

**SHLAA Panel Meeting**  
**Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> May 2014, 9.30am**  
**Council Chamber, Phoenix House**

Attendees:

Alex Hugo, Barratt Homes  
Steve Russell, Devonshire Homes  
Iestyn John, Bell Cornwell  
Sally Parish, Highways Agency  
Mike Bailey, Stevens Homes  
Philip Kerr, Harcourt Kerr  
Tim Smith, Greendale Investments Ltd  
Ian Sorenson, Devon County Council  
Joanne Fox, Sovereign Housing Association  
Robin Leivers, Environment Agency  
Matthew Seaman, Persimmon Homes SW  
Cllr Richard Chesterton, Mid Devon District Council  
Katharine Smith, Exeter City Council  
Chloe Nielson, Dartmoor National Park Authority  
Liz Pickering, Mid Devon District Council  
Dean Titchener, Mid Devon District Council  
Isabel French, Mid Devon District Council

Apologies:

Cllr Polly Colthorpe, Mid Devon District Council  
Rob Finch, Devon and Cornwall Housing Association  
Ralph Farleigh, KF Farleigh Ltd

**1. Welcome and apologies**

Dean Titchener welcomed the attendees, and gave details of the apologies.

**2. Local Plan update**

Liz Pickering gave an update to the panel on the progress of developing the Local Plan. The consultation on the Local Plan Review ended on 24<sup>th</sup> March. Over 1000 responses have been received. The Council is currently reviewing the representations received. It has also recently commissioned a number of evidence documents which will underpin the plan. The Council anticipates that the publication version of the plan will be made publicly available in

the autumn for potentially a 6-8 week consultation prior to submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

### **3. Revisions to methodology**

Katharine Smith and Liz Pickering provided an update to the panel regarding a number of proposed changes to the methodology. The Government had recently brought out the National Planning Policy Guidance which contains updated information on how to assess housing and economic land availability. This new guidance supersedes the previous SHLAA guidance from 2007. The new guidance now stipulates that student accommodation and housing for older people can be counted towards the housing supply by local planning authorities.

Katharine Smith stated that there has been no existing approach for calculating the contribution of student accommodation. Discussions with Exeter University had taken place but had not resulted in any standard approach. In order to agree an approach for the inclusion of student accommodation it was agreed that 6 bedroom cluster flats will count as the equivalent of one house. This could always be revised in future if other information came to light.

Similarly, there is no standard approach for how to include housing for older people. It was noted that people do not always move permanently into a care home, and may return to their original dwelling – therefore resulting in a property not always being released. Katharine Smith stated that the only survey work she had been able to find had 72% of people in nursing homes as having previously lived alone. Following this study, an approach of 1.4 beds in a nursing home being equivalent to one house would be the outcome. However, this dated to 1992 and was considered unlikely to be accurate given it is now over 20 years old. An approach using the floorspace of a home was suggested. Katharine agreed to look into this further, and circulate via email. **ACTION**

Liz Pickering discussed a further proposal to the methodology proposing to return to the standard conditions model. The market conditions model has been used almost since the SHLAA panel approach was instigated to reflect the recession and associated downturn in the housing market. Figures from Mid Devon, Exeter and Teignbridge were provided indicating an increase in completions over and above previous year's figures. It was also noted that the Inspector for the Teignbridge Local Plan had not objected to the use of the standard conditions model. The panel felt that despite these figures there were not universal signs of a return to 'normal' conditions, with variations between the districts. It was felt that much of the market was being propped up by 'Help to Buy', which could be withdrawn by the Government. The panel agreed not to revert to the standard conditions at this time.

### **4. Sites discussion**

Dean Titchener gave a presentation which gave a brief summary of the characteristics of each site and factors likely to affect viability. The panel then discussed each site and determined whether each site was achievable and whether the yield and commencement rate set out by the methodology was appropriate. The presentation was broken down into two sections. First, a small number of sites which had been considered in 2013 were asked to be reconsidered by the panel. Second, new sites, submitted during the recent Local Plan consultation were also considered.

The following decisions were made per site:

### **Reconsidered sites**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Rationale/comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Bow Site 4, East Langford Farm	Site previously limited to 25 off Iter Park. Alternative access off Station Road acceptable subject to Transport Assessment. Leave yield at 25 at present.	Achievable
Crediton, Site 2 (larger area), Cromwells Meadow	Larger area submitted. Mid point yield of 89 ok but subject to Transport Assessment.	Achievable
Morchard Bishop Site 1 (larger area), Greenway	Larger area submitted. Would require widening of road, inclusion of footway and removal of Devon bank however. Mid yield of 58.	Achievable
Sampford Peverell Site 2 (larger area) Land off Whitnage Road	Larger area submitted. Previously considered achievable. Apply min yield of 154 given extent of buffering needed from A361. Subject to Transport Assessment of junction of Whitnage Road and Lower Town.	Achievable
Sampford Peverell Sites 3 & 4 (combined), Morrells Farm	Sites resubmitted. Previously considered landlocked but promoter has clarified access arrangements. Traffic impact on Halberton would be required. May need to result in total removal of farm from site. Achievable. Dean Titchener to confirm flood zones not included within net area <b>ACTION. Update:</b> Have amended site area accordingly to 2.5ha. New mid point yield of 60.	Achievable
Thorverton Site 1a (larger area and split from 1b), Paddock and allotments	Different area submitted. Landowner able to offer alternative site for allotments. Yield of 37.	Achievable
Uffculme Sites 1 & 7	Sites combined with access via Site 1. Yield of 97.	Achievable.

(combined) Harvesters and Land West of Uffculme		
Willand Sites 4 & 5 (combined & larger area) Land east of M5 and rear of service station	Returned with larger area and alternative access arrangements. Acceptable access can be achieved, but would need to consider capacities of J27 & J28. Min yield of 248 applies given need for noise buffering. Caveat: some land may be needed for slip roads or other motorway mitigation dependent on transport solutions to J27/J28 new settlement options. As stand-alone site is deliverable however.	Achievable
Cullompton, Site 18, East Cullompton Urban Extension	Smaller site area as 38ha now not available. Reduced site area of 160ha approx., can still deliver mid point yield of 3528. Year 11 start date agreed to still apply. Further info to be provided as and when available at future panels.	Achievable

### New Sites

Site	Rationale/comments	Decision
Cheriton Fitzpaine, New Site 1, Poole Barton	Historic environment and access limitations. Access road via doctors will limit available land. Yield reduced to 10. Would need to be subject to flood risk assessment to assess full extent of flood zone and potential impact.	Achievable
Crediton, New Site 1, Land off Barn Park	Accessed via long private drive, also public right of way. Max 3 off private drive. Therefore below threshold and excluded from process.	Below site threshold
Cullompton, New Site 1, Part OS Enclosure 7031 Colebrooke	Divorced from settlement. Unsuitable/unsustainable location.	Unsuitable
Cullompton, New Site 2, Park Padbrook Hill	Topography very challenging. Difficult to get estate road into site. Considered financially unachievable.	Unachievable
Cullompton, New Site 3, 'Emmett Land'	Adjacent NW Cullompton site, potential extension to site. Would need to be subject to same masterplanning process. Same start date as other potential extension to NW Cullompton (Growen	Achievable

	Farm – i.e. year 6). Mid yield of 379. Would need to consider impact on J28.	
Cullompton, New Site 4, Acklands	Potential extension to Knowle Lane allocation. Access either from allocated site or from south with associated widening of lane. Mid point yield of 45.	Achievable.
Culmstock, New Site 1, The Croft	Yield considered too high. Min yield of 40 more appropriate, subject to Transport Assessment.	Achievable.
Hemyock, New Site 1, Land adj cemetery	Likely to require off-site highway works. Min yield (80), but landscape impacts to be considered.	Achievable.
Hemyock, New Site 2, Depot	Infill site – may be too tight to get in estate road. Limited to min yield of 13.	Achievable.
Hemyock, New Site 3, Churchills Farm (west)	Narrow road with no footpath. Unachievable on highway grounds.	Unachievable
Hemyock, New Site 4, Churchills Farm (east)	Access difficulty given height differentials between road and site as well as traffic limitations of High Street act against viability. <b>ACTION:</b> Ian Sorenson to check planning history and traffic assessment of Churchills Rise development. <b>UPDATE:</b> Previous development was traffic neutral or less than significant. No change to panel decision as a result.	Unachievable.
Kennerleigh, New Site 1, Land north of Old Rectory	Min yield considered too high. Location considered unsustainable. Likely numbers to be below site threshold. Other means by which site can come forward (i.e. planning application approach for cross subsidy scheme)	Below site threshold; unsuitable
Kennerleigh, New Site 2, Land adj Woodbere House	Location considered unsustainable. Can come forward via others means as per NS1	Unsuitable.
Lapford New Site 1, Land south of Sandhurst	Junction to west has limitations. However considered achievable for mid yield of 30 but must include provision of footpath link through site joining housing to west and linking to school	Achievable.
Morchard Road, New Site 1, Car park	Considered borderline of site threshold (five on site seems unlikely). Concerns over displacement of parking and effect on highway. Collectively therefore considered unachievable.	Unachievable
Rackenford, New Site 1, Higher North	Remote/unsustainable location.	Unsuitable.

Coombe Farm		
Sandford, New Site 1, Land at Sandford (west)	Likely to be costly site given topography. Small cul-de-sac possible. Yield reduced to 20 maximum given constraints.	Achievable
Sandford, New Site 2, Land at Sandford (east)	Challenging topography, divorced from settlement.	Unsuitable; unachievable
Tiverton, New Site 1, Westfield	Within flood zones 2 & 3. EA advice would fail sequential test. Other non-housing uses more appropriate in location.	Unachievable
Uffculme, New Site 1, Land at Hillhead Farm	Divorced from settlement. Considered unsustainable.	Unsuitable
Wembworthy, New Site 1, Land opp Coronation Villas	Technically achievable but location unsustainable. Can come forward via other means (i.e. exceptions approach)	Unsuitable
Wembworthy, New Site 2, The Farm	Divorced from settlement, remote/unsustainable location.	Unsuitable
Willand, New Site 1, Land NE of Four Crosses Roundabout	Achievable for mid yield of 224 but subject to consideration of impacts on J27 and J28	Achievable
Halberton, New Site 1	Would need to consider potential impact on J27. Existing shared surface road limits numbers. Max yield 10.	Achievable.
Morchard Bishop, New Site 1, Canns Meadow	Access width limited. Max three off private drive. Excluded as therefore below threshold.	Below site threshold.
Sampford Peverell, New Site 1, Former Tiverton Parkway Hotel	Potential for site to deliver housing and doctor's surgery. Mid yield of 14.	Achievable.
Westleigh	Location considered unsustainable. Exception site proposed which can come forward via other route.	Unsuitable.

## 5. Any other business

Dean Titchener updated the panel regarding the next meeting which is due to take place on Friday 6<sup>th</sup> June at 9.30am, in the Exe Room, Phoenix House. A lunch will be provided for all attendees which will take place at 12.30pm. The meeting closed at 11.30am.