

### Clyst St George 1<sup>st</sup> Version NP Feedback Form Analysis Sheet

| Policy | disagree | neither | agree |   |
|--------|----------|---------|-------|---|
| CSG01  | 4        |         | 13    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan defines Ebford as unsustainable. How can there be a presumption of sustainable development?</li> <li>An opener to developers</li> <li>This could be open to interpretation by developers and I feel there should be no presumption to development at all</li> <li>Coastal preservation area - We have been unable to discover the criteria for strategy 44 and are puzzled to find that it covers land behind Elbury Barn and Haydons Farmhouse, neither of which have estuary views or have been subject to flooding</li> </ul>  |
| CSG02  | 1        |         | 18    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cricket Field should be local green space</li> </ul>   |
| CSG03  |          |         | 17    |   |
| CSG04  |          |         | 16    |   |
| CSG05  |          | 2       | 16    |   |
| CSG06  |          | 1       | 16    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest a parish-wide tree survey with a view to issuing tree preservation orders where appropriate</li> </ul>   |
| CSG07  |          | 2       | 16    |   |
| CSG08  |          | 3       | 16    |   |
| CSG09  | 2        | 1       | 16    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What about executive use of road transport affecting traffic? Planning have ignored it in recent applications.</li> <li>If only – we are at the whim of the planning officer, and what he or she likes at any given time</li> </ul>  |
| CSG10  | 5        | 3       | 9     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete no garden development in the countryside. If we lose our 5-year supply we will have bigger problems than garden development</li> <li>Strongly against development in gardens but it could happen if EDDC fails to hold sufficient building land</li> <li>The Local Plan does not consider our settlements to be sustainable; this is at odds with the community survey; 2 members of the SG strongly opposed this policy but were not provided with an opportunity to debate; developers could exploit this policy to their advantage; this goes against the grain of village planning leading to ad hoc ill-thought out urban sprawl</li> <li>Note EDDC comments please</li> </ul> |
| CSG11  |          | 2       | 15    |   |
| CSG12  |          | 2       | 16    |   |
| CSG13  |          | 2       | 16    |   |
| CSG14  |          |         | 17    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to those desirable one through the centre of the village from Lower Lane to Ebford Lane would be an enormous benefit</li> </ul>  |
| CSG15  | 1        |         | 16    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Folk that move into country areas from suburbia presumably do so out of preference – so why try and convert country lanes without pavements or streetlights to suburbia?</li> <li>It was very disappointing when we were on the Woodbury cycle route to find there was no safe way of crossing the busy/fast Woodbury Road and we would like to advocate and campaign for a crossing there.</li> </ul>   |
| CSG16  | 2        |         | 15    |   |
| CSG17  | 1        | 3       | 13    |   |

|       |  |   |    |  |
|-------|--|---|----|--|
| CSG18 |  | 2 | 16 |  |
| CSG19 |  | 1 | 17 |  |
| CSG20 |  | 2 | 15 |  |
| CSG21 |  |   | 17 |  |

Minutes of a meeting of the CSGNP steering group 30<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

Present:- Kim Dearsly, Anna Smith, Gail Van Thiel, Andrew & Tracy Teasdale, Darren Baker, Bob Grainger, John Manser, Richard Cousins & Paul Weston.

John Manser (chairman) opened the meeting and explained that the meeting was to review feedback from the residents to the draft Plan, and to consider the consultation paper put forward by our consultant Paul Weston.

Feedback:- 21 responses from residents mostly in favour of the policies put forward.

Policy CSG10 proved to be contentious; this was drafted before EDDC's Local Plan came into force, after discussion the Steering Group decided to drop this policy on the grounds that with rewording of policy CSG001 would cover the intention of CSG10.(unanimous decision)

Policy 18 which EDDC had suggested needed more evidence, firstly it received support from the community, but it was felt that members could feed back any occurrences when on-street parking had given rise to problems and photographic evidence of overnight parking in and around the Parish.

The group also discussed a letter from Stags of Exeter planning department, commissioned by two landowners, the group decided that it gave no clear reason for us to change any of the policies.

The Consultation paper from Paul Weston was discussed: he had set out the options for CSG001.

We could have no Policy on Sustainable development, or define a Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)

or have a Criteria based approach. The Pros and Cons of each were discussed and unanimously the group agreed on Criteria based policy, to be finalised later by email.

Next steps, SEA Screening, the updated plan should be submitted to EDDC asap, for Screening,

John Manser reported that he had an email from EDDC about screening, circulated to all after the meeting. Whilst I have asked the Officer to check that the bodies consulted had not raised any comments, It would appear that the process has been completed.

Design Statement, Bob Grainger and John Manser to approach Peter Cusa from Clyst St. Mary for assistance, we have a statement ready for professional appraisal.

Paul Weston suggests that we should be now looking as to what needs to be done for Regulation 14 consultations also known as the pre-submission consultation.

Date of next meeting: TBA (Mid-September? ).