

Appendix – A – Housing Site Assessments

Where we are

Inevitably the planning process does not stop for the formation of a neighbourhood plan – new submissions are constantly being put to EDDC. The following table shows the current position (at the date shown in the top left hand corner) in relation to the 2006-26 Local Plan.

	W #	Land Name	Inclusion	Planning Status	#	Total Houses	Cum. # Houses V Tgt 40
Past completions		Part of "Churchill Court" Development	Included		4	4	N/A
2006/07 to Sept 2012		Bridge House Underhill	Included		1	5	N/A
Net commitments		The Shippon, Jubilee Grove	Included		1	6	N/A
		Highcliffe and Greystones, Sowden Lane	Included		-1	5	N/A
Projected	W307	Land to North of Glebelands	Included	Planning Permission Granted	15	20	15
		Lympstone House	Windfall	Planning Permission Granted	1	21	16
	W174	Land N of Long Meadow Road behind garages	Windfall	Planning Permission Granted	1	22	17
		Higher Orchard	Windfall	Planning Permission Granted	1	23	18
		Jackson Meadow 1 (Larger)	Potential	Planning Permission Requested	13	36	31
		The Old Rectory – Burgmann's Hill	Potential		6	42	37
		Jackson Meadow 2 (Smaller)	Potential		6	48	43
	W119	Lympstone Nurseries	Potential		9	57	52
	W337	Land to rear of Town Dairy/Meadowgate	Potential	Planning Application Withdrawn	4	61	56
		Land to E of Strawberry Hill and E of The Grange	Windfall		1	62	57
	W307a	Remaining land to North of Glebelands	Reserve		60	122	117

The progress to this position started back in August 2012 with the launch of the Village Boundary Line Review by EDDC – this process still to be completed by EDDC. The following section documents the exercise to consider all development opportunities within the Parish.

a. Methodology

1. Village Boundary Line Review was handed over to a Parish Council Working Party who were already working on the Neighbourhood Plan. This WP consisted of 4 Parish Councillors, 1 joint Parish and District Councillor, 1 District Councillor and 6 non-councillor parishioners. One non-councillor was designated as “People’s Champion” and was paid to lead the focus groups and the village meetings – he attended all WP meetings and gave views and opinions but did not have a vote. Specifically he was tasked with the independent role.
2. The WP compiled a list of possible sites.
 - ✚ SHLAA sites,
 - ✚ sites submitted by The Lympstone Land Owners Association,
 - ✚ sites submitted by parishioners,
 - ✚ sites known to the WP plus any other submissions
3. Collated all known data on sites and obtained landowners consent (where applicable and necessary).
4. Produced an initial set of 5 “Test Criteria” – these were expanded to 10 by
 - a. Factoring in EDDC Sustainability Assessment tests
 - b. Feedback from Focus Groups and testing with the Housing Development Focus Group.
5. The “Test Criteria” were further tested by the WP and the definitions improved
6. Scoring – each WP member scored each site as Green “Fully complying with the criteria” = 2pts, Amber “Could comply with criteria with minor modifications to policy” = 1pt, Red “Does not comply or directly contradictory to the criteria” = 0pt. Where a member declared an “interest” then they left that site’s points blank. The number of points for each site was totalled and divided by the number of members scoring to give an average score for that site out of a maximum possible of 20.
7. The Test Criteria, definitions and scoring were presented to the Parish Council, agreed and signed off on Monday 1st October 2012.
8. The WP completed the assessment of all viable locations on Monday 8th October 2012.
9. The list of viable locations, with recommendations, was passed to the Parish Council for their agreement and ratification on Monday 15th October 2012.
10. The final list with back up detail of Methodology was presented to the Parish at a Village Meeting on the 23rd and 24th November 2012.
11. Minor alterations were made to this list – Singleton sites were deleted as was Lympstone House where circumstances had changed and the WP could not guarantee the site as “Developable”.
12. The final “Preferred List” and associated documentation was signed off by the Parish Council on Monday 3rd December 2012 and presented to EDDC.
13. Since December 2012 planning applications have been received and granted and these have been reflected in the above matrix which shows the latest position.

b. Criteria Used

1	Vehicle access to location	Vehicle access to location does not compromise safety or congestion
2	Pedestrian access to community services	New developments should be located within 750m of most facilities. Account should be taken of gradient, pavements, lighting only in extreme circumstances. Within distance and good (Green) slightly over distance or roads with no pavements or with steep hills (Amber) over distance and roads with no pavements or with steep hills (Red)
3	Pedestrian access to primary school	New developments should be located within 750m of school. Account should be taken of gradient, pavements, lighting. As 2 above
4	Pedestrian access to transport	New developments should be located within 750m of public transport facilities. Account should be taken of gradient, pavements, lighting. As 2 above
5	Proximity to Built-up Area Boundary	Priority should be given to locations within the BAB (Green) or adjacent to the BAB (Amber). Sites remote from the settlement should be excluded (Red)
6	Maintain the local amenity, quality and character of the local environment	The extent of intrusion into local open space, Coastal Protection Zone, Green Wedge or other amenity area. None (Green), Minor (Amber), Major (Red)
7	Not increasing congestion in the village centre	The location should not contribute to congestion within the village centre (Cox's Hill to bottom of Burgmann's'

		Hill). Vehicular access to the A376 should not involve using the village centre. Fully meets requirement (Green) some additional congestion (Amber), adds to congestion (Red)
8	Compatible with the existing Urban Grain	The pattern of the arrangement of streets blocks, plots and their buildings in a settlement. The degree to which an area's pattern of blocks and plot subdivisions is respectively small and frequent (fine grain) or large and infrequent (coarse grain). Compatible with locality (Green), Minor inconsistencies (Amber), Major inconsistencies (Red)
9	Maintain or enhance the special character of the village	New Development should not be located where it will harm the character or setting of an historic asset or be detrimental to the existing character of the village. Somewhat subjective. No effect or enhancement (Green), some effect (Amber), detrimental (Red). Red scores should be annotated with a reason in the comments box
10	Will not lead to coalescence	Coalescence is seen as the biggest threat to the Lympstone Community. No incremental threat (Green), Minor incremental threat (Amber), Major incremental threat (Red)

Red = 0 points = Fails the criteria

Amber = 1 point = Falls slightly short of the criteria

Green = 2 points = Fully meets or exceeds the criteria

c. Notes on Criteria and Assessments

Distances

- ✚ Lympstone Village is a rectangular settlement stretching 1.1km from the Exe Estuary in the west to the A376 at The Saddlers in the East (as the crow flies). North-South from the new EDDC houses on Meeting Lane in the north to the edge of the BBL in the south is 760m. The “Centre of the village” is considered to be The Strand outside the Swan Inn, Londis Store and Shears Cafe and only 80m from the Post Office and 50m from the Railway Station. Given this point as a village centre then the following distances apply:-
- ✚ Centre to Primary School, Church and Village Hall = 450m
- ✚ Centre to Saddlers Arms and A376 = 1,150m
- ✚ New EDDC houses on Meeting Lane to :- School 500m; Centre 960m; Railway Station 935m
- **As a result of the foregoing the Working Party felt that the distance criteria proposed by EDDC at 400 to 600m was too restrictive and would not adequately differentiate sites. Accordingly in the Assessment Criteria the “Green” band was extended to less than 750m**

Hills

- ✚ The Village of Lympstone lies in a valley formed by the Wotton Brook. Historically the village consisted of two villages the “Farmers” to the East and “The Fishermen” to the west. Over time the two have merged and filled the valley. More modern post WWI and WWII developments have slowly claimed the hills either side of the valley.
- ✚ The majority of developable land is therefore on or over a hill from the previously defined “Village Centre”. Burgmann’s Hill, School Hill, Strawberry Hill, Church Path, Cox’s Hill and Underhill Close are all accepted challenges of daily life.
- **As a result of the foregoing the Working Party felt that the aforementioned hills did not merit any exception from the distance criteria on the basis of “gradients” and were not considered exceptional.**

Pavements

- ✚ Lympstone Village is characterised by a lack of pavements. Of the main access roads (Burgmann’s Hill, Strawberry Hill, Longmeadow Road, Church Road, The Strand, Sowden Lane and Cox’s Hill) there is only 150m of pavement in Longmeadow Road.
- ✚ Elsewhere in the village pavements only exist on the newer built developments, Glebelands, Trafalgar Road, Jackson Meadow, Greenhill Avenue, Grange Close/Birch Close, Underhill Crescent, Chapel Road and Highcliffe Close.
- ✚ Many of the surrounding lanes are very narrow, single track roads with passing places
- **As a result of the foregoing the Working Party felt that pavements were not a factor in the criteria but that the use of surrounding lanes was very important and should be avoided where possible.**

Footpaths

- ✚ Lympstone Village has a network of footpaths which in some small way compensate for the lack of pavements. Of particular note :-
 - Underhill to Church Road = 135m
 - Underhill Car Park to The Strand = 70m
 - Trafalgar Road to The Primary School – over Candy’s Field = 225m
 - Burgmann’s Hill to The Station – via The Avenue = 255m
- ✚ There are also a number of significant footpaths outside of the village but within the Parish Boundary – The East Devon Way, Clay Lane of note.
- **The Working Party would like to see the network of footpaths in the village extended**

Flood Risk

- ✚ There is a flood zone in Lympstone running from the Saddlers down the Wotton Brook to the River Exe. Whilst some of the prospective sites are adjacent to the flood zone, none are in the flood zone itself and none have a record of flooding.
- **The Working Party accordingly discounted this criteria**

✚ There has been considerable anxiety expressed through our consultations at the impact significant development within the Parish would have on existing surface and foul water drainage. The Wotton Brook is the main drainage for all surface water and is already under pressure. The manhole at the Saddlers regularly “blows” from the pressure of water coming down Exmouth Road and Wotton Lane and surface water regularly runs down Longmeadow Road to the drain at the bottom of Maltfields.

- **The Working Party has taken due note of these concerns and believe that the proposed sites will not exacerbate the situation unduly. However they do voice their concerns at “L18/W174 Land to the rear of garages – Longmeadow Road” where suitable holding tanks would be a pre-requisite. “L13/W332 Land to East of Strawberry Hill and west of A376” is of even more concern since the drain running NE/SW across the middle of the site would be put under intense pressure – this feeds into a underground culvert that runs under Rose Cottage and Pretty Corner exiting in the Wotton Brook. Before any consideration could be given to development of this land the Environment Agency should be commissioned to carry out an extensive survey and community consultation.**

Sewerage Capacity

✚ Sewerage can be an issue in Lympstone although cannot be considered a major one at present. For each chosen location there is considered to be capacity, however the Working Party believe that there is not surplus capacity for a single major development without major further investment by South West Water

- **The Working Party believes that before any consideration could be given to any major single development South West Water needs to undertake a full review of capacity.**

Designated Landscape

✚ AONB is not relevant to Lympstone

- **This has been replaced by “Green Wedge “ and “Coastal Protection Zone” as a “Designated Landscapes”**

d. Scoring Matrix

W #	Land Name	Pot #	Vehicle access to location	Pedestrian access to community services	Pedestrian access to primary school	Pedestrian access to transport	Proximity to BBL	Maintain the local amenity, quality and character of the local environment	Not increasing congestion in the village centre	Compatible with existing urban grain	Maintain or enhance the special character of the village	Will not lead to coalescence	Pts	Scorers	Score	Cum. # Houses
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
W307	Land to North of Glebelands	15	17	10	20	20	10	11	17	13	11	15	144	10	14.4	15
	The Old Rectory – Burgmann’s Hill	6	20	20	20	20	20	18	19	18	16	20	191	10	19.1	21
	Jackson Meadow 2 (Smaller)	6	15	20	20	20	20	17	19	20	18	19	188	10	18.8	27
	Jackson Meadow 1 (Larger)	13	16	20	20	20	20	16	19	16	13	19	179	10	17.9	40
W119	Lympstone Nurseries	9	18	20	20	20	12	12	14	11	12	15	154	10	15.4	49
W337	Land to rear of Town Dairy	4	14	20	20	20	12	12	14	11	12	14	149	10	14.9	53
	Lympstone House	1	Deleted - site has been subsequently put up for sale we can no longer confirm it's availability for development													54
W174	Land N of Long Meadow Road behind garages	1	Deleted - as singleton development													55
	Land to E of Strawberry Hill and E of The Grange	1	Deleted - as singleton development													56
	Higher Orchard	1	Deleted - as singleton development													57
W307a	Land to North of Glebelands	65	17	10	20	20	10	11	17	13	11	15	144	10	14.4	122
W125	North of allotments, access off Underhill Cres	3	10	18	18	18	9	9	5	13	11	8	119	9	13.2	125
W340	Land to rear of 2 Paynes Cottages - Lynchfield	0	Deleted - Report from Devon Highways rejects development													125
W69	N of allotments and E of railway track off Underhill Close	9	13	20	10	20	10	10	5	12	10	9	119	10	11.9	134
W332	Land to East of Strawberry Hill and west of A376	80	19	10	20	20	10	3	16	3	1	13	115	10	11.5	214
W343	Land Off Clay Lane		Deleted - Report from Devon Highways rejects development													214
W339	Courtlands Lane Nursery Site	3	11	0	0	9	0	7	14	8	10	6	65	9	7.2	217
W339	Courtlands Lane/Sowden Lane		11	0	0	9	0	7	14	8	10	6	65	9	7.2	217
W315	Car repair shop, Courtlands Lane	3	11	0	0	9	0	6	14	6	10	6	62	9	6.9	220
W202	Land to NW of Courtlands Cross	150	15	0	0	18	0	0	13	1	0	0	47	8	5.9	370
W310	Land to E of Hulham Road and N of Marley Drive	4	19	0	0	0	0	4	19	6	5	5	58	10	5.8	374

e. Individual Site Assessments

The assessments for each site are shown in Appendix H

f. The Preferred List

These were the preferred sites as submitted to EDDC in December 2012:-

- ✚ The Old Rectory – Burgmann’s Hill
- ✚ Jackson Meadow 2 (Smaller)
- ✚ Jackson Meadow 1 (Larger)
- ✚ Land N of Long Meadow Road behind garages
- ✚ Lympstone Nurseries

These locations account for c46 homes. The first 4 of these locations lie within the BuAB. To accommodate Lympstone Nurseries we would require a minor amendment to the BuAB – this would be a line tight to the West of the existing greenhouses down to the main East/West sewer and bounded by the lane to the East and Church Road to the North. No other changes to the BuAB are requested at this time.

As backup against any shortfall we put forward:-

- ✚ Land to rear of Town Dairy
- ✚ Land to North of Glebelands – smaller site

These locations account for a further c17 homes.

This was the Parish conclusion and was submitted to EDDC. The appropriate supporting documents are contained in the Evidence Base. EDDC have yet to publish their conclusions on this evidence.