

Clyst Honiton Parish Council

There was a meeting of Clyst Honiton Parish Council on Wednesday 2nd October 2024 at 7.00pm held in the Black Horse Inn Meeting Room

Members Present: Parish Councillors Suzanne Hales; Grant Harrison; Mike Muir; Sean Wheeldon.

Also Present: No district or county councillors.

In attendance: Rob Martin, Clerk.

8 members of the general public.

MINUTES

25/44 APOLOGIES

No parish councillors had apologised for absence.

District Cllr. Paula Fernley had apologised for her absence.

25/45 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY)

No declarations of interest were made.

25/46 MINUTES

On a proposal by Cllr. Harrison, seconded by the chairman, it was **Resolved** to approve, as a correct record, the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 10th July 2024.

25/47 COUNCIL REPORTS

a) To receive a verbal Clerk's Report.

The clerk reported that:

- Comments had been made about being uncertain about the planning status of outstanding applications. The clerk had prepared a format for recording this which he would periodically send to councillors and place on the website.
- He stated that, if councillors were interested, the Devon Countywide Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Consultation was now open, closing on 30 November 2024.
- In addition, the Devon and Torbay Local Transport Plan 4 Consultation was also open, again closing on 30 November 2024.

b) Village Maintenance

Cllr. Muir reported as follows:

- The regular visual inspections of the play equipment had taken place.
- He had replaced and repaired the mobile goalpost frame.

- He had cut the parish field hedge twice.
- He had strimmed the grass
 - In front of the Duke of York car park three times
 - Around the bus shelter opposite the Exeter Inn three times
 - Next to the pumping station twice
 - The embankment opposite St Michael's Hill once, and
 - The embankment in Churchside once.
- He had removed vegetation next to the private fence in the playing field
- He had helped with organising the fete
- He had removed the damaged gazebo from the fete
- He had removed the iron triangle from the field as it was causing a potential hazard

The clerk reminded Cllr. Muir that he had arranged to pick up some of the empty sandbags to store for any flooding episodes in the village. Cllr. Muir stated that this was organised and he would be picking up 50 bags from the Exmouth depot and that he had enough sand still to fill these.

Cllr. Wheeldon wanted to record thanks for Cllr. Muir for doing an excellent job in the village over the summer with the flower beds looking lovely throughout, and this was supporting by all councillors.

c) Other Councillor Reports

There were no further reports by councillors.

The Chairman to adjourn the meeting to allow the public to speak.

25/48 PUBLIC AND OTHER BODIES' SESSION

The members of the public in attendance were all there to offer their observations on the EDDC New Settlement Consultation (see minute 25/51 below).

Janvrin Edbrooke acted as spokesperson for the residents present, all of whom lived in the area that would be within the proposed new town boundary. She had forwarded a summary of the thoughts of the group on the two scenarios put forward by EDDC which the clerk had sent on to all councillors. The document is attached to these minutes at **Appendix A** below.

Parish Councillors discussed the various elements of this submission with the residents outlining their further concerns about way this was being handled by EDDC and questioning whether the process of choosing the location for it had taken into account the undulating topography of the site. It appeared as though there were better locations which could have been chosen with less challenging development needs.

The Chairman to reconvene the meeting.

25/49 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The clerk explained that the last process before the referendum was for the Neighbourhood Plan as adjusted by the Examiner to be agreed by the EDDC Cabinet. The Head of Planning, Ed Freeman had expressed concerns about some of the examiner's wording on some policies particularly those relating to self-build and live-work conversions. Janvrin explained that it was unlikely that the NP would not be agreed but that a report would be drawn up explaining where the differences lay. The

report for the 30th October 2024 Cabinet meeting had to be forwarded by Angela King by 8th October.

25/50 NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDER

The clerk had circulated an email received from Matthew Naylor regarding the current position from the Church Commissioners point of view. The clerk had annotated this email with his thoughts on each element of the email. The situation was that when the viability of the project was calculated it would be necessary to have at least 41 dwellings on site to pay for the community hall valued at £1m. At this level the viability was marginal.

In order to improve the viability of the project, the question was asked whether the cost of the community hall could be reduced, or the site access could be via the cheaper Waterslade Lane entrance rather than the by-pass. In addition, the Church Commissioners had responded to the Neighbourhood Plan consultation with objections based on the use of its land being used as Open Space when the only requirement was for the land to be made available for footpaths. The clerk pointed out that this had now been settled by the NP Examiner who had accepted the objection and altered the policies accordingly.

As the option of the access to the site was absolutely fixed and not negotiable the only option on viability was to reduce the cost of the community hall so the clerk had contacted Andrew Kirby, the architect and asked whether a budget of between £500K and £750K would provide a facility that met the needs of Clyst Honiton. The architect thought this would be possible but would investigate further and the result of this was awaited.

Cllr. Wheeldon expressed his concerns about the NDO proposal. These concerns were, in summary:

- The need to pay for the security of the hall once operational.
- The need to pay for someone to run the hall, as it was difficult to get volunteers.
- The need to pay for insurance.
- This made the operation of the hall a 'proper business'.

The clerk pointed out that he deals with many halls in other parishes, in his role as a clerk, acting as a Presiding Officer in elections and as a user in his own village of Lapford. Every one of the halls he deals with are run without such security measures and completely with volunteers. Whilst it was important that the asset is looked after and all legal requirements are met, these are not reasons for not having a hall.

The clerk also pointed out that he believed that the parish council had a duty to continue with pursuing the project because of the enormous effort others had put in to make it happen and Clyst Honiton still had no community meeting place. He was prepared to pursue the project until it becomes a fact, or it is obvious it will not go ahead. He would answer the questions asked by the Church Commissioners, sort out what facility could be viably supplied, get the access agreed and then there would be an active project to be pursued.

Cllr. Harrison asked whether **Devon Communities Together** (DCT) could provide advice on the operational side, which the clerk confirmed he had already started to do. DCT were very keen to be

involved if that was what the parish council needed.

On a proposal by the chairman, it was **Resolved** that the clerk continue with his work on the project by sending the answers back to the Church Commissioners and to take it from there.

Cllr. Wheeldon wanted to have a council meeting where councillors discussed how the parish council is to be run going forward as he was concerned that it was being run by the clerk without receiving responses by councillors. He thinks that thought needed to be given to having more meetings to resolve ongoing problems as they occur.

The clerk pointed out that for a committee, non-councillors can be coopted to take a full part in the meeting, excluding matters of finance.

25/51 EDDC LOCAL PLAN – NEW SETTLEMENT RESPONSE

The clerk had circulated a report outlining his thoughts on the proposals being put forward by EDDC a good deal of which corresponded to the residents' document replicated in the public session above.

It was **Resolved** that the clerk would prepare a submission in time for councillors to comment before the end of the consultation period on 7th October 2024. This would incorporate relevant parts of the residents' thoughts alongside other strategic planning issues in relation to the allocation. The clerk would prepare something for councillors by close of play on 4th October 2024, which would also be shared with the residents involved before the final version was to be submitted.

25/52 SUMMER FETE

The overall income received from the fete amounted to £506.15. It was believed that the organisers should have a say in what the money should be used for, so it was agreed that, for the time being, the funds would be the subject of an Earmarked Reserve until they could be consulted about this.

25/53 ZIPWIRE REPLACEMENT

The Community Lottery Grant application had been submitted by Cllr. Wheeldon, in the sum of £11,500 but no answer had yet been received. The clerk had received three quotations to date ranging from £13,000 to £19,500. He was meeting a representative from Sovereign playgrounds on Wednesday 9th October 2024 and following this he would construct a report outlining the options and deciding upon the one preferred and the financing available.

25/54 BANK RECONCILIATION

The 30th September 2024 Bank Reconciliation statement was **Approved**.

25/55 RECEIPTS & PAYMENTS TO DATE COMPARED TO BUDGET

The statement of Receipts and Payments compared to Budgets for the period from 1st April 2024 to 30th September 2024 was **Approved**.

25/56 **RECEIPTS & PAYMENTS SCHEDULE**

On a proposal by Cllr. Muir, seconded by the chairman, it was **Resolved** to approve the payment of the invoices on the schedule below for the period since the last meeting:

PAYMENTS

Payment to	Services	Month or Reference	Amount £	Payment No.
2024/2025				
Vodafone	Mobile Phone	Sept 24	16.03	DD
Vodafone	Mobile Phone	Oct 24	16.03	DD
Simon A Martin	Payroll Services	Sept 24	8.00	Card
Simon A Martin	Payroll Services	Oct 24	8.00	Card
RJ Martin	Salary	Sept 24	803.76	2425-14
HMRC	Tax Deduction	Sept 24	223.73	2425-14
RJ Martin	Salary	Oct 24	803.76	2425-17
HMRC	Tax Deduction	Oct 24	223.73	2425-17
Adobe	Professional Upgrade	Sept 24	19.97	DD
Adobe	Professional Upgrade	Oct 24	19.97	DD
Countrywide GM	Grass Cutting	July 24	122.10	2425-11
Countrywide GM	Grass Cutting	Aug 24	122.10	2425-15
Countrywide GM	Grass Cutting	Sept 24	122.10	2425-16
UKHSS	Zipwire Removal	004426	720.00	2425-13
TK Play	Zipwire Inspection (revised)	11351	948.00	2425-15
Amazon	Loppers & Shears	206-7396126-3079552	76.93	Card

RECEIPTS

Receipt from	Services	Amount £	Method
2024/2025			
Residents	Summer Fete Donations/Stalls	105.00	BC
Sean Wheeldon	Summer Fete Donations/Stalls	386.15	BC

25/57 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

To consider the following Planning Applications and to agree comments:

Reference	Location	Proposal
24/1173/FUL	Hill Barton Business Park Blackmore Road Clyst St Mary EX5 1DR	Proposed extension to existing Stuarts Truck and Bus building to provide enhanced welfare facilities, office and meeting space Decision: No comment
24/1049/FUL	South West Metal Finishing Ltd Exeter Airport Business	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide two replacement employment buildings, new accesses

	Park, Clyst Honiton Devon EX5 2UL	and associated infrastructure and landscaping Decision: No comment
24/1612/FUL	Land and Buildings South of Waldrons Cottages Clyst Honiton	Proposed self storage container yard (partially retrospective) Decision: Objection
24/1641/FUL	J And R Food Services Ltd Fair Oak Close Exeter Airport Clyst Honiton EX5 2UL	Extension of warehouse building for additional freezer storage Decision: No comment
24/1715/FUL	Waldrons End Cottages Clyst Honiton Devon EX5 2NJ	Retrospective application for the addition of a fence on a boundary wall. Decision: Support
24/1807/FUL	Fix 24 7 Ltd Harrier Court Exeter Airport Clyst Honiton Exeter EX5 2DR	Proposal to extend existing building to provide more warehouse space Decision: No comment
24/1915/FUL	Fair Oak Cottage Clyst Honiton EX5 2BH	Erection of new open-fronted carport to side of dwelling, over existing driveway. Decision: Support

25/58 DCC APPLICATION FOR A STOPPING UP ORDER

It was **Resolved** that there was no objection giving consent for Land Adjacent to Swordfish Avenue to be stopped up for highway purposes.

25/59 MEETING FREQUENCY

It was **Resolved** to return to holding meetings once a month from this point forward. The clerk would produce a schedule of dates for the meeting until May 2025 for approval next time.

25/60 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting is on **Wednesday 13 November 2024** and will be held in the Black Horse meeting room starting at 7.00pm.

25/61 PARISH COUNCIL MEETING CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 9.15pm

Signed:.....

Print:.....

Date:.....

Appendix A

EDDC Development New Settlement Masterplans

This document is a response from the residents of Holbrook (a settlement located in the centre of the new settlement area)

The comments made are from a wide demographic of residents that live and work in the settlement area, some have been resident for over 50 years.

Comments favour a Masterplan that takes features from both Scenario 1 and 2 but that there is a need for **extensive work in developing an informed Masterplan for a town that exemplars superior design.**

The following section provides positive and constructive comments.

PV Panels:

There is support for PV panels being located on all new houses and economic / commercial buildings to ensure that this is an integral part of a "sustainable" settlement.

The Solar farm of 25 hectares = 62 acres seems excessive. What is the purpose of these PV panels and for what will the electricity generated be specifically used for? If the electricity generated is not linked to the new settlement micro grid, then there is no support.

There is support for a smaller solar farm to be located by the A3052 as in Scenario 1. This roadside location and adjacent to an Industrial Estate is an appropriate siting.

Scenario 2: The location of this solar farm not only reduces space for residential development it also leaves a space beyond Hill Barton Economic Space which has no role and serves no purpose in the new settlement, especially as there is no access by foot or cycle into this green space. This lack of "land use and purpose" could allow Hill Barton to extend yet further east towards Farringdon.

Sewage Treatment

There is huge support for a new sewage treatment site. This has to be provided. No sewage plant, no town. This must be a stand-alone site and not reliant on existing overloaded systems: Clyst Honiton/ Countess Weir. It is essential that the sewage plant is built to cater for the whole town, proposed town extensions and the existing properties within the area.

Cemetery:

There is support for a cemetery to be provided as part of the new settlement. There needs to be more consideration as to what this facility requires roads / car parks to function effectively. Presently it is in a position with no road access, and it lies within a designated green space.

Challenging Topography

The topography of this area consists of rivers courses, flood, and meadow land, and in some cases steep sided valleys. There is recognition that this topography will result in huge expenses being incurred. The selection of the area for the creation of a new settlement is still not supported.

The residential group strongly disagree with the consultation process and the selection of this site for and on each of the following:

- The site's ability to deliver on The Vision.
- The 0.1 difference used to favour this site (Option 1 vs Option 3) in the comprehensive technical assessment and scored evaluation.
- The technical understanding of the environment, landscape, infrastructure opportunities and challenges.

To build a town on such challenging topography with extensive flooding incidents (which close all access routes including access over the bridge) will create a town where residential areas and facilities are isolated by the topography. To utilise walking and cycling as the major access mode and for getting to the Park and Ride in 10/ 15 minutes is not physically achievable for the majority of residents due to the topography. For residents at the far edges of the residential sites will require at least a 35-minute walk. Some hill gradients within the settlement would challenge most cyclists and walkers. Design and appropriate access infrastructure will need to be employed to compensate for the topography and for this new town to achieve "The Vision."

Cohesive Community:

To be a cohesive community, residents should be able to move around the three areas of the new settlement and to access its centres, facilities and services for both work and leisure.

Scenario 1 provides the northern residential area with vehicular access to the A30 but with no access into the rest of the settlement. The access to the Town Centre and the other two residential areas is by bus or by pedestrian /cycle path. There also seems to be no access provision to nearby offices or the economic space. This will produce a very isolated residential area, with vehicular access having to use the routing of A30 and A3052 to gain access to the other residential areas. The topography will limit walking and cycling access for a considerable number of residents wanting to access the town centre and other residential areas.

Scenario 2 design provides a much more cohesive community model where a ring road structure allows for residential movement into and out of each residential area and with links to the Town Centre. The downside is that this access is only for those using the bus. The northern area has no cycle/ footpath provision at all.

To function as "sustainable town" the community will need to be able to walk/ cycle to work, and the location of housing in discrete areas determined by water courses and topography makes walking/ cycling to work a challenge.

The presentation of Scenarios on paper provides a flat surface hiding the challenges that face a community trying to function cohesively across a topographically challenging area, where the use of electric cars is going to be inevitable. For example, if attending Brownies (or any organised child activities) in winter daylight hours will the bus system or active routes be used? the answer is NO. Providing the required infrastructure is key to a cohesive community.

There is a need for design to link the three communities. The Town Centre also needs to have links to each residential area. The ring road designed for buses and vehicles will facilitate connecting the three communities. A north /south link can be a superior design if it is circular in nature, with speed limits, and passing through communities as it will help to control the traffic flow and will stop a direct "rat run" route.

There are houses and a small community in the settlement area and there is a concern as to how these going to be interwoven into a new settlement without being compromised. The placement of a new town centre adjacent to a hamlet is therefore not supported.

Infrastructure /Access:

Roads

Why are the main road infrastructures buses only, this makes no design sense for a community divided into 3 areas to function as a new town. Happy to have bus lanes and bus priority built within the scheme, as seen in Holland but electric vehicular access will be needed and will be used. It is not flat. Is the intention that all residents will be walking / cycling? Once again it is not flat.

For both Scenario 1 and 2 there are 3 access roads onto the A3052 and only one onto the A30 Dual carriageway. This makes no sense at all, why has the traffic flow strategy not utilised or prioritised a dual carriageway over a road that is single track in each direction and one that has already got capacity issues. At the Westpoint event it was confirmed that there were no proposed changes to either the A 3052 or A30. Cranbrook required new infrastructure and so will this new settlement. The present road access strategy is flawed and needs a total re design.

Primary Road scheme needs to be a combination of Scenario 1 and 2. With the Main route still running North /South as in 1 and using the access points as seen on this masterplan but with an addition of a circular road as seen in Scenario 2 coming off the N/S route. This road design will avoid ancient woodland being destroyed and would ensure that all communities are interlinked with access to the Town centre located as in Scenario 2.

No road access to sports pitches. How do the visiting teams and their transport vehicles get to these facilities?

No road access to the Cemetery.

Roads to Service the Town Centres:

Scenario1 results in all vehicles accessing and serving the centrally located new town having to use the A 3052. There are no vehicular routes at all into the northern residential area and onto the A30. This means that there is no option; all delivery vans and lorries have to come to Junction 30 and use the Clyst St Mary roundabout. Traffic flow into and out of two residential areas will be increased by the traffic accessing a centrally located town centre.

Scenario 2: The Town centre is located centrally within the Northern residential area, with no access other than by bus!!!!!! There is no provision for any delivery vehicles at all to access the town centre. The Town centre in this location would utilise the A30 for access and this would allow access to visitors which would help with the long-term vibrancy of a town centre.

Active routes (pedestrian and cycles):

There is recognition that to be a sustainable town that active route infrastructure is a key requirement. Even though the Masterplan is in its early stage the level of this provision is extremely poor. There needs to be links into and out of the settlement, links to economic spaces (work), playing fields, the town centre, park, and rides and into and along green spaces. The provision needs to be extensive and comprehensive, neither Scenario provides this. Where are the links to Crealy/ Greendale Farm shop, CVRP, established local bike routes. Where are the links to economic spaces? There are none to northern economic spaces in both Scenario 1 and 2.

Scenario 2 is dominated by routes along side roads, there are none to playing fields, green spaces. The routes are often peripheral. There is a lot more work to be done to evidence that these routes are key element to this sustainable new town.

Economic Spaces:

The provision of economic spaces in Scenario 1 is best with work evenly provided in the north and south. But to work these spaces require access. Hill Barton has 2 access routes. Scenario 2 sees a large increase in Hill Barton, which is not favoured as it will create yet more traffic onto the A3052 and takes away land for residential development .

Green spaces:

There is recognition that the landscape results in green spaces being located alongside water courses across the settlement. There is also recognition that the green spaces are located peripherally to stop coalescence with neighbouring villages. There is concern that there is little planned within the three residential blocks to support good urban design. Each Scenario provides urban green spaces but in only 2 out of 3 of the residential areas, why not in each? In scenario 1 the green space is also the playing fields. Further consideration as to the number, size, and function of green spaces within an urban setting is required, especially as habitat loss will be extensive.

Phasing:

This needs to be planned & sequenced.

Infrastructure was announced as being provided first is welcomed, but there is confusion as to what is seen as infrastructure?

A minimum requirement is for all primary and secondary roads to be in place first.

Will the existing buildings be linked up to the new roads?

Present residents' disruption needs to be minimised.

Current residents:

We have heard nothing from EDDC.

Why have we not been notified?

This will have a huge affect on our property value, businesses & lifestyle.

Will the existing properties and businesses in the settlement area be linked up to the new roads?

Present residents' disruption needs to be minimised.