

Meeting With Developers To Discuss Haven Banks Redevelopment Project

11am, 5th December 2022, Online via TEAMS

These are Andrew Nixon's informal notes only. Please be aware that they are not agreed and are one person's views of the meeting.

Attendees

- Colin McQueston [CM]- Coplan (Development Manager)
- Jonathan Rowlett [JR]- Union4 Planning (Planning Consultant)
- Richard Pia [RP]- Camargue (Assisting Consultation)
- Gert Vonhoff [GV]- Exeter Civic Society
- Keith Lewis [KL]- Exeter Civic Society
- Andrew Nixon [AN]- Local Residents

Consultation Status

- The consultation period had finished and Coplan had gathered the information and met ECC and the Design Officer.
- Coplan have a further review with ECC before xmas to ensure that they are moving in the right direction.
- Coplan are looking at making amendments and submitting revised plans in early January.
- Coplan are expecting ECC to suggest a re-consultation process.
- Coplan confirmed that the overall development objectives remain as the submitted proposals. There are 9 or 10 amendments that are being progressed.
- Coplan advised that they cannot come up with a scheme that will please everyone, however they are not here to fight with people locally.
- When questioned if the planning comments by the community are being addressed, Coplan advised there are overlaps with the broader comments and these will be considered.
- Coplan has held discussions with the Water Lane and 'gas site' developers.
- Coplan has had little engagement with LDA, the architect that ECC use for envisioning work.

Site Ownership

- Coplan advised that the site is owned by Wellbeck Estates and was acquired 18 months ago.
- Coplan are acting as the Development Manager, although they are a developer in their own right on other projects.

Prospectus

The prospectus for Haven Banks development has been issued to the development team previously. KL/GV/AN gave an overview of the prospectus and their thoughts, including:

- The purpose of the prospectus was to consider the development of the wider area
- The Haven Banks proposals do not appear to consider the wider area
- The Haven Banks proposals are very inward looking as is the Water Lane development
- There needs to be synergy with the local community
- The size of the building and the co-living model do not sit well within the community
- The need for development is understood but it must enhance the community not be detrimental to it

Improvements to community infrastructure

- Coplan advised the developer can only focus on the 'red line' constraints of the site.
- Coplan advised that a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is paid to the Local Authority (LA) and it is down to the LA to implement their community plans. The developers cannot influence the LA.
- This was challenged. If the increased resident numbers meant that there were community issues- such as the safety impact of increased footfall on the alley on the opposite side of the bridge- then they do need to be considered.
- It was acknowledged that the Civic Society/Residents need to engage with the LA.

Parking/ Traffic

- Coplan confirmed that there are 5 co-car stations on the development as this is what was recommended with the co-car business.
- Coplan confirmed that the feedback from Highways was that the traffic levels would be less with this development and would not support re-letting as retail units.
- We questioned how the parking on the highways would be managed.
- Coplan confirmed that no residents parking permits would be available to residents of the development.
- Increased parking enforcement visits would be encouraged by the developers.
- We advised that people just ignore tickets as it turns out to be cheaper than buying a permit anyway.
- We advised that the parking challenge would just be moved to the closest neighbouring area where permits were not needed.
- Coplan didn't believe that the tenancy could dictate that car ownership was not allowed.

Co-living concept

- The concept was defended by Coplan. They believe that it has a role to play in local communities.
- We raised the failure of 'The Collective' development where a co-living developer went in to administration. Coplan advised that this development had much smaller rooms than Haven Banks development and that advised this development is much more aspirational.
- Coplan has had meetings with Exeter City Council (ECC) to discuss the co-living concept.
- There is no national guidance on co-living but ECC is looking to develop in line with 'emerging standards' and the relevant 'London Plan'.
- Coplan advised the room sizes on the Haven Banks development are between 21-30 sq m. This is the upper range of co-living sizes.
- The co-living concept was challenged with the benefit that it brings to local communities. The residents tend to be transient.
- Coplan confirmed that there would be staff running the co-living scheme that would look at engaging with the community. There was reference to a company (Native?) that ran similar schemes and successfully engaged. The developer offered a visit to their co-living in Woking to see the engagement.
- There was challenge that the local community wanted homes to buy for the community.
- Coplan countered that the homes could be bought and then leased in an uncontrolled manner.
- Coplan confirmed that the development wouldn't be proposed if they didn't have belief that it was a successful concept.
- We agreed that we didn't agree on the co-living concept.

Design

- Coplan advised that the height will not be amended.
- When challenged on the graphics developed by the group showing the impact of the development on the community, Coplan didn't accept this as an accurate reflection of the development.
- Coplan advised that the Exeter Observer article where the images appeared was not helpful and misleading.
- We advised that we had requested views but that they had not been provided.
- Coplan confirmed that more views would be provided in the re-submission. The architect is meeting the planner on site to agree the key views to be presented,
- We advised that the building was 'very blocky' and this made the height more imposing. Coplan advised that this is being considered.
- Coplan confirmed that the substation on to Haven Banks attached to the climbing centre is operational and not owned by the developer.
- Coplan is looking in to how the square next to the large climbing centre wall can be enhanced.
- The scale of the project was challenged and that the developer would maximise units to increase profit. Coplan countered and said that the scale of the project needed to be suitable to justify the operational management and support costs.

Next Steps

- The developer has offered to meet the same team as at this meeting in January to discuss progress.
- The developer has accepted a request to engage with a wider section of the community group in January to discuss the revised proposals.