

Exeter Plan 2021-2041

Publication Stage (Regulation 19)

Representation Form

Ref:

**(For official
use only)**

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates: Exeter Plan 2021-2041

Please return to Exeter City Council, Local Plans Team, Paris Street, Exeter, EX1 1JN, upload onto our consultation portal at <https://exeterplanpublication.commonplace.is/> or email to planning.policy@exeter.gov.uk by **11:59 pm on 6 February 2025**.

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal Details: Needs to be completed only once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A: Personal details

1. Personal details*

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation (if application) boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in section 2.

Title

First Name

Last Name

Broom

Job Title (where relevant)

Organisation (where relevant)

c/o agent

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone number

E-mail address

2. Agent's details if applicable

Title

Mr

First Name

James

Last Name

McMurdo

Job Title (where relevant)

Director

Organisation (where relevant)

McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Address Line 1

The Basement Office

Line 2

4 Baring Crescent

Line 3

Exeter

Line 4

Devon

Post Code

EX1 1TL

Telephone number

E-mail address

Part B – Representation

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

3. To which part of the Exeter Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph

Policy

Policies Map

4. Do you consider that this part of the Exeter Plan is legally compliant?

Yes

No

4 (a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Exeter Plan, please use this box to set out your comments.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

4 (b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Exeter Plan is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

4 (c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Exeter Plan legally compliant, in respect of any legal compliance matters you have identified at 4(b) above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Exeter Plan legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

5. Do you consider that this part of the Exeter Plan is Sound?

Yes

No

No

5 (a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Exeter Plan, please use this box to set out your comments.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

5 (b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Exeter Plan is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please note that these representations should be read in conjunction with representations submitted to previous consultations of the Exeter Plan made by McMurdo LPD on behalf of our Client.

Policy H2

Proposed Policy H2 allocates land for new homes, listing these allocations under headings, strategic mixed use brownfield sites, large scale predominantly residential sites, major predominantly residential sites and minor residential sites. It notes that the principle of housing development on unallocated windfall sites in the urban area will be supported.

Policy H1 refers to the Council's housing requirement, identified as 642 new homes per year, and the Exeter Plan indicates it will deliver a supply of 13,975 homes (allowing for a headroom of 1,135 homes). Policy H1 refers to the allocated sites (listed in policy H2) as delivering a total of 5,369 new homes and 1,006 new homes being delivered on windfall sites.

The allocations listed in policy H2 largely rely on the redevelopment of large scale brownfield sites. The focus on brownfield sites, whilst a laudable aspiration, is flawed. Recent planning decisions demonstrates that the viability of brownfield redevelopment is fragile. As such a plan which seeks to deliver the vast majority of the City's housing requirements on brownfield land is likely to fail at meeting the housing needs of the City.

Proposed allocation SBA1 Water Lane includes 1,861 new homes and 980 of these homes are subject to planning application reference 23/1007/OUT. The ECC Planning Committee has recently resolved to approve this application, in accordance with the Officer recommendation [See Committee Agenda for Planning Committee here](#). The recommendation concluded that the development is unviable both with and without affordable housing provision. A Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA) was included within the application submission, assessed by an independent consultant and considered to be consistent with the RICS Practice Statement and Guidance. The independent assessment of the FVA confirmed that the viability gap is substantial and that the development is unviable. The Committee Report confirms that, due to significant abnormal and additional costs in bringing this brownfield site forward, the development would not be able to provide affordable housing in addition to the infrastructure funding.

The Committee Report confirmed that still, even without affordable housing provision, the development is unlikely to proceed without external subsidy or other intervention.

The conclusions of the application FVA is a stark contrast to the findings of the Viability Assessment (VA) of the Exeter Plan (para. 6.5) which found that the brownfield higher density allocations of VA1 Exeter central (which includes SBA1 Water Lane), *'are broadly viable as tested and able to deliver the general policy requirements'*. The VA (para.6.8) caveats that *'there is little detail available on site costs or funding mechanisms for the allocation specific policies'* and that *'the approach taken within the viability assessment is to separately test the likely forms of development and tenures and consider the viability headroom available to meet any site specific cost implications'*. Further, the VA assumes lower values than existing use values, i.e. the viability assumes brownfield land values not existing high value employment use values, resulting in unrealistic outcomes when determining the viability of the Exeter Plan. In light of this (and in noting the outcome of 23/1007/OUT), the accuracy and reliability of the findings of the VA with regard to brownfield allocations is highly questionable. [See Viability Assessment of Viability Plan here](#)

Application reference 23/1007/OUT Water Lane (South) demonstrates that brownfield sites cannot be a reliable source of housing delivery to meet Exeter's housing needs.

As set out in our previous representations, whilst brownfield redevelopment is a cornerstone of sustainable development and is an admirable aim that our client fully supports, viably delivering the vast majority of housing required in the plan period largely on brownfield land in a city, would stifle development, and worsen the documented undersupply of housing in the sub region.

It is reasonable to conclude that additional land, and in particularly greenfield land, will need to be released to supplement brownfield land allocations to meet housing need, taking account of the historic shortfall that has taken place over the current plan period. If sufficient land to meet housing need cannot be allocated within Exeter's administrative area, neighbouring authorities must, under the Duty to Cooperate, allocate land to meet their needs and those of neighbouring authorities.

ECC and EDDC (and arguably other administrative areas) are failing in their Duty to Cooperate. The Exeter Plan needs to address the shortfall in housing and employment land supply either by allocating additional deliverable land within its administrative boundary to meet Exeter's need or alternatively if this is not possible it must successfully engage in the Duty to Cooperate and formally make a request to EDDC (and other administrative area) to assist in meeting the housing and employment needs of Exeter.

Our Client's land is suitable and available to meet Exeter's (and East Devon's) needs broadly in line with the issues that subregion faces.

5 (c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Exeter Plan sound, in respect of any soundness matters you have identified at 5(b) above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Exeter Plan sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.
(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

The Exeter Plan needs to address the persistent and significant shortfall in housing land supply either by allocating additional deliverable land within its administrative boundary to meet Exeter's need or

alternatively if this is not possible it must successfully engage in the Duty to Cooperate and formally make a request to EDDC (and other administrative area) to assist in meeting the housing needs of Exeter. Consideration should be given to suitable greenfield sites where new homes can be delivered with more certainty.

Our Client's land is suitable and available to meet Exeter's (and East Devon's) needs broadly in line with the issues the subregion faces.

6. Do you consider that this part of the Exeter Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate?

Yes ☐

No ☐

6 (a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Exeter Plan's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.
(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

6 (b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Exeter Plan fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.
(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Exeter is more than 2,000 houses behind in the current plan period ([See Authority Monitoring Report 2023-2024 here](#)) and doesn't have a 5 year housing land supply ([See Committee Agenda for Planning Committee here](#)). Clearly, it doesn't have enough employment land (See EDNA). East Devon, its neighbour, has 2.97 years housing land supply ([See SPC Report here](#)) and a recent appeal ([See Appeal Decision here](#)) found that it had only 2Ha of employment land available. Advice from Inspectors following the EiP into Teignbridge DC's Plan means that TDC will have to reconsult on housing policies that provide for growth from Exeter (and Torbay).

The evidence shows a failure in the DTC.

Our Client's land is suitable and available to meet Exeter's (and East Devon's) needs broadly in line with the issues the subregion faces.

Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.

7. If you would like to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) please provide your comments here, stating to which part of the SA your comments relate.
(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

8. If you would like to make representations on the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) please provide your comments here, stating to which part of the HRA your comments relate.
(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please note In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

9. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

10. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

We would like to participate in the hearing sessions to elaborate further on the issues raised in these representations.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

For more information on how we use your data – please read our privacy notice at the following website: <https://exeter.gov.uk/media/5750/planning-policy-privacy-notice.pdf>

Appendices 20009

Land at Clyst St George & Clyst St Mary

This plan is published for the convenience of the purchaser only. Its accuracy is not guaranteed and it is expressly excluded from any contract.



Based on Ordnance Survey 1:2,500 mapping with the permission of the Controller of HMSO
©Crown Copyright
Licence No. VA 100033416


Drawing No. W17693-01 Date 29.07.22


Scale
1:10,000 @ A4



**THE
MAPPING
COMPANY**

Little Cutsey, Cutsey, Taunton, Somerset, TA3 7NY
Tel: 01823 421354 Email: patrick@mapping-company.co.uk





Land at Clyst St George & Clyst St Mary ☐ - Retained Land

 - Retained Land

Grid Ref. SX 983 004
bearing No. WY603-13 Date 17.10.24

Based on Ordnance Survey 1:2,500
mapping with the permission of
the Controller of HMSO
© Crown Copyright
Licence No. VA 100033416

Scale
1:250 @ A3



**THE
MAPPING
COMPANY**

Little Cutsey, Cutsey, Taunton, Somerset, TA3 7NY
Tel: 01823 421354 Email: patrick@mapping-company.co.uk

