MINUTES OF A LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 2.00PM ON THURSDAY 23RD JULY 2026.

PRESENT:	
Councillors	D Atkins (DGA), P Carlisle (PRC), S Francis (SF) (Lead Cllr to P&T committee), K Hill (KH) and R Gale-Hasleham (RGH)
Clerk	Mr N Linfoot (Volunteer). Verified by Miss L Tyrrell (Clerk to LPC)
County Councillors	None
District Councillors	G Jung (GJ)
Public	2 members

Prior to commencement the councillors voted unanimously to send Cllr Staddon flowers and a card of condolences.
SF chaired the meeting.

Public session
A resident highlighted the fact that although in Woodbury parish the proposed development, 26/1289/MOUT, was the gateway to Lympstone and would impact the visual approach to the village and place further strain on the village infrastructure.
The original plan was for 131 houses in approximately 15 acres, so 8-9 houses an acre. The developed land for the outline application was just over 7 acres, so 10 houses per acre, this application should seek to build no more than 60 houses on this land. Whether the PC supported or objected to this application.
The PC should request:

- House numbers reduced.
- Further landscaping along Nutwell Road to soften the impact.
- Confirmation of construction of a pavement from the entrance on Nutwell Road to connect to Meeting Lane.
- Pepperpotting of affordable homes to create a 'sense of place'.
- The full CIL payment in acknowledgement of the impact on Lympstone (Woodbury Parish voted in support of this in a meeting in the Autumn of 2023).

GJ confirmed he was present at the Woodbury Parish Council meeting in the autumn of 2023, and he stated that it was he that had suggested transferring the CIL money to Lympstone.

P&T 26/1 Apologies

Cllr Coleman, Lowery, Payne, Roberts, Staddon and LPC Clerk due to other commitments.

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

P&T 26/2 To receive any Declarations of Interest

Councillor Atkins declared a personal interest with 26/1289/MOUT.
This was recorded in the book.

P&T 26/3 Planning Applications
26/1289/MOUT - Outline permission for up to 70 dwellings, formation of vehicular access from Nutwell Road and pedestrian access from Meeting Lane, public open space and other associated infrastructure, as well as the demolition of the two existing agricultural barns, with all matters reserved apart from access at Land To The East Of Nutwell Road, Lympstone (expires 30th July).

SF stated that the site was listed for development of 42 houses by EDDC in the new East Devon Local Plan. There was some lingering resentment that Lympstone PC were not allowed to make comment at the Strategic planning meeting as this was in Woodbury Parish. This was not a sustainable site for Woodbury, and there was no clarity on whether Lympstone would receive a CIL payment to improve infrastructure, or ongoing precepts to contribute to the daily upkeep of the village.
Woodbury Parish Council (WPC) would support a requested construction of a safe footway along Nutwell Road to ensure a safe route to the facilities within the village. WPC had also requested play equipment be installed in the play area which was metal and not wood.
The estate would be managed by an estate management company.
GJ stated that it could be included in the S106 agreement that the estate was maintained by the company for a number of years.
DGA stated that there was ongoing upgrades to the drainage leaving the Meeting Lane site and running through the lower part of this site and towards the Nutwell Estate. He felt that if this site was given permission, the pipe running through the Nutwell land to the river should be upgraded at the Developers cost.
RGH stated that this development was in an agricultural field on the edge of the village. He feared that if this site was given permission, it would open the door to further development of the fields running up to the A376. He felt that the PC should object as this was setting a precedent for development in the countryside, it would ruin the rural approach to the village and would have a serious impact on the infrastructure of the village.
PRC agreed with this view and feared that the whole triangular wedge of land between Nutwell Road and the A376 was then vulnerable to further applications and development. The entrance to the development was in a hidden dip, and even with a reduction in the speed limit prior to the entrance there was danger of accidents as the splay was not wide enough. There was a possibility of up to 140 cars using this entrance and needed to be reconsidered.
SF stated that a further concern was the provision of visitor car parking spaces, and this could be a potential hazard if cars were forced to park on Nutwell Road.
KH raised concerns that the doctor's surgery, the schools (junior and secondary) could not cope and agreed with RGH that the PC should object to the development.
SF stated that some years at the school were full and the children should attend school in Woodbury, but this would create problems as the two buses available only went to Exmouth or Exeter. SF felt it was important to list all concerns in the PC's response to the application, but it was her personal inclination to submit a 'neutral' header as this was a selected site and in Woodbury Parish.

RGH proposed objecting to the development, KH supported this for the following reasons:
1.In the Coastal protection area
2. In the proximity of SSSI and concerns re the possible effects of the development on it.
3. **Visual Impact** The development would have a negative visual impact on the landscape and the ecology of the area, and its appearance will be detrimental to the character of the area as you approach the village. This sets a precedent for building in the countryside.
4. **Character of the local area** The development will not fit into the historic settlement pattern of the village, and will look like many other housing estate's on the edge of towns. This will have an adverse effect on the landscape and the environment and ultimately destroy the sense of place that Lympstone is a rural village nestled in next to the River Exe.
5. **Highway safety.** Concerns on the visibility into a restricted vision road. Speed limit should be restricted to 30mph a lot earlier in Nutwell Road.

6. **Public Services** The development will place a burden on infrastructure, with limited public transport options, car use will rise, and roads are at capacity.
Confirmation is required that SWW can cope with the additional burden, and Grampian orders should be used until new works come on line in December 2028.
7. Overdevelopment of the site – this site was initially put forward for 42 dwellings and has now been submitted for outline planning 70 dwellings.
8. To support improvements/confirmation would be necessary in:

a) Density of housing
b) Visitor car parking
c) Confirmation that SWW can cope with the extra demand.
d) Highway safety (vehicle access onto Nutwell Road, speed limit reduced and a footpath to Meeting Lane).
e) Landscaping along Nutwell Road.
f) Confirmation that CIL payments would be to Lympstone Parish.

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of object from LPC to EDDC.
RGH proposed. KH seconded. PRC supported. AR had objected to the proposal in writing to the PC.
SF and DGA abstained.

P&T 26/4 Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan (LNP)

SF explained she was now drafting V13 of the LNP. She explained the changes and the five main themes. This was now a planning document, although it had no control on location of sites (and numbers), the plan would set out style, materials, carbon zero standards and green spaces. This version was with EDDC Officer, Angela King, for checking. Dependent on the response, a third and final consultation would take place early autumn. New regulations were coming in September which meant that the LNP only had to plan locally, anything covered by EDDC policy or National policy was not required in the LNP as all aspects would be considered by the EDDC planning level.

P&T 26/5 Pétanque Pitch

DGA updated all that unfortunately he had received an email from Mr Mathews at 3West, who stated that due to current market conditions 3West could not assist with the planned pitch. Mrs Bates was seeking support for the project elsewhere.

P&T 26/6 Items for the next Agenda

Parking in parking bays (Courtland Lane)

Councillors then opened and considered two sealed tenders from local tradesmen re the repainting of the MUGA. The two quotes were of similar sums. Both tradesmen were reputable contractors.
Vote:
Mr Wilson DGA/KH
Mr Harris PRC/RGH
The chair (SF) had the casting vote. She felt that so the PC could build up a list of local trades, and as the PC had already used Mr Wilson, on this occasion SF voted for Mr Harris. Mr Harris to be informed by the clerk.

Meeting closed: **3.30pm**

Chairman: Date: