelling had been completed. JB explained that it was noted that the tank in the car park was leaking and running at near full capacity, this was being investigated by SWW.

25/117.2 Planning and Transport committee –

Cllr Culhane reported on the NALC's Online Event; Planning For The Future: Navigating The New Planning Framework held on the 29th October (see Appendix 5).

25/117.3 Assets and Amenities Committee

The Clerk reported that she had been in touch with DCC street lighting for recommended contractors. She had received a contractor name and contacts details and would report back to the PC with an idea of costs for repairing the lights in Candys Field.

25/118 Items for the next Agenda

Neighbourhood Plan

Meeting closed: **9.00pm**

Chairman: Date:

Appendix 1:

Woodbury and Lympstone Dec 2025

There are 4 major local concerns that I've been working on.

Council Unitary. Basically, it not unified at all.

Plymouth, Exeter, and Torbay want to annex substantial existing parishes from their neighbours to expand their urban sprawl. Splitting existing District boundaries was not to be done, Government guidelines said, but they ignored government advice.

The districts want to amalgamate with a 4 district, and a 5 district Unitary with Plymouth left as it is in the 451proposal. Then the County Council want it to be simply a "One Devon" Then we have the added complication of a mayor or not, for controlling a whole Devon, and even a Devon and Cornwall mayor.

I can see the sense in a 1 Devon for running services, but it's the lack of Councillor representation with the maximum number of Councillors being only 100, is my stumbling block. This gives poor representation to the rural parishes with one councillor per 4 to 5 parishes, and the Towns and Cities being represented by 3 to 5 councillors each.

So, the Plymouth, Exeter, Torbay gives the large, urbanised areas annexing numerous rural parishes is simply a land grab, and what happens to the rural parishes, without the towns and city, it simply cannot work.

Then the other alternative known as 451 gives the best balance of Councillor numbers but splits the Devon unified services, of Highways and Children and other services.

Whatever happens, Lympstone, Woodbury and Exmouth will be in the same Council as Exeter, as all 3 scenarios does that.

Harbour Review Order. (This includes the canal and basin plus the whole Estuary to a mile offshore.) Exeter City Council want to update the historic out of date bylaws and governance. Most sensible as the Harbour master now can transport people to Australia for some minor stone throwing! Unfortunately, I am concerned regarding the possible fees and fines, that could be charged. Without a business plan it impossible to gauge the Estuary uses impact. EDDC, and many users' groups have submitted their concerns.

The Local Plan Consultation, Is now out for an 8-week consultation. This includes all the changes following the previous public feedback and includes the Water Cycle Report the Air quality report effecting the Pebblebeds and the new town proposal.

I would suggest the issues regarding sewage treatment and Air Quality are key issues to this Parish and need to be carefully scrutinised.

Unwarranted developments. From many people's perspective no housing development is the preferred option, but that's not possible.

It's claimed by some that all the UKs housing could go on Brown Field sites. Unfortunately, East Devon do not have much redundant industrial land (Approx 130 dwellings worth). Therefore, we are required to build on greenfield sites. None of you like it and nor do I, but we are compelled to provide 950 locations for dwellings a year, in our Housing Plan. No ifs no buts! If we don't, developers have carte blanche, and the Council will not have a say where they go! We have received 2 unwanted proposals, one for 150 at the top end of Hulham Road which is 2 sites eliminated from the local plan, as it is in Lympstone Exmouth Gap. Then we have a new community of 1750 new dwellings straddling the land between Clyst St George and Clyst St Mary which is to be submitted very early next year.

Both are rejected sites for the new local plan, but from the dubious evidence provided by the developers they both claim substantial local and planning support.

I will be resisting these 2 very undesirable proposals, and I hope I have your support.

District Cllr Jung

Appendix 2:

1st December 2025

A couple of updates.
The phone box door is now back on the Gibraltar Rd telephone box, it looks awesome and is ready to be a library once again.

On a query by residents of a smelly bin outside properties, the PC has managed to have this changed and we now have a bin in front meadow which is super useful for this well used area.

It is coming up to a cold snap, there is still the possibility for any volunteers to become Snow Wardens in our village - help with gritting places that may need it etc, please email Lucy our Clerk.

The Christmas tree festival is fully lit up and welcomes you to view it at the Church, thank you to Wendy Reynolds for organising again - thank you also to Cllr Francis for getting LPC's tree together in all its glory.

And finally, my sincere thanks to all of LPC Councillors for their hard work and dedication to the Council and village and to Lucy our Clerk for her support at all times.

May I take this time to wish you all a Merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Cllr Lisa Staddon
Chair to Lympstone Parish Council

Appendix 3:

Carpark Closure
Underhill carpark has 84 + 2 disabled resident parking spaces. EA's plan shows that 64 of these spaces will be unavailable for 6 months.

EA state 60% of carpark closed, their plan shows a greater than 75% loss of spaces.
Where are EDDC proposing to provide alternative overnight parking for residents currently having to use the carpark?

Will EDDC reimburse permit holders 50% of their fee as they have sold spaces that they are no longer providing.

Will EDDC make more disabled spaces available, currently many with permits, such as myself, park in other spaces as our vehicles are often parked for long periods. Hence, we leave the designated spaces available for those who may have to use their vehicles regularly, for hospital visits, work, etc.

Cllr K Hill

Appendix 4:

Please excuse me reading my concerns, I find it very hard not to become emotional with this issue after a previous meeting.

I expressed my concern in The Assets meeting about this project being another open-ended long-term commitment for the PC. I am even more concerned, now this 2nd change has been made, and even more convinced my concern is justified.
Personally, I regret supporting the proposition when I freshly rejoined the PC last December having missed the background to this project. Years back it had been discussed that a few new trees in the corner of Candy's would be good, and I believed this proposal was to be for a 'few trees' but it seems to me to have grown into so much more and is now in my view completely different and we must take a new vote on the proposal.

I believe the original project in conjunction with the EA was mitigation for flood defence works was based around BNG units remaining in the Parish. Candy's was the only acceptable site to the EA and the number of trees was required to meet their criteria. If those units are now going out of the Parish, I question the wisdom and why we should continue to be willing to transform Candy's from a recreational area with so much new planting to parkland that is less open.
When examining the first agreement with EA our solicitor advised Council to consider carefully if this project was really right for us and the space. Advice I think we should listen to and act upon now with this proposal which would mean new contracts and ongoing costs for the council.
Although the positions and numbers of trees are consistent with the original plan. There has been a substantial change to the reasons and terms. It is right for us to reconsider it and
consider any implications the new offer may have. Significant annual costs after the first five years which in a time when we are looking for ways to close gaps in our budget and ensure our finances are on a sound footing - this just does not make sense to me.
I question whether we really need the number of trees proposed at this time. Candy's is an open area and having succession planting along the other side of the pathway between Candy's and the Village Hall/Tennis Courts when the tennis Club doesn't like the trees that are already there because of the leaves and roots damaging their surfaces. It doesn't make sense at this time when we must be mindful the Hub reconstruction may begin in the next two to three years. Isn't having young there going to make things more complicated and expensive during the build? It just doesn't make sense to me, is succession planting really needed now?

If this number of trees are planted, they will need care and regular watering. Being a tree guardian is a big responsibility; it takes a lot of commitment and daily time and effort. Where will the water come from and who will pay for it? Enthusiastic numbers of volunteers at the beginning of a project may fall away and the logistics of the watering that will be required over an extended time I do not think have been adequately addressed.
I can support a goodwill gift of a small number of trees (5) planted in the wet corner of Candy's this would be very welcome, but I cannot support the numbers and places of the trees originally agreed with these changed circumstances.
I truly believe Council should not take on anymore large open-ended commitments that have a cost and may well have unintended outcomes as we have discovered with other projects
In my view as this is now a significantly changed proposal, we must reconsider all the implications and if the change from recreational space to parkland is really right for the village.

Cllr S Francis

Appendix 5:

29 October 2025 - NALC's Online Event - Planning For The Future: Navigating The New Planning Framework

Webinar aimed at helping local councils understand the impact of the amended National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Hugh Ellis, Director of Policy, TCPA - People are a solution to the problems they face in their communities, but the government largely assumes that people are in the way of development. This has set up negative tension, and there is a huge pressure on councils to mediate, deal with and work through that tension whilst navigating an extremely complex planning framework. The government is planning to move towards more strategic planning, deregulation and simplification, and to removing community oversight. The irony is that the power of parish and town councils to shape their own future, to work out the solutions that will actually deal with the climate crisis, with flooding, with community-led energy and housing, can help the government deal with some of the more difficult local issues.
It is vital to have an up to date Neighbourhood Plan in order to have a voice in the planning process, help communities understand the complexities and continue to define a vision.
"*Get stuck in, and accept you might lose occasionally*".

Roger Mortlock, Chief Executive, CPRE - CPRE want to shape the planning system in the following ways:

1. Prioritise genuinely affordable homes especially in rural areas
2. Brownfield first (currently untapped) - there is enough brownfield land in the UK for 1.2M homes
3. Protect and enhance the Green Belt (to grow food and connect with nature)
4. Protect our landscapes as we transition to renewables (there's enough roof space in the UK to meet 60% of our solar targets, preserving our countryside for farming and nature)
5. Support nature recovery and strategic land use (the UK is one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world)

CPRE is a Steering Group member of the Better Planning Coalition.

Paul Miner, Head of Policy and Planning, CPRE - Updated guide to commenting on planning applications available on CPRE and NALC websites (Note re Step 1: there is no statutory requirement for LPAs to invite local councils to pre-application discussions, even on S106s).

Key issues in rural areas:

Andrew Towlerton, National Planning Advisor to SLCC - The 'housing need' 0.8% growth is a purely arbitrary percentage - there is no evidence to support this. In the UK we consent on average 300k houses per year, but build only 220k.
Current situation is negative, but there are a few positives from government:

- Local councils can now play a bigger role in the appeal process
- Continued commitment to Neighbourhood Plans
- Easier to compulsorily purchase land

BUT the government risks undermining public trust in the planning system with strategic decision-making in Whitehall and Westminster, rather than proper planning in the local area.
Advice for local Councils

- Flood risk can challenge the tilted balance
- Arguments about design quality and sustainable development should still be considered and made (increased car dependency is <u>not</u> sustainable).
- Plenty of examples in planning case law for protecting SSSIs, RAMSAR sites etc
- Necessary to have a Housing Needs Assessment to demonstrate a need for affordable housing
- Lots of examples in Suffolk for improved transport infrastructure through major planning
- Neighbourhood Plan is vital
- Work as much as possible with District Councillors and planning officers, and get involved in the local plan-making process

---

Most common question:
Should we just keep objecting to major development?
Planning is supposed to be positive - recommend "Yes, we'll take this housing, provided there is a level of affordability, and the homes are flood resilient and genuinely zero carbon."

Cllr S Culhane

MINUTES OF A LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 6.00PM ON MONDAY 15TH DECEMBER 2025.

PRESENT:	
Councillors	S Culhane (SC) (Lead Cllr for P&T committee), S Francis (SF), R Gale-Hasleham (RGH), A Roberts (AR) and L Staddon (LS) (LPC Chair)
Clerk	Miss L Tyrrell
County Councillors	None
District Councillors	B Ingham (BI) and G Jung (GJ)
Public	15 members

Public session

SC welcomed all present to the meeting and invited members of the public to speak.
Residents raised the following points regarding planning application 25/2221/MOUT:

- The site was unanimously rejected for inclusion in the Emerging East Devon Local Plan (EDLP) in October/November 2024.
- The site was rural in character and lay within the countryside. It lay outside any 'Built Up Area Boundary' for Lympstone (the Parish where it is proposed) and for Exmouth.
- Would create irreversible coalescence of Exmouth and Lympstone. The sites were distant from Lympstone and Exmouth and detached for both. The sites were unsustainable and unsuitable for residential expansion.
- Flood Risk to Lympstone and Exmouth - Surface water would run-off into the Wotton Brook catchment rather than partially percolating into fields as was the case now.
- Over-development and density of the area.
- Public Services and Negative Effects on Amenity, Social and Economic Impact - The locality did not have the infrastructure available to sustain the immense amount of new housing already agreed. There were insufficient school spaces in primary schools and Exmouth Community College was over-subscribed.
- Road Infrastructure - Hulham Road was already a busy/fast road and could not be widened due to TPOs, Conservation, Drainage and Private Land issues. There was no ability to install a pavement or cycle path along Hulham Road.
- Water, Sewage and Drainage Infrastructure - Exmouth's sewage system could not handle existing flows, and this was before the already-allocated, planned sites were developed (over 1,200 dwellings). No development should be considered until water, sewage and drainage infrastructure was in place for allocated, planned development.
- Health Infrastructure – Surgeries, Medical and Dental, already oversubscribed within Lympstone and Exmouth. No provision was made for this.
- Character of the Local Area/ Spirit of Place - Lympstone Parish had a distinct and historic Spirit of Place, and local character, which must be protected. Tourism was an essential part of Lympstone's economy, not least open green spaces, walking, cycling, water sports and sailing on the Exe.
- There were numerous trees protected by TPOs along the edges of Hulham Road, including ones that were marked for removal by the developer to create 'pedestrian access' to any development.
- Ecology and Wildlife, these sites were green agricultural sites. They support fauna (Bats, deer, dormice, other rodents, owls, birds, etc) and flora (wildflower margins,

ancient trees, ancient hedgerows and Devon banks) that provide a 'wild' edge to Exmouth and part of Lympstone's ecology.

- Proposed Coastal Preservation Area (CPA) - Lympstone and Exmouth residents enjoyed the site as part of the wider landscape setting of Exmouth, and its contribution to local amenity. Development would irretrievably remove this relief from urbanisation.
- Highway Safety - None of the access roads to the site had a pavement or cycle-path. All, but particularly Hulham Road, were unsuitable for pedestrians. If unexpected road closures occurred on the A376 or the Woodbury Road, all three alternative roads were grid-locked and emergency and residential access was unobtainable. The proposed development would add to this as none of the roads were suitable for amending to include pavements or cycle-paths. Motor vehicles would be the sole method of safe and meaningful access.
- Visual Impact & Design Issues - The urbanisation of the main, rural road into Exmouth from the direction of Woodbury/ Sidmouth would create an ugly, urban ribbon development as a 'Welcome to Exmouth' message. Currently, the tree-lined, hedge-lined, ditch-lined Hulham Road was a welcoming rural, then semi-rural entrance into Exmouth and should be retained. Ribbon residential development was out of scale with the surrounding fields, ancient woodland, individual rural buildings and areas of outstanding natural beauty.
- No one had sought permission of the owner of the land between the two proposed sites to connect them.
- Concerns of displacement of wildlife.
- EDLPs consultation and review was all about housing numbers and should be shelved.
- Developments were not considering water quality and control.
- Absent water quality documents or water treatment systems. Development on this scale would produce pollution and would vary the water flow. Would not be able to control the impact and change would be made forever.
- Current EA works to improve the flood wall at the lower part of Lympstone would be counterproductive.
- Increased volume of traffic already choked Wotton Lane, Marley Road and the roads to Woodbury due to current over development.
- Concerns of change in planning regulations where a new law could be introduced to applicants going to appeal for approval if local council refused proposals.
- Unstainable with surrounding developments in situ and ongoing.
- SC read Mrs Moffatt's letter of objection sent to the PC. *(See Appendix 1 for two letters of objection from residents)*

SC explained that there was evidence at appeal of flooding challenging the tilted balance.

P&T 25/36 Apologies

Cllr Atkins, Coleman, Hill and Payne due to other commitments.

RESOLVED that the apologies were accepted.
SC proposed. RGH seconded. Unan.

P&T 25/37 To receive any Declarations of Interest

Cllr Atkins had sent the Clerk his personal interest declaration with planning application 25/221/MOUT.
This was recorded in the book.

P&T 25/38 Planning applications

25/38.1

25/2221/MOUT - Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved apart from access) for the phased development of up to 151 residential dwellings at Land North Of Hulham Road, Exmouth *(expires 20th Dec).*

The Clerk raised a point that the address for this site was incorrect, she had queried this with an EDDC planning officer who had told her the site was not in Lympstone. District Cllr Jung added that he had also highlighted this with EDDC planning officers but explained that the site was using an Exmouth postal address rather than a Lympstone parish boundary address. District Cllr Ingham pointed out that the address was misleading and should be corrected. He asked the PC to consider highlighting this issue in their response to EDDC.

SC explained that this application contravened existing policy - EDLP Strategy 46 and Strategic Policies SP06; OL03; AR01; AR02; D2; D3 and NPPF Chapter 15. Contrary to Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan Policies 3, and 14. This was deemed to be unsustainable development in a rapid response catchment and would increase the risk of flooding in Lympstone. SC read her report *(See Appendix 2)*

AR raised concerns of highway changes proposed to narrow roads and erect speed bumps for traffic calming measures. Proposed pedestrian crossing and a path down Hulham Road would further narrow the road. The narrowing would not improve the safety of the road. The proposed development only offered a play area and no other community benefit. SF reiterated a concern of highlighting the fact that this one application was actually two separate sites. It was unanimously agreed to object to this application. SC would draft an objection and circulate it in full to all Cllrs to agree to send to EDDC.

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of object from LPC to EDDC.
SC proposed. RGH seconded. Unan.

25/38.2

25/2407/VAR - Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 25/0408/Ful (Timber shower room removed, lean-to demolished, replaced with garden room. Stair/bridge to garden to be replaced, windows & doors repaired or replaced, new flue, minor ground excavation, entrance gates replaced and repositioned) to change window W13, W21 and door D6 at The Mill, Stone Lane *(expires 31st Dec).*

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of support from LPC to EDDC.
SC proposed. RGH seconded. Unan.

25/38.3

25/2442/VAR - Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 25/0409/LBC (Timber shower room removed, lean-to demolished, replaced with garden room. Internal alterations/repairs including damp repair work to floors and walls, alterations to staircases, internal layout changes, ceiling repairs/replacements, timber preservation works, electrical and plumbing with associated works. External works including stair/bridge to garden to be replaced, windows & doors repaired or replaced, new flue, minor ground excavation, entrance gates replaced and repositioned) to change the design of windows W13 and W21 and door D6 at The Mill Stone Lane *(expires 2nd Jan 2026).*

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of support from LPC to EDDC.

SC proposed. RGH seconded. Unan.

P&T 25/39 East Devon Local Plan consultation

SC encouraged all present to submit their own responses to the public consultation. Cllrs felt the consultation was off putting for members of the public due to being too long to complete every single question. It was unanimously agreed to send an overall response from LPC to EDDC instead. The response would include certain areas to focus on and challenge. SC highlighted the major concerns of flooding, drought risk, water quality and impact on wildlife. AR would draft a response to circulate to all Cllrs to agree to send to EDDC from LPC. SF explained she would be attending the EDDC webinar regarding the EDLP consultation and would report back to the PC.

Mr Davies, representative of Lympstone Water Quality Group asked the PC to consider working with developers for opportunities to improve water quality and proper sustainable drainage schemes to protect future generations.

P&T 25/40 Items for the next Agenda

Consultation with DCC regarding water quality improvements.

Meeting closed: **7.03pm**

Signed: Date:

Appendix 1:
LPC copied in to email to EDDC planning:

Sir/Madam

I strongly object to this Speculative outline planning application (with all matters reserved apart from access) for the phased development of up to 151 residential dwellings on the land north of Hulham Road. The land is stated as being part of Exmouth, but is actually within the boundaries of Lympstone Parish (Lymp_09 and Lymp_10).

1. Contrary to Relevant Council Planning Policy

The sites are not a preferred residential allocation in the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan, which has already been considered and adopted by the EDDC Strategic Planning Committee. This is a SPECULATIVE and unsustainable development.

Both were rejected as suitable sites for development in the East Devon District Council local plan at The EDDC Strategic Planning Site Allocation Meeting held over two days in October and November 2024. The sites were considered unsustainable as Hulham Road is narrow and cannot accommodate pavements or cycle paths, traffic is fast coming into Exmouth on the main route from Woodbury, the flood risk to Lympstone of developing the fields causing hard standing so water cannot naturally drain, protected trees, natural green break between Lympstone and Exmouth, etc. Councillor Paul Hayward, Axminster, had been a firm supporter of the sites BUT after he visited them, he quickly changed his mind and considered them entirely unsuitable. REJECTION WAS UNIVERSALLY CARRIED.

Although EDDC cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, the harm caused by SPECULATIVE development outside adopted Plan must still be weighed heavily in the planning balance.

2. Outside of Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)

The site is rural in character and lies within the countryside. It lies OUTSIDE any 'Built Up Area Boundary' for Lympstone (the Parish in which it lies) and for Exmouth.

Proposed Development on these sites is contrary to Strategy 1 (Spatial Strategy for Development in East Devon) and Strategy 7 (Development in the Countryside), both of which strictly control new countryside development. Unlike recently approved application 25/0007/MOUT (Land NE Of Kings Garden And Leisure Hulham Road Exmouth) this site is not contiguous with the built up area boundary of Exmouth as defined in the current Local Plan. Only the smaller first site is adjacent to the *emerging* built up area boundary (west of Sowden Break) and even then it is ACROSS the busy Hulham Road and is actually in Lympstone. The Hulham Road is a PHYSICAL BOUNDARY to prevent the ever-encroaching coalescence of Lympstone and Exmouth and so this fallacious belief that this is an 'Exmouth development' should be removed. The whole of the two sites are outside BUAB, within Lympstone Parish and would create irreversible coalescence of Exmouth and Lympstone. The sites are distant from Lympstone and Exmouth and detached for both. The sites are unsustainable and unsuitable for residential expansion. The sites are more than a mile's walk, initially along the narrow, busy, un-pavemented Hulham Road, from the nearest shop, Morrison's Local, on Pines Road off Dinan Way, Exmouth. I took my life in my hands on Hulham Road and walked the distance with my GPS last autumn, prior to the EDDC SPC meeting.

3. Flood Risk to Lympstone and Exmouth

Surface water will run-off into the Wotton Brook catchment rather than partially percolating into fields as is the case now. The sites slope westward downhill toward the Exe Estuary. In times of rain and increasingly heavy rain, Hulham Road and Wotton Lane are already subject to levels of flooding that causes traffic danger upstream and existential flood risk downstream in Lympstone and Exmouth. Irrespective of proposed attenuation provision, run-off from hard-standing will be greater and flood risk will be exacerbated (see modelling of Lympstone Flood Resilience Group which has been front and centre in managing flood risk in Lympstone for EDDC for 20+ years).

4. Over-Development and Density

The Sites lie within Lympstone Parish. At the EDDC Strategic Planning Site Allocation Meeting held over two days in October and November 2024, Lympstone Parish had residential development sites allocated to it that would increase the size of Lympstone by more than 275 residential dwellings (Lymp_07, GH/ED/72 and GH/ED/74), or by more than 30%. This is already over-development of Lympstone. This proposed additional development of >150 residential dwellings would increase the size of Lympstone by >45%. This represents over-development; that cannot be argued against.

Taken with the development to the south of Hulham Road (Goodmores Farm and east of Goodmores up towards Lympstone Common and the Pebblebed Heaths) this is overdevelopment of a rural and agricultural area. It is Ribbon development up Hulham Road, destroying agricultural and rural land.

Regarding density of build (proposal for 150 dwellings on these two sites), the developer's statement that the scheme's density "*complements the local area and recently approved/constructed developments to the*

south" (Design and Access Statement (DAS) p13) is NOT a valid justification for the proposed density. National policy requires density to be derived from a design-led assessment of the specific site context, including landscape sensitivity, settlement edge character, and *emerging* policy designations. These sites occupy a far more sensitive position within rural upper-Lympstone and on the rural edge of Exmouth and BOTH are within an area identified for future designation as a Coastal Preservation Area, where a softer, lower-density transition is essential.

Simply replication of suburban densities from development on the southern side of Hulham Road, located within the established urban fabric and subject to different constraints, fails to demonstrate that an average density of 34 dwellings per hectare is appropriate here. The density assessment therefore does not provide an adequate or context-responsive justification for the proposed density.

5. Public Services and Negative Effects on Amenity, Social and Economic Impact

The locality does not have the infrastructure available to sustain the immense amount of new housing already agreed to (already increasing Lympstone by >30% from the emerging EDDC Local Plan) added to the outward development of Exmouth. There are insufficient school spaces in primary schools and Exmouth Community College is over-subscribed; local children are schooled away from Exmouth as they cannot secure places at the Community College. The knock-on effect is that those further out in the catchment will be without a school place. The sewage problems in Lympstone and Exmouth have been publicly and frequently documented in the local and national press and remain unresolved.

The sites are distant from the centres of both Lympstone and Exmouth; motor vehicles will be the 'safest' and most expeditious method of getting from the developments to shops, work, stations, etc. so will go against the declaration of climate emergency signed by Lympstone Parish Council, Exmouth Town Council, EDDC and Devon County Council. The sites will be isolated and quite probably 'ghettoised' due to their remoteness by anything other than car.

In summary:

Road Infrastructure - Hulham Road is already a busy/fast road and cannot be widened due to TPOs, Conservation, Drainage and Private Land issues. There is no ability to instal a pavement or cycle path along Hulham Road for these well-documented reasons. All journeys to and from the proposed development will require a motor vehicle, which makes the development unsustainable. The addition of a further 150 dwellings will compound this and its location will encourage commuting by car. Even with a reduced speed limit the entrances will be difficult to navigate safely. The entrance near Kings Garden Centre will have to cope with traffic from both their entrances/exits together with bus stops (in road) that DCC plan to add in the new year.

Water, Sewage and Drainage Infrastructure - The recent Water Cycle Report (published in November 2025) indicates that Exmouth's sewage system cannot handle existing flows, even before the already-allocated, planned sites are developed (over 1,200 dwellings). No development (especially no SPECULATIVE development) should be considered until water, sewage and drainage infrastructure is in place for allocated, planned development.

Health Infrastructure – Surgeries, Medical and Dental, are already oversubscribed within Lympstone and Exmouth. No provision is made for this.

6. Character of the Local Area/ Spirit of Place

Lympstone Parish has a distinct and historic Spirit of Place, and local character, which MUST be protected. On the shores of the Exe Estuary, Lympstone is a charming fishing village; at the other end of the Parish (on Lympstone Common/ The Pebblebed Heaths) it is rural and agricultural with lanes and green fields. This Spirit of Place has always attracted visitors and tourists alike and this proposed development will further destroy Lympstone's Spirit of Place, something that EDDC seem intent on doing with the already allocated sites for development in the Parish as part of the new Local Plan.

Tourism is an essential part of Lympstone's economy, not least open green spaces, walking and cycling and water sports and sailing on the Exe. They will not come to see a massive conurbation of new build housing estates that all look alike and a beach with the sewage from said conurbation all over it.

There has always been a concerted effort and public determination to prevent the coalescence of Lympstone and Exmouth. This SPECULATIVE and unwanted proposal existentially threatens this separation and Lympstone's identity and ECONOMY.

7. Protected Trees, Conservation and Ecology

TPOs

There are numerous trees protected by TPOs along the edges of Hulham Road, including ones that are marked for removal by the developer to create 'pedestrian access' to any development.

The development must be avoided for this reason alone.

Ecology and Wildlife

These sites are green agricultural sites. They support fauna (Bats, deer, dormice, other rodents, owls, birds, etc) and flora (wildflower margins, ancient trees, ancient hedgerows and Devon banks) that provide a 'wild' edge to Exmouth and part of Lympstone's ecology. ALL these would be lost.

Proposed Coastal Preservation Area (CPA)

Lympstone and Exmouth residents enjoy the site as part of the wider landscape setting of Exmouth, and its contribution to local amenity. Development would irretrievably remove this relief from urbanisation. While the adopted Local Plan did not include this site within the CPA, the **emerging** Local Plan rightly proposes its inclusion. The NPPF emphasises conserving and enhancing valued landscapes. Strategy 46 of the East Devon Local Plan supports protection of landscapes, not their loss.

8. Highway Safety

The access roads to the site are:

South Edge – ***Hulham Road***, two car width max, main route into Exmouth from direction of Woodbury and Pebblebed Heaths. Bordered by essential drainage ditches running east/west alongside the road, ancient hedges and Devon banks, protected trees (TPOs) and private land. There is no pavement or cycle-path and no space for these to be installed (for the reasons above). Speed limit is 40mph and then 30mph, both of which are frequently exceeded. Lorries and wide loads have to stop to pass other vehicles. The road frequently is turned into a standing water 'stream' when it rains.

West Edge – ***Exe View Road***, a single-track lane with occasional passing places.

West Edge – ***Wotton Lane***, a largely single-track lane joining Exe View Road to the A376. Main route to St Peters Prep School, a good number of residential properties on the lane, and also a farm and stables, with horses and riders frequently on the lane.

None of these roads has a pavement or cycle-path. All, but particularly Hulham Road, are unsuitable for pedestrians, particularly after dark as all get busy. If unexpected road closures occur on the A376 or the Woodbury Road, all three get grid-locked and emergency and residential access is scuppered.

The proposed development would add to this as none of the roads is suitable for amending to include pavements or cycle-paths. Motor vehicles would be the sole method of SAFE and meaningful access.

9. Visual Impact & Design Issues

While accepting that this is an Outline Planning Application. The urbanisation of the main, rural road into Exmouth from the direction of Woodbury/ Sidmouth would create an ugly, urban ribbon development as a 'Welcome to Exmouth' message. Currently, the tree-lined, hedge-lined, ditch-lined Hulham Road is a welcoming rural, then semi-rural entrance into Exmouth and should be retained as such. Ribbon residential development is also out of scale with the surrounding fields, ancient woodland, individual rural buildings and areas of outstanding natural beauty, which would be worryingly almost encroached on.

This is a speculative development proposal, outside any Local Plan, BUAB or Neighbourhood Plan. It should be rejected permanently and the agricultural land put back to agriculture.

Mr Minter

Email received to LPC:

25/2221/MOUT Land North of Hulham Rd

I strongly object to this outline planning application. I was at the EDDC Local plan meeting where these sites were discussed. Lympstone fielded many speakers against this site being included and it was strongly rejected by the committee as it was NOT SUSTAINABLE in terms of access, travel and sustainable transport. The road adjacent was deemed dangerous to pedestrians with no lighting and no pavement with no opportunity to put in pavements. The only access is onto the road to the common with limited visibility and the only transport available being cars. As Lympstone PC, EDDC AND DCC have declared a climate emergency, allowing this application goes against their declaration. It would be expected that without sustainable public transport anywhere near, commuter traffic will end up on the A376 which is already at capacity and has yet to see the effect of the 1000 new homes already planned in Exmouth. We will see commuters going up along the common road through Woodbury or onto the Sidmouth Road causing environmental damage to the pebblebeds and gridlocking those roads, we already see this during works to make the Dinan way bypass.
It was argued strongly and agreed that building on these agricultural field which provide percolation to rainfall and slow the effects of flooding would cause a huge flooding risk to Lympstone Village as it is at the top of the Wotton Brook catchment which feeds down through the village and into the estuary. Lympstone Flood prevention group (a well-respected group) gave their scientific and research reports at the time of the local plan.
We have yet to see the detrimental effect of the building already agreed to in the Wotton Valley so to add to the flooding risk without first seeing the effect of the present additions would be irresponsible by any council.
It is outside the BUAB and this boundary should be robustly defended. If this site were permitted, then it would open the floodgates (pardon the pun) to building all the way along that side of Hulham road.
The locality does not have the infrastructure available to sustain the immense amount of new housing already agreed to: there are not enough school spaces in primary or secondary schools with the knock-on effect that those further out in the catchment will be without a school place. The sewage problems in Exmouth have not been resolved, and no new developments should be allowed until this is sorted.
There has always been a concerted effort and public determination to prevent the coalescence of Lympstone and Exmouth. Lympstone MUST preserve its spirit of self with its charming fishing village at one end of the parish and its farming history and traditions at the other. This area relies on tourism and tourists are attracted to the area by gems like Lympstone. They will not come to see a massive conurbation of new build housing estates that all look alike and a beach with the sewage from said conurbation covering it.
I urge the council to reject this application in the strongest terms.

Jane Moffatt

Appendix 2:

Principle of development

Contrary to EDLP Strategic Policy SP06: Development beyond Settlement Boundaries - In locations outside of the defined settlement boundaries development will not be permitted. A very small portion of the site might be deemed 'adjacent' to Exmouth's extended BUAB, but the majority of this site is outside defined settlement boundaries. Hulham Road acts as a physical boundary between the rural parish of Lympstone and the extended built up area of Exmouth, with no pedestrian crossing. There are no pavements on Hulham Road, nor sufficient width to incorporate such improvements. The site is unsuitable for residential expansion.

Rejected for inclusion in the EDLP during the site allocation process, due to the important rural setting at the entrance to Exmouth, and coalescence between Lympstone and Exmouth. The importance of the rural landscape here is identified as vital to protect the rural views from and to the coast, and this area has been included in the new local plan Coastal Preservation Area (ref Strategic Policy OL03). This does not form part of the policy baseline in the applicant's Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. Approving a major planning application here would be contrary to Strategy 46 of the East Devon Local Plan which supports protection of landscapes.

Contrary to **Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan** Policy 3 - development will not be permitted within the Green Wedge or CPA; Policy 5 - developments of fewer than 10 dwellings to reflect the rural village character, and Policy 14 - development should not increase flood risk.

The outline nature of this application does not allow for a full assessment of key issues such as Design and Local Distinctiveness (Policy DSO in EDLP - Building for a Healthy Life assessment); carbon impact of levelling and retaining works required to combat the sloping nature of the site (ref Strategic Policy CC01 - Climate emergency); Policy DS02 - Housing Density and Efficient Use of Land, or Heritage Assets. Strategic Policy CC01 is explicit that any development that by the nature of development design or subsequent operations will generate significant emissions will need clear justification for development that articulates how carbon saving approaches and methods, in design and operation, are incorporated into proposals.

National and local planning policy require an agricultural land assessment before land can be determined for development. This has not been included.

Access constraints and TPOs - TPO coverage limits improvements necessary to Hulham Road to enable pedestrian access. Policies D2 (Landscape Requirements) and D3 (Trees and Development Sites) of the current East Devon Local Plan require development to conserve and enhance trees and hedgerows, yet two category B trees and a length of ancient hedgerow are specified for removal in order to create pedestrian and vehicle access.

This application is effectively for two separate sites requiring two points of access, with no safe pedestrian access between the two areas. There is no pedestrian or cycleway access across Hulham Road to Aldi, King's Garden Centre or Goodmore's Estate to access shops and services.

Increased Flood & Water Pollution Risk

The recent Water Cycle Report indicates that Exmouth's Sewage system is currently at capacity, therefore this development is contrary to Strategic Policy AR02: Water quality and efficiency. A Grampian order will be necessary to prevent more sewage outflows.

This planning application is contrary to EDLP Strategic Policy AR01 on Flooding - "All development must minimise the impact and mitigate the likely effects of climate change on existing and future occupants, **together with the wider community and environment**, through the delivery of developments and communities which are resistant and resilient to future floods."

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 CCF-002 – Cumulative Impact Assessment (Parish Map) identifies that Lympstone is at a high risk of cumulative flooding, and therefore development proposals should help to reduce flood risk overall by demonstrating in particular the Flood Risk Assessment considers the potential cumulative effects of the proposed development.

The Flood Risk Assessment has no information on the volume of surface water run-off from the sites, nor the route it will follow. The attenuation ponds proposed will not satisfactorily mitigate the risk of flooding to Lympstone village via Wotton Brook, and any overflow, if not following the natural drainage routes, will cause more pollution and disrupt the natural flows - bringing significantly increased risks during periods of heavy rainfall and drought. Irrespective of proposed attenuation

provision, run-off from hard-standing will be greater and flood and pollution risk will be exacerbated, which is contrary to Strategic Policy AR01 - the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment must demonstrate "that the development, including access and egress, will be safe for its lifetime, **without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere** and where possible will reduce flood risk overall."
Currently there is plenty of evidence of brightly coloured sediment laden surface water runoff from these fields which already cause significant flooding in Hulham Road, Exe View Road and Wotton Lane, and ultimately drain into the Wotton Brook rapid response catchment, and from there into the Exe Estuary (SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR site).
The Environment Agency is investing £1.2M in flood wall improvements in Lympstone, but this windfall site has not been included in the EA's extensive research and modelling for this major investment project which is designed specifically to reduce the risk of flooding for 100 properties and services.
The planning application does not comply with the national Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) standard 2025, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Chapter 15, or the EDLP Strategic Policy AR02: Water quality and efficiency - to protect, manage and improve water quality in all water bodies affected by development in East Devon.
There is already concern and reported pollution events resulting from flooding from the construction of the Dinan Way Extension, particularly as this has not been designed to take account of the latest advice on the implications of climate change. Planning permission was granted in 2017 and although the work did not start until 2025, the scheme was not redesigned to meet the revised standards.
The NPPF is clear that development should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere;
that the cumulative effect of developments should be taken into account when considering applications, and advises directing development away from high-risk flood areas. Footnote 7 of the NPPF specifies that policies protecting areas at risk of flooding are considered policies of "particular importance".
A recent appeal was dismissed in Oxfordshire in 2024 when the Inspector turned down a major development for sixty dwellings at a site located just beyond the edge of an Oxfordshire village due to risk of surface water flooding. The inspector concluded in this case that surface water flood risk disapplied the tilted balance.

Cllr Susie Culhane
15th December 2025

25/122 Clerks Report

Correspondence received:

16th December 2025

Hi Lucy,
Please can the pétanque court go on your agenda for further consideration. Several years ago it was agreed in principle by the Parish Council.
Please find attached photo of the Pétanque Court we now have at Exton play park
It was initially ordered via Wicksteed for £10k, but Outdoor Play actually installed it…
…The one in Exton is very popular with all ages, and we now have a local village league/club.
A location that perhaps members of Lympstone Parish Council might consider is top of Candy's Field adjacent to the Muga court. This would not disturb events or school activities on the field and would allow other facilities to be enjoyed at the same time…
Thank you.
Regards
Anne-Marie Bates

Finance – November Payments / Financial summary / Budget report

Current account c/f 30th Nov 2025	
TSB	£ 99,163.74
Unity Trust	£ 79,834.89
Total current account	£178,998.63

Bank Account Reconciled Statement

Current Account

Statement Number	32	Bank Statement No.	32
Statement Opening Balance	£246,166.94	Opening Date	01/11/25
Statement Closing Balance	£178,998.63	Closing Date	30/11/25
True/ Cashbook Closing Balance	£178,998.63		

Date	Cheque/ Ref.	Supplier/ Customer	Debit (£)	Credit (£)	Balance (£)
04/11/25	TSB EDF	EDF (Candys Field)	79.34	0.00	246,087.60
05/11/25	UT 5/11/25	Bespoke Web Designs	40.00	0.00	246,047.60
05/11/25	UT Copyrite 5/11/25	Herald Printing	775.00	0.00	245,272.60
05/11/25	UT EF 05/11/25	Express Fire	168.00	0.00	245,104.60
05/11/25	UT JC 5/11/25	Toilets cleaning	620.00	0.00	244,484.60

05/11/25	UT 05/11/25	PC contractor	945.00	0.00	243,539.60
05/11/25	UT 05/11/25	PC Contractor	2,490.00	0.00	241,049.60
05/11/25	UT 05/11/25	Employment	477.68	0.00	240,571.92
05/11/25	UT 05/11/25	Employment	2,375.19	0.00	238,196.73
05/11/25	UT 05/11/25	Lympstone Village Hall CIO	16.00	0.00	238,180.73
05/11/25	UT 05/11/25	Employment	214.29	0.00	237,966.44
07/11/25	UT HB 7/11/25	Hilton Barnfield Architects	3,402.00	0.00	234,564.44
10/11/25	UT DM 11/11/25	Advent calendar event	137.56	0.00	234,426.88
14/11/25	UT 14/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	50.00	234,476.88
14/11/25	UT 300003	Employment	960.30	0.00	233,516.58
14/11/25	UT LL 14/11/25	Community lunches	120.39	0.00	233,396.19
14/11/25	UT 14/11/25	Lympstone Village Hall CIO	8.00	0.00	233,388.19
14/11/25	UT RP 14/11/25	Reformed Plastics (UK) Ltd	630.00	0.00	232,758.19
16/11/25	TSB 16/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	45.00	232,803.19
17/11/25	TRF 17/11/25	Transfer to instant savings	100.00	0.00	232,703.19
17/11/25	TSB EDF 11	EDF (Candys Field)	162.52	0.00	232,540.67
17/11/25	TSB EDF(2)	EDF (Candys Field)	87.05	0.00	232,453.62
17/11/25	UT KA 17/11/25	Memorial bench	0.00	525.00	232,978.62
17/11/25	UT SS 17/11/25	Stephens Scown LLP	962.40	0.00	232,016.22
18/11/25	TRF18/11/25	Transfer of funds to instant access	50,000.00	0.00	182,016.22
18/11/25	UT RBL 18/11/25	Royal British Legion	100.00	0.00	181,916.22
19/11/25	UT 19/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	30.00	181,946.22
19/11/25	UT SLCC 19/11/25	SLCC	300.00	0.00	181,646.22
20/11/25	UT 20/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	25.00	181,671.22
21/11/25	UT 21/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	5.00	181,676.22
24/11/25	UT 24/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	135.00	181,811.22
24/11/25	UT 24/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	5.00	181,816.22
24/11/25	UT 24/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	40.00	181,856.22
25/11/25	UT GT 25/11/25	Gary Tate	625.00	0.00	181,231.22
25/11/25	UT IS 25/11/25	Plants for remembrance memorial	10.00	0.00	181,221.22
25/11/25	UT 25/11/25	Lympstone Sailing Club	35.00	0.00	181,186.22
25/11/25	UT 25/11/25	Lympstone Village Hall CIO	8.00	0.00	181,178.22
25/11/25	UT 25/11/25	Lympstone Village Hall CIO	8.00	0.00	181,170.22
26/11/25	UT EA 26/11/25	Environment Agency reimbursement	0.00	802.00	181,972.22
27/11/25	UT 27/11/25	Herald Advert	0.00	50.00	182,022.22
28/11/25	UT 28/11/25	Herald Printing	775.00	0.00	181,247.22
28/11/25	UT 28/11/25	Employment	138.79	0.00	181,108.43
28/11/25	UT 28/11/25	Employment	2,103.80	0.00	179,004.63
30/11/25	UT fee 30 11 25	Unity Trust Bank	6.00	0.00	178,998.63

Uncleared and unpresented effects

Total uncleared and unpresented	0.00	0.00

Total debits / credits	68880.31	1712

Reconciled by Lucy Tyrrell

NOVEMBER Instant Access savings account: Bank Account Reconciled Statement

Savings Account

Statement Number	1	Bank Statement No.	1
Statement Opening Balance	£0.00	Opening Date	01/11/25
Statement Closing Balance	£50,100.00	Closing Date	30/11/25
True/ Cashbook Closing Balance	£50,100.00		

Date	Cheque/ Ref.	Supplier/ Customer	Debit (£)	Credit (£)	Balance (£)
17/11/25	TRF 17/11/25 open		0.00	100.00	100.00
18/11/25	TRF18/11/25		0.00	50,000.00	50,100.00

Uncleared and unpresented effects

Total uncleared and unpresented	0.00	0.00
Total debits / credits	0	50100

Reconciled by Lucy Tyrrell

Clerk's Action List - Lympstone Parish Council: Clerks Action List – December 2025

Month and Minute	Response	Date Actioned
Dec – public session	Include overgrown hedges in the PC Herald report.	3/12
Dec – public session	Write to NT and explain 'no cycling' sign in Cliff Field was still missing.	18/12
Dec - 25/113.1	Apply to EDDC for a Parish precept of £60,000 for 2026/27.	
Dec - 25/113.3	Let Devon Auditing Partnership know that their services would be used again for the internal audit 2025/26.	15/12
Dec - 25/113.4	Let LVHCIO that a grant of £200 was awarded.	8/12
Dec - 25/113.5.1	A recommended firework code would be added to Lympstone website.	
Dec - 25/114	Clerk to send JT all the details of utilities equipment on PC land.	8/12
Dec 25/115 planning applications	**25/2137/FUL** - Replacement rear extension with first floor accommodation, replacement side extension, changes to fenestration with addition of cladding and construction of detached carport at The Retreat, Church Road. R*ecommendation: Support*	3/12 Recommendations sent to EDDC
	25/2246/VAR - Removal of condition 2 (Removal of Permitted Development rights), of planning permission 98/P0587 (Permission for Retention of Use of Land as Garden), to reinstate permitted development rights available to residential gardens at Garden Of 6 Bakers Cottages*. No comment.*	
	25/2323/FUL - Hip to gable roof alterations including rear first floor extension, removal and replacement of front dormer, removal and replacement of garage, installation of front decking and the addition of cladding at Byfield, Longmeadow Road*. Recommendation: Support*	
Dec - 25/117.1	LPC to tender for cost of planting and maintaining trees for five years – send quote received to EA to fund.	
Dec - 25/117.3	Clerk to report back to the PC with an idea of costs for repairing the lights in	18/12

	Candys Field.	
Dec P&T – 25/38 planning applications	**25/2221/MOUT -** Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved apart from access) for the phased development of up to 151 residential dwellings at Land North Of Hulham Road, Exmouth. *Recommendation: Object*	16/12 Recommendations sent to EDDC
	25/2407/VAR - Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 25/0408/Ful (Timber shower room removed, lean-to demolished, replaced with garden room. Stair/bridge to garden to be replaced, windows & doors repaired or replaced, new flue, minor ground excavation, entrance gates replaced and repositioned) to change window W13, W21 and door D6 at The Mill, Stone Lane. *Recommendation: Support*	
	25/2442/VAR - Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 25/0409/LBC (Timber shower room removed, lean-to demolished, replaced with garden room. Internal alterations/repairs including damp repair work to floors and walls, alterations to staircases, internal layout changes, ceiling repairs/replacements, timber preservation works, electrical and plumbing with associated works. External works including stair/bridge to garden to be replaced, windows & doors repaired or replaced, new flue, minor ground excavation, entrance gates replaced and repositioned) to change the design of windows W13 and W21 and door D6 at The Mill Stone Lane. *Recommendation: Support*	

Additional actions:	
PC meeting Minutes	1/12 2/12
Meet with grave digger at cemetery	4/12
P&T committee meeting Minutes	15/12 18/12
Herald report	9/12
Publish Jan agenda	29/12

Master Correspondence List

December 2025

Date	Received from	Subject
3rd	Mr Tyrrell	Sewage
3rd	Mr Davies	Pollution – Dinan Way Link Road project
4th	Ms Evans (EDCTG)	Community transport timetable
5th	Ms Harris (EDDC)	Agenda for Planning Committee meeting 16th Dec
5th	Mr Tyrrell	Sludge
6th	Mr Minter	25/2221/MOUT planning application
8th	Mrs Murray	Cleaning The Green
9th	Mr Clements	Tree along footpath at The Mill
9th	Octavius	Hulham Road - Night works Planned
11th	LFRG	25/2221/MOUT planning application
12th	David Reed MP	Christmas wishes
15th	Mrs Moffatt	25/2221/MOUT planning application
15th	Mr Davies	Ongoing pollution
15th	Mr Barnfield	Hub project
16th	Mrs Bates	Pétanque pitch
17th	Mr Tyrrell	Wotton Brook
17th	Mr Davies	URGENT - DCC knowingly permitting pollution - Dinan Way Link project
17th	LWQG	More information - Pollution from 2 construction sites in our catchment

25/125 Planning decisions

Date	Planning Application	LPC	EDDC
21/2/25 expires 14/3	23/2627/MFUL - Construction of proposed 'Educatering' facility (use class E(g) and B8) including parking, access, area for growing crops and landscaping at Land North East Of Parkfield Cottages Pink House Corner.	4/3/25 Object	11/12/25 REFUSED
7/10/25 expires 30/10	**25/2039/LBC -** Replace existing passageway roof and install 3no. rooflights; construct wall at end of passageway and insert 1no. window on north elevation; removal of partition walls in utility and construct new partition wall and door opening to create wet room; create level floor across the passageway; install double doors in existing opening between dining and lounge to create bedroom at Jasmine Cottage.	23/10/25 Support	17/12/25 APPROVED
31/10/25 expires 23/11	**25/2090/VAR -** Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and condition 4 (tree protection scheme) on planning permission 24/0921/FUL (Construction of first floor extension and new external materials) change to lower roof design only and fenestration, and submission of tree protection plan at Sowden Orchard, Sowden Lane.	20/11/25 Support	17/12/25 APPROVED
7/11 expires 30/11/25	**25/2104/LBC -** Internal alterations to Flat 3 and Flat 4 to create a one 2 bedroom flat. Internal alterations: removal and construction of walls to create utility; remove inner entrance doors to both flats; partial removal of wall to link both flats in lobby area and remove wall between the 2 kitchens to create a large kitchen area at Flat 4, Manor House, Burgmanns Hill.	20/11/25 Support	18/12/25 APPROVED