

CHPC Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Minutes 31st July 2018 7pm

Venue: Bell Tower, St Michael's Church, Clyst Honiton

Present: Michael Burden (MB), Janvrin Edbrooke (JE), Alice Gent (Clerk), Sue Hales (SH), Grant Harrison (GH), Mike Muir (MM), Sean Wheeldon (SW)

Apologies: Lynne Askew, Graham Williams

Contents

1. EDDC Feedback on draft NP Policies.....	1
2. Discussion of Email received from Exeter Airport.....	3
3. Dave Chapman Meeting.....	4
4. Summary of Action Points from meeting	4
5. Appendix A – Feedback from EDDC Planning Team on Draft NP Policies	5
6. Appendix B – Email from Exeter Airport to Architect re noise legislations and the Bypass Site	5

1. EDDC Feedback on draft NP Policies

Feedback had been provided by EDDC Planning team on the completed draft policies so far (see Appendix A). This feedback was looked at and recommendations decided upon. It was also noted that Policies H1, H2 and H3 are not yet finalised, but will be once the Masterplan has been finalised.

Policy NE2 – Landscape Corridor

- ❖ EDDC had questioned whether the allocated green corridor had been agreed with the landowners.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that the Clerk will draft a letter Highways and Church Commissioners (owners of this section of land) confirming that this green corridor can be safeguarded within NP Policy NE2. Circulate draft before sending.
- ❖ GH questioned what benefit there would be for the landowners if this strip of trees was allocated; JE answered that it is land that is valued by the community, landscape, and village.

Policy NE3 – Protection of highest grade agricultural land

- ❖ EDDC recommended changes and policy layout alterations which will tighten up the policy by including grades referred to in each statement.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** Steering Group **accepted** the recommended changes.

Policy H5 – Residential Storage

1. EDDC think that some of the suggested requirements within residential storage policy such as prams /wheelchairs/ garden equipment goes beyond what is reasonable/enforceable.
2. **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that prams/buggies could be unreasonable and therefore will be removed from policy requirements.
3. **RESOLVED:** It was **disagreed** that including wheelchairs/mobility scooters was unreasonable. A sentence will be added to show that there is evidence acquired from Clyst Honiton to justify that there is need for facilities for people who require wheelchairs and mobility scooters in the village.

4. SH also noted that it might be important to provide electric charging points within this storage spaces to enable powered mobility scooter /wheelchair users to charge their device. However, this might also be seen as unreasonable/unenforceable.

Policy H6 – Residential Infill Developments

- ❖ EDDC noted inconsistency with bullet pointing system – opening line ends “should:” but some of the subsequent points also open with ‘should’, therefore repeating the word.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that subsequent “should”s will be removed, and the final word of the opening line will open with “will” rather than “should” to make the policy stronger. So, it will read: “Development proposals for infill proposals **will:**”. All “should”s at the beginning of subsequent bullet points will be removed.
- ❖ EDDC also suggested that point 3 should come under point 2.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** Steering Group **disagreed** with this suggestion and point 2 will be kept separate from point 3.
- ❖ EDDC noted that we need to define what ‘adequate parking’ is.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** The Steering Group **agreed** that the wording of this policy will be altered so that it reads: “provide adequate parking as *per EDLP standards* and access arrangements”.
- ❖ EDDC noted that point 5 reading “where airport noise levels will be lowest” it too vague, and might cause a restriction on all infill developments to less suitable locations away from the village.
- ❖ Suggested by JE to remove first sentence, which states that infill proposals should be located where airport noise levels will be lowest. By removing this sentence, the vagueness of the statement is removed and of the rest of the policy is more specific in relation to airport contours and therefore less restrictive.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that the first sentence in the 5th bullet point will be removed. So, the point will begin as “no dwellings will be exposed to...”.

Policy TL1 – Communications Infrastructure

- ❖ EDDC suggested that our requirement to provide superfast broadband at all new developments is not reasonable or enforceable.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** The Steering Group **disagreed** with this view and resolved to keep the policy as it current stands.

Policy E1 – Supporting the rural economy

- ❖ EDDC disputed the wording of Clyst Honiton as having a ‘built-up area’ as Clyst Honiton does not have a Built-up Area Boundary to base this statement on.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that the words “built-up area” will be removed, so the statement will just read “outside the village”. Village map will also be added to this policy.
- ❖ EDDC also suggested splitting the policies into two so there is a distinct policy for holiday and tourism, and another policy for employment.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** to accept the recommended changes.
- ❖ Regarding point a), EDDC pointed out that the legislation for ‘previously developed land’ and ‘conversion’ is different. Therefore, this point needs to be split into 2.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** to accept the recommended change.

Policy E2 – Opportunities for new and improved business development

- ❖ EDDC suggests that this policy needs to be more site to specific to sites in mind.

- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** to make this more site specific and directly specify that this policy refers to the Bypass Site only.

Policy E3 – Local priority development areas for business and enterprise

- ❖ EDDC were concerned that by including ‘Hotel’ in uses allowed within this policy, this could allow the area to become heavily industrial, and/or have chain companies in the village.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that this policy also needs to be more site specific for each class i.e. for each of the 3 sites suggested, specify what uses would be allowed. It was also **agreed** that for Home Farm Business Park, as well as Use Class B1, it would be nice to have some form of retail, such as hairdressers or a flower shop. So, it would read:
 1. “Proposals for new or improved business and commercial facilities (Use Class B1) and some form of suitable retail (not manufacturing) would be encouraged at Home Farm Business Park”
 2. “Proposals for hotel accommodation (Use Class C1) would be encouraged at Exeter Inn Car Park”
 3. “Proposals for improved business and commercial facilities (Use Class B1) would be encouraged at the Old School Business Park”

It was **agreed** that proposals for food and/or drink establishments (Use Classes A3 and A4) would not be appropriate for the Exeter Inn Car Park as it may end up with a chain establishment such as Subway/Costa.

Policy C1 – Community facilities and services

- ❖ EDDC concerned about how much the policy opens the door to unwanted developments. Policy is parish-wide, and not restricted to the village. By allowing drinking establishments and hotels, this can expose the risk of allowing chain establishments.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** to remove the whole last sentence from the policy. By removing this sentence, this means that ‘community facility’ is classified by the Parish Council.

Policy AC2 – Improved car parking provision

- ❖ EDDC concerned that by not specifying that the improved car parking provision would be for residents, this opens it up to short and long-term holiday parking users.
- ❖ **RESOLVED:** It was **agreed** that this will be re-worded to “parking spaces for *residents* in Clyst Honiton village”.

2. Discussion of Email received from Exeter Airport

An email had been received by Andrew Kirby Architects from Chris Edwards of Exeter Airport regarding the noise impacts of the airport on the Bypass Site (see Appendix B).

The statements made within this email sparked concern within the Steering Group that the residential element of the proposed Bypass Site might not be feasible.

However, it was thought by JE that Exeter Airport at the time of writing this email did not realise that we are already aware of all the limitations and the legislation.

Janet Wallace, Environmental Health Officer for EDDC had previously provided a specification of where we can and can’t build, and the Architects plans had ticked all these boxes.

The Architect already knew that the houses would be more expensive than normal due to the necessary steps required within the Airport Specification.

JE thinks that the strongly worded email from Exeter Airport was written in such a way because they were not aware that the Architects design plans had already taken into account the limitations of the airport.

RESOLVED: It was **agreed** that this letter from Exeter Airport will be passed onto Janet Wallace, in order to gain her advice on how to respond, if a response is needed.

3. Dave Chapman Meeting

The Steering Group discussed possible dates for a meeting with Dave Chapman, who will advise Council on how to meet with the Church Commissioners.

RESOLVED: Several dates in August and September were proposed, and it was **agreed** that the Clerk will correspond with Dave Chapman and try to arrange 2 meetings for Dave to meet with the Steering Group.

It was **agreed** that it will be necessary to set up a Community Facility Management group.

SW made suggestion that as part of the Church Commissioners deal we ask them to carry out work on the church to modernise it and create more of a community space out of it.

It was **agreed** that the Steering Group will create a list between them in the run up to the meeting with Dave Chapman with all the ideas to date.

4. Summary of Action Points from meeting

1. Policy NE2 - the Clerk will draft a letter Highways and Church Commissioners (owners of this section of land) confirming that this green corridor can be safeguarded within NP Policy NE2. Circulate draft before sending.
2. Policy H5 - prams/buggies could be unreasonable and therefore will be removed from policy requirements.
3. Policy H5 – It was disagreed that including wheelchairs/mobility scooters was unreasonable. A sentence will be added to show that there is evidence acquired from Clyst Honiton to justify that there is need for facilities for people who require wheelchairs and mobility scooters in the village.
4. Policy H6 – The opening statement and subsequent statement alterations: subsequent “should”s will be removed, and the final word of the opening line will open with “will” rather than “should” to make the policy stronger. So, it will read: “Development proposals for infill proposals **will:**”. All “should”s at the beginning of subsequent bullet points will be removed.
5. Policy H6 - JE will alter the wording of this policy so that it reads: “provide adequate parking *as per EDLP standards* and access arrangements”.
6. Policy H6 – the first sentence in the 5th bullet point will be removed. So, the point will begin as “no dwellings will be exposed to...”.
7. Policy E1 - the words “built-up area” will be removed, so the statement will just read “outside the village”. Village map will also be added to this policy.
8. Policy E1 – for point a), the legislation for ‘previously development land’ and ‘conversions’ is different, so this point will be split into 2.

9. Policy E1 – It was agreed to split the policy into two so there is a distinct policy for holiday and tourism, and another policy for tourism.
10. Policy E2 – This policy will be made more site specific by directly specifying that this policy refers to the Bypass Site only.
11. Policy E3 - this policy also needs to be more site specific for each class i.e. for each of the 3 sites suggested, specify what uses would be allowed. It was also agreed that for Home Farm Business Park, as well as Use Class B1, it would be nice to have some form of retail, such as hairdressers or a flower shop. So it would read:
 - a. “Proposals for new or improved business and commercial facilities (Use Class B1) and some form of suitable retail (not manufacturing) would be encouraged at Home Farm Business Park”
 - b. “Proposals for hotel accommodation (Use Class C1) would be encouraged at Exeter Inn Car Park”
 - c. “Proposals for improved business and commercial facilities (Use Class B1) would be encouraged at the Old School Business Park”

It was agreed that proposals for food and/or drink establishments (Use Classes A3 and A4) would not be appropriate for the Exeter Inn Car Park as it may end up with a chain establishment such as Subway/Costa.
12. Policy C1 - It was agreed to remove the whole last sentence from the policy. By removing this sentence, this means that ‘community facility’ is classified by the Parish Council.
13. Policy AC2 – It was agreed that this policy will be re-worded to “parking spaces *for residents* in Clyst Honiton village”.
14. Letter from Airport re noise limitations on Bypass Site - this letter from Exeter Airport will be passed onto Janet Wallace, to gain her advice about how to respond, if a response is needed.
15. Dave Chapman meeting – Clerk will correspond with Dave Chapman and try to arrange 2 meetings for Dave to meet with the Steering Group.
16. The Steering Group will create a list between them in the run up to the meeting with Dave Chapman with all the ideas to date.

5. Appendix A – Feedback from EDDC Planning Team on Draft NP Policies

6. Appendix B – Email from Exeter Airport to Architect re noise legislations and the Bypass Site

From: Chris Edwards <Chris.Edwards@exeter-airport.co.uk>

Date: Wednesday, 18 July 2018 at 07:32

To: Cayti <cayti.crozier@akirbyarchitects.com>

Subject: Clyst Honiton NDO - Bypass site

Dear Cayti,

Further to my previous response to your Clyst Honiton proposals please see below from the Regional and City Airports Estates Manager, who deals with noise issues concerning Exeter airport.

I have considerable concerns as to noise impacts which I should be grateful if you could feed back the below to the architects, together with your initial thoughts on safeguarding.

“The residential element is almost entirely located within the 57dB LAeq16 hr contour, generally accepted as the point of onset of significant community annoyance. Further, large swathes are within the 60dB contour and the southernmost dwellings about the 63dB contour. At such sustained levels of noise there will inevitably be persistent levels of likely nuisance to the occupiers and complaints received by the Airport.

Although design could provide for improved levels of insulation to walls and window (and other) openings, this relies on such openings remaining shut to afford the occupier some level of mitigation. During the summer months, windows are left open for increased ventilation which would imply that the designers do not see this as an important factor to consider. I have no evidence that mechanical ventilation is being considered for the houses closest to the loudest noise contour. Nothing can be done to prevent noise from disturbing the enjoyment of gardens and other open areas and we note that the “Welcome Square” is itself sited within the 63dB LAeq16hr contour.

The commercial elements are within the 63 dB LAeq16hr contour and will experience levels close to 66dB on an averaged scale. The instantaneous maximum, short term noise levels will be far higher and possibly be at a level where normal conversations will be impossible to conduct.

The pre-existence of housing in such noisy environments is recognised but we would not condone adding to the numbers of affected properties in such a short sighted manner.

All noise generation from an airport will be a function of its business success and there is no doubt that Exeter continues to grow, having returned its passenger numbers close to the maxima experienced in 2007/08. It is therefore clear that the worst case noise levels, predicted by the Airport Masterplan in 2009, remain likely within the life of the plan, ie, by 2030, to be reached. Any developments that may otherwise serve to constrain the Airport should have regard to the predicted Airport growth levels at the design stage to ensure that the methods of construction, location and orientation of buildings and intended use types of buildings to be contemplated (residential/commercial/service/education/etc) should be compatible with the outputs from the Airport over the foreseeable future.

Lastly, we should be interested to see what noise monitoring has been carried out in support of a contention that the noise levels are not the limiting factor that they should be. We should wish to understand the nature of modelled noise to ensure that it includes that from the airport and the adjacent highway in combination.

EDAL would not support development of the site indicated due to the inevitable creation of noise disturbance for its eventual occupiers and the future limitations which may flow from persistent complaint.”

Regards

Chris Edwards
Airfield Operations Duty Manager