

In attendance

Informal viewing and discussion: Parish Councillors; Kate Little (EDDC); 94 members of the public.
Formal consultation: Parish Councillors; 68 members of the public.

Setting the Context chapters 1 - 5

1 Cranbrook New Town boundary proposal to extend west – Area A

1.12 1.16 7.33

- a) If boundary extended to incorporate Area A – would land be compulsorily purchased for the extra housing developments proposed?
KL: confirmed that no land has needed to be compulsorily purchased so far for the existing Cranbrook area.
- b) Area A includes:
- parkland with trees covenanted
 - a listed building
 - flood area
 - Private road to Blue Hayes... only agricultural traffic allowed through
 - Part of the south of this area is exposed to noise from airport, and not thought suitable for residential housing
 - Good agricultural land, which should be preserved for future food security
 - There should be no access from Area A onto Station Road. Already there is a lack of pavements in Station Road (public safety?)
 - Station Road bridge- unsuitable for additional traffic. If Area A development goes ahead infrastructure should include safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists in first phase, not after 4000 houses. Must push for safety improvements in Station Road if Area A does become part of the extended Cranbrook town boundary.
 - Safe access from Broadclyst to Cranbrook Station on foot/cycle to include bridge over railway?
- c) Areas A, C & D are proposed to provide additional 3,100 homes in an area smaller than Cranbrook's existing boundary – which is designated to take 2,900 homes. Area A - simply to fulfil housing quota?
Public strongly object to density planned for Area A, considering all limitations stated above.
- d) Clarification was given of 'affordable' and 'social' housing.
The need to adhere to agreed Percentage of affordable housing was discussed
Straw poll – *percentage of affordable housing considered acceptable, if Area A development goes ahead?*
More than 40% affordable housing = 2 votes
Less than 40% affordable housing = 47
Abstained = 19
- e) Area A boundary is proposed as a planning development boundary.
Straw poll – *extending the Cranbrook boundary into area A?*
Against = 64 For = 4
- f) Additional extension of Area A across Station Road up to Clyst Honiton parish boundary or beyond is proposed as an electoral register boundary only.
Straw poll – *agreeing with electoral boundary extending West of Station Road?*
For = 0 Against = 52 Abstained = 16

7 **Community Facilities & Infrastructure** 16.35 16.4 19.5 – 19.18

Can EDDC guarantee adequate funding for infrastructure & health/education facilities will be delivered through s106 funding / new Community Infrastructure Levy?

Straw poll – should EDDC ensure tighter controls on developer contributions to infrastructure?

Yes = 66

No = 0

Abstained = 2

Our response should stress that EDDC should ensure sufficient developer contributions towards vital community facilities

<u>Part Two – Development Management Policies</u> Chapter 21
--

- 8 We should support the positive changes to DMP in this draft (e.g. reducing Broadclyst allocation of 50 to 30 dwellings)

<u>Part Three – Neighbourhood Plans</u> Chapter 22
--

- 9 “Communities can decide whether to follow the DM policies of the Local Plan (*part 2 of the plan*) or establish their own, locally specific ones” p240
... If we have a Neighbourhood Plan, our community plan will over-ride their DMP, subject to it complying with the Section 1 of the Local Plan.

- 10 Govt. anticipates the Neighbourhood Plan process taking 1 year to get through the obligatory stages required by law.
EDDC will not take notice of our draft Neighbourhood Plan before it has become adopted; it must be supported by a minimum of 50% mandate from the voters:
“If more than 50 per cent of people voting in the referendum support the plan or order, then the local planning authority must bring it into force” – Communities and Local Government

Straw poll: Do you agree with the importance of developing a Neighbourhood Plan for our parish to protect our interests up until 2026?

Yes = 66

No = 0

Abstained = 2

Staw Poll: Do you support the Parish Council driving forward a Neighbourhood Plan?

Yes = unanimous

Meeting closed 9.27pm

Commitment Statement (from EDDC CONSULTATION GUIDE 2005)

Openness - The consultation process should be open and transparent to consultees about the reasons for consultation and the way in which the outcomes of the consultation will realistically influence the decision. It is important to be clear about what participants can contribute to the process, what they will gain from taking part and the extent to which their input can influence decision-making.

Commitment - We endeavor to show respect for both stakeholders and taxpayers by giving consultation the appropriate priority, time and resources, and demonstrating that it is a genuine attempt to understand and incorporate other opinions.

Responsiveness - Those being consulted must perceive that their voice will be taken seriously. There is no point in spending time and money on a consultation exercise if there is no willingness to listen to the results.

These are notes taken at our open discussion.

E&OE