

Planning application 15/0851/MOUT – land adjacent Shire Lane

Construction of up to 120 no. residential dwellings (class C3) or up to 100 no. residential dwellings (50% affordable) (class C3) plus land for care home/extra care housing (0.5 ha), retained and improved "park and ride" facility, new access and associated highway and utilities infrastructure and green infrastructure framework

Statutory Consultees

A number of statutory consultees have already responded, as summarised below:

Lyme Regis TC	Long list of concerns, incl. affordable housing should be available to LR residents, s106 monies to LR/TC/WDDC for necessary infrastructure, lack of sewerage capability.
Housing Strategy Officer, EDDC	Concerns about sustainability of affordable housing and distance from local services along difficult routes.
DCC Education Dept	No S106 money asked for. Capacity at both nearest primary and secondary schools for pupils likely to be generated by the proposed development.
Landscape Architect	Detailed analysis of Hallam landscape documents, unpicking many assertions. Conclusion that the proposal is unacceptable in landscape terms (contrary to paras 115 and 116 of NPPF ¹ and policy EN1 of the EDDC Local Plan) and the visual impact on the western approach to LR is underestimated.
Public Health Directorate E Devon	Recommends a swale or pond for water storage rather than tanks, and wishes not to compromise the proposed storage lagoon above Highland Farm.
DCC Flood Risk SuDS Consultation	Have concerns over calculations re runoff, and possible impact on flash flooding down the valley.
County Highway Authority (Devon)	Recommends refusal on 3 grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location and access likely to create the need for additional travel by private vehicles contrary to paragraph 14, 29, 32 and 34 of the NPPF. 2. Likely to generate increase in pedestrian traffic with consequent additional danger to all users of the road contrary to paragraph 32 of the NPPF. 3. Adequate information has not been submitted to satisfy the Local Planning Authority that the proposal is acceptable in terms of access contrary to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
Dorset County Highways	Recommends refusal on highway grounds: The proposals fail to provide an acceptable, appropriate or safe new footway and traffic management solution and scheme to serve the likely

¹ National Planning Policy Framework

	generation of further pedestrian movements, to and from the proposed development site along the A3052 and would be detrimental to the safety of all highways users.
Architectural Liaison Officer	Some concern over safety of rear parking areas, and boy racers in the park and ride.
Devon County Archaeologist	Recommends refusal because supporting information insufficient to determine impact of proposed development upon the archaeological resource, unless more evidence can be provided.
Environmental Health	Must be a construction management plan submitted and agreed.
South West Water	No objection if foul waste (not surface water) can be connected to public sewer.
Environment Agency	Standing advice (not specified).

Joint SHLAA assessment

Site E324 (Shire Lane/Sidmouth Rd) was proposed by the developers for the East Devon SHLAA², and assessed by a joint team from WDDC and EDDC. They concluded in summary:

Site not considered suitable for development. Highly prominent seen from the west, when existing settlement in Lyme currently invisible. Significant landscape impact. Remote from services and facilities of town.

Public comments on web site

At the time of writing (Wednesday morning), there were 116 public comments on the web site, of which 113 were objections.

Perhaps the most authoritative is from the **chairman of the East Devon CPRE**. The objection is made on the grounds of:

1. **Planning policy** – EDDC 5 year land supply which is now believed to be in place. Outside the BUAB of Lyme Regis and not allocated in local plans. LR and Uplyme both considered suitable for only limited development in respective emerging local plans.
2. **Affordable housing**: need is likely to be met by developments in Lyme, Axminster, Bridport etc. Large stock of second homes. No evidence of great unmet need.
3. **Landscape**. Assessed by WDDC/EDDC as sensitive to landscape change and not suitable for development. Impact of site on landscape much greater than indicated in supporting documents - "significant and adverse".
4. **Visual impact**. Misleading photographs with no indication of focal length of lens used, taken in summer and full leaf. Street lighting in dark area.
5. **AONB**: paras 115/116 of NPPF and EN1 are relevant. Development should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances it where enhances the local area or is in the national interest and no alternative sites available. This is not so.

² Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

6. **Design and local distinctiveness.** Out of character, dense and contrary to policy D1 of EDDC Local Plan.
7. **Unsustainable location.** Walking or cycling impractical on steep routes to LR/Uplyme. Proposal for footway to LR impractical. Traffic flows not measured during holiday periods. Undue dependence on cars, contrary to policy TA1 of EDDC Local Plan.
8. **Park and ride** was never intended to be permanent.
9. **Care Home** – need has not been established.
10. **Public consultation** was for another scheme and not held in the parish. Inadequate.
11. **Sustainability:** benefits regarding creation of construction jobs and provision of housing. But too remote from facilities, and adverse effects on landscape / environment significantly outweigh these therefore not sustainable as defined by NPPF.

To date, there are no supportive comments, but there are two neutral ones which both acknowledge that the affordable houses proposed would be beneficial to Lyme Regis and therefore an arrangement to allocate a proportion to Lyme-connected people is essential. The third neutral comment questions figures used in the traffic survey.

Many of the public objections address the same issues as the CPRE, especially the landscape harm and the difficulty of getting to local facilities on foot or cycle.

Other major areas of concern are:

1. So many inaccuracies and misleading or mendacious statements in the documentation that it is hard to know how much, if any, can be relied on as accurate.
2. Impact on local facilities especially schools and medical centres.
3. Detrimental effect on tourism by spoiling the rural western approach to Lyme, and gridlock in summer.
4. Number of second homes in the area could easily fulfil the desire (not need) for more houses. No 'urgent unmet need' for houses evidenced by number of houses already on the market and being built locally.
5. Affordable (80% market value) housing, e.g. in Lyme, is not really affordable given the very high property prices and low wages in the area.
6. Households in most need on the housing register would be dropped into an isolated settlement with no facilities.
7. The care home could fulfil the affordable element as stated by Hallam, without any actual affordable houses.
8. Public transport past the site is infrequent and mistimed for commuters to larger employment centres. Local employment is limited and low-paid.
9. Increased traffic in Gore Lane is dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists, and on Sidmouth Rd especially at holiday times.
10. Arrangements for the proposed footpath to Lyme will result in huge hold-ups at holiday times.
11. Parking in Lyme is impossible at busy times and cars park up from the telephone exchange to Ware Cross for special events.
12. Concern over Lyme's bathing water quality if increased demands on sewers.
13. Concern over flooding into Uplyme down Gore Lane catchment.
14. Light pollution in a current area of dark skies.

15. Permanent ruination of the AONB which should be protected for everyone, not carved up for private gain.
16. This reduced application, from the one previously proposed, is clearly phase 1, and if granted, so that the view east to Lyme includes suburban development, the AONB is fatally compromised and there is little incentive to prevent further development along the A3052.

Not all of these are material planning reasons, but the highways issues, sustainability, local services and flood risk are, for example.

Public comments made at Uplyme PC consultations on 5/6 and 13/6/2015

Many of the above points were reiterated by the 61 people who left written comments. Some of these people have also commented on the web site so are not new objectors.

Other issues raised included:

1. The dangerous exit onto the B3165 from Gore Lane.
2. Danger to people walking their children to school from Venlake.
3. Flooding from the fields into Barbers Lane.
4. Losing a green wedge between Uplyme and Lyme.

Draft comments made by the Ward Councillor

I have seen a copy of these and made sure that there are no other points not included above. They do make extensive reference to policy, and EDDC and WDDC plans, and cross-border co-operation however.

Ian Thomas's comments will be published in due course. In the mean time, they are confidential.