

**EXETER SHLAA 2015**  
**NOTES OF PANEL MEETING: WEDNESDAY 14 JANUARY, 10.30 am - 12.30pm**  
**RENNES MEETING ROOM, EXETER CITY COUNCIL**

Present: Katharine Smith – Principal Project Manager (Housing Delivery)  
Andy Robbins – City Development Manager (present for part of the meeting)  
Daniel Bullock – Project Support Officer

Mike Bailey – Stevens Homes  
Ralph Farleigh – KP Farleigh Ltd  
Pamela Wootton – Exeter Civic Society  
Will Pratt – DCC Highways  
Sally Parish – Highways Agency

**1. Welcome and apologies**

No apologies received.

**2. Purpose of meeting**

KS outlined the purpose of the SHLAA meeting and emphasised the importance of the Panel's role, in particular in providing advice on development viability and yield.

Pamela Wotton declared an interest in Sites 125 and 126 (ECFC Sites), due to her involvement on the Exeter St James Forum Design Panel.

**3. Site discussions**

The Panel's advice on each site is summarised below:

|  |
|--|
| <b>Site 115: Land rear of 2-20 Locarno Road</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yield of 7-14 is ok.</li><li>• Pedestrian/cycle access will be required onto Locarno Road.</li><li>• Viable in Years 1-5 subject to the cost of acquiring the land needed to provide highways access (owned by ECC).</li></ul> |
| <b>Site 116: Land at St Thomas Court</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Max yield should increase to 5.</li><li>• Viable in Years 1-5, provided FRA does not show that the site is in Zone 3b (in which case it would be discounted).</li></ul>  |
| <b>Site 117: Land north of Grange House, Pocombe Bridge</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agree that the site is unsuitable for development on flood risk grounds.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Site 118: Frickers Yard, Willeys Avenue</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yield needs to increase to 10-12 (flats) in order to become viable.</li><li>• Noise from railway doesn't pose insurmountable problems.</li><li>• Viable in Years 1-5.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Site 119: Social Club to south of Monitor Close</b>   |

|   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield of 6-8 is fine.</li> <li>• Site will need to be marketed, so should not be included in Years 1-5. Years 6-10.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Site 120: Units 1 &amp; 2 Gabriels Wharf, Water Lane</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield is fine.</li> <li>• DCC Highways have significant concerns over access into the Haven Banks area. A second point of vehicular access and planned public transport improvements in the vicinity is likely to be required if the area is to come forward for significant redevelopment.</li> <li>• Viable in Year 11+, in part to take DCC's comments into account. Also amenity issues.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Site 121: Land off Wreford's Lane</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notwithstanding that the site has been discounted by ECC on policy grounds, this is a viable site in Years 1-5.</li> <li>• Lack of transport infrastructure serving the north of city. Additional infrastructure would be required to bring forward significant sites in this area (e.g. P&amp;R, upgrade of Wrefords Lane, Cycle Route towards City Centre).</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Site 122: Land rear of Lower Argyll Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site already discounted by ECC on policy grounds.</li> <li>• Viability is questionable due to topography (may be less questionable for student housing).</li> <li>• DCC Highways would also have concerns about creating additional vehicular access onto Lower Argyll Road. Lack of transport infrastructure serving the north of city. Additional infrastructure would be required to bring forward significant sites in this area (e.g. P&amp;R, upgrade of Wrefords Lane, Cycle Route towards City Centre).</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Site 123: Nos. 15-16 Richmond Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield of 10 is fine.</li> <li>• Car parking would need to be provided on site, as the site is in a location where no new parking permits are being issued. Car access can be achieved to the rear of the site.</li> <li>• Viable in Years 6-10, as not available during Years 1-5.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Site 124: 23 Cathedral Yard &amp; nos. 55-56 High Street</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is now the subject of a planning application (14/4831/03) and LB application to convert the upper floors to 7 apartments.</li> <li>• Therefore amend yield to 7.</li> <li>• Viable in Years 1-5.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Site 125: ECFC Fountain Centre, St James Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield is fine.</li> <li>• If developed for non-student housing: attending Panel Members advised that the site would not be viable if scheme involved converting the existing buildings. Viability marginal if existing buildings demolished. <b>ACTION: KS TO SEEK VIEWS OF NON-ATTENDING PANEL MEMBERS.</b></li> <li>• If developed for student housing, Years 6-10 given issues with Neighbourhood Plan and need to market the site as a community facility.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Site 126: Land at ECFC/Yeo &amp; Davey/ rear of no.20 Old Tiverton Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield is fine.</li> <li>• Loss of garages on Y&amp;D site may not be too much cause for concern, as probably too small to be used for parking and could be off-set by provision of on-site car parking in any development scheme.</li> <li>• DCC Highways would require a contribution towards provision of the University-City Centre cycle route, if site developed to provide student housing.</li> <li>• Viability a concern if developed for non-student housing. <b>ACTION: KS TO SEEK VIEWS OF NON-ATTENDING PANEL MEMBERS.</b></li> <li>• Leasehold terms are not known. Also issues with the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, even if developed for student housing, it would need to be placed in Years 6-10.</li> </ul> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Site 127: Pyramids Leisure Centre, Heavitree Road</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend yield to 20-30 units.</li> <li>• No potential for conversion. Therefore looking at demolition and new build. If landowner covers the costs of clearing the site and addressing drainage issues, then it may be viable in Years 6-10. Otherwise not a viable site.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Site 128: RD&amp;E Hospital (Heavitree Campus), Gladstone Road</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield is fine.</li> <li>• Land contamination issues likely to be significant.</li> <li>• Two points of highways access will be required, as at present. DCC would also like to secure land to help deliver part of a strategic cycle link.</li> <li>• Viable in Years 6-10, as not available until then.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Site 129: No 79 Heavitree Road</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield is fine.</li> <li>• Conversion only due to merits of existing building.</li> <li>• Viable in Years 1-5.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Site 130: Land adjacent Wonford House, RD&amp;E Hospital (Wonford Campus), Dryden Road</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is suitable –development would not harm the landscape setting of Wonford House and there is no need to safeguard for future hospital use, as it has been confirmed as surplus to requirements.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding draft assessment that site is unsuitable, development would be viable.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Site 131: 91-91 Wonford Street</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCC Highways would no longer require provision of footway along northern boundary. Adequate parking provision required.</li> <li>• Both demolition &amp; new build and conversion of existing buildings likely to be viable in Years 1-5.</li> <li>• Amend yield to 7-11, to reflect need to discount 4 existing dwellings if scheme was for conversion of existing buildings.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Site 132: West of England School Topsham Road</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KS confirmed that the site is no longer available and will not appear in the published SHLAA.</li> <li>• Panel advised that development would be viable if site was available.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Site 133: Land to north east of Newcourt Drive</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yield is fine.</li> <li>• Viable in Years 1-5, given the site is the subject of a current planning application made by a housebuilder.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Site 134: Land adjacent Lakeside Avenue</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel queried why the site is open space, when it is privately owned.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding that the site is discounted on policy grounds, it is a viable site.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Site 135: Land adjacent Gullpit Cottages, Glasshouse Lane</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unviable – lime kilns would need to remain. Potential net site area is too small.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Site 136: Land at Highfield Farm, Clyst Road, Topsham</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel commented on site viability, notwithstanding that site is discounted on policy grounds.</li> <li>• Highways Agency expressed concern about the impact of development on Junction 30, which will be operating at capacity once Ikea and other planned schemes are delivered. A major upgrade will be required, which may affect site viability. However, other potential development sites in the area could share the burden.</li> </ul> |

#### 4. Any other business

KS to follow up on actions and report back to the Panel ASAP. Agreed that sign-off of the SHLAA Report will be via email.

KS advised that the SHLAA Steering Group have produced nursing/care home data, to try and help address the Panel's concerns about how this type of housing can be taken into account in projections/completions figures. This will be circulated to the Panel over the next few weeks, with a view to updating the SHLAA Methodology.

KS thanked the Panel for their attendance.