



Exeter City Council

South West Alphington Development Brief
Supplementary Planning Document
Adoption Statement

June 2014

Exeter City Council adopted the South West Alphington Development Brief on 24 June 2014. Following representations, the consultation version of the document (February 2014) has been amended as set out in the schedule below.

Rep No	Respondent	Summary of Representation	ECC Response	Changes to Development Brief
1	Mr M Salmon. Sustainable Places Planning Specialist	NPPF seeks to direct any new development to areas outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3 and any new development within these zones would need to be safe for a lifetime and not increase flood risk elsewhere. We need new development to manage surface water drainage on site through SUDs to halt the increase and if possible, reduce surface water flooding. We are satisfied with the proposed development brief.	Noted	None
2	Mr C Liversidge. NPS South West Ltd on behalf of Devon County Council	The brief incorrectly states that the site is allocated in the Exeter Core Strategy, the land to the west of Shillingford Road (the island site) and coloured green on Fig 1 is not included in the Core Strategy plan.	Agreed.	Amend Brief to clarify that the island site is not allocated for development in the Exeter Core Strategy.
		The brief needs to consider the wider South West of Exeter development proposals for 2500 dwellings.	Noted. Section 4 includes information on the relationship of the site to development in the wider SW Exeter area. This will be updated to reflect the current situation.	Update the information in section 4 about the relationship of the site to the wider SW Exeter development area. Move this information to section 1 of the Brief.
		There is a medical centre in Alphington and neither evidence nor funding for a new doctor's surgery are available to locate them on this site. A new health centre would support the needs of the wider development area in the Teignbridge District and should be located in a more sustainable location.	There is a clear need for a doctor's surgery within the SW Urban Extension as a whole. At present there is no clear certainty that s surgery will be provided within Teignbridge. Until such a commitment is in place, it is prudent for the City Council to safeguard a site at SW Alphington.	No change to Brief.
		It is not considered appropriate to locate a recycling facility adjacent to a health centre.	Disagree.	No change to Brief.

		<p>Land allocated for allotments should be in accordance with existing policy and will ultimately be determined by reserved matters or detailed planning applications.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CP17 requires development to the south of Alphington to provide allotments to meet the needs of residents. Albeit that it does not form part of the Strategic Allocation, the island site is identified as the location for future allotment provision in order to provide certainty to developers. It is considered to be the optimal location for the allotments, given that it is the area of the site most affected by traffic noise from the A30, is of a size that would accommodate allotments to meet the needs of future residents, and is the most elevated (and thereby visually the most sensitive) area of the site. Developing the island site for allotments would enable best use to be made of the remaining site.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
		<p>The provision of Public Open Space is already an adopted policy and will depend on the overall site area with formal space being dependant on population and no. of dwellings. The siting of Public Open Space and SUDs are a matter of detailed design. The positioning of SUDs cannot be linked to a play area although it would be desirable if SUDs could be included in the overall provision of Public Open Space.</p>	<p>Disagree. The amount of public open space required by the Brief equates to the amount that can be sought under Local Plan Policy DG5. Core Strategy Policy CP12 is clear that all development proposals must mitigate against flood risk utilising SUDs where feasible and practical. The FRA undertaken for the site indicates that SUDs can be utilised in certain areas of the site. It is reasonable to require the public open space to be located so as to maximise the use of SUDs.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>

	Housing mix should be based on an up to date assessment and not based on evidence that is now 5 years old.	Disagree. Core Strategy Policy CP5 requires schemes of 10 or more dwellings to include a housing mix that is informed by the most up-to-date HMA. At present, the 2010 HMA is the most up-to-date version. A new HMA is being prepared and will inform any planning application, subject to timing.	No change to Brief.
	The paragraph relating to affordable housing should read 'Any development should include affordable housing in accordance with the current adopted policy'.	Noted. The Brief will be amended to refer to viability. Co-operative housing will be accepted, but not required, as part of the mix.	Amend brief to state that "Any development must include 35% affordable housing, subject to viability, to be provided as an integrated part of the scheme and in accordance with the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. Co-operative housing may form part of the affordable housing mix."
	Asking for proposals in the vicinity of the Markham Land ridgeline to be accompanied by sections showing impact on the skyline and proposed boundary treatments, limits design flexibility. It would be better to limit ridge height to allow for roof space utilisation.	Disagree. The Exeter Fringes Landscape and Capacity Study states that "The area (i.e. the SW Alphington site) has some capacity for housing but this is limited to the north, retaining the southern area as a buffer to ensure development does not break the skyline when viewed from the south.". In view of this, it is entirely reasonable to require sections so that any impact on the skyline can be fully assessed.	No change to Brief.
	The principle of encouraging residents to walk, cycle or use public transport is supported.	Noted.	No change to Brief.
	Outlining the three off-site projects to be funded by S106 agreement is too prescriptive. Individual items should be considered at the time of application, should be relevant to the number of units proposed and take into account any other sources of funding	Disagree. The three projects are outlined in order to provide developers with certainty as to costs. The three projects are necessary to ensure the sustainable development of the site.	No change to Brief.

	available.		
	The need for shared cycle paths is supported. However the provision of access points should be agreed in detailed applications. It is unreasonable to insist upon a footpath cycleway along the southern boundary between Chudleigh and Dawlish Roads when safe linage will be provided in accordance with prevailing design manuals.	Agree that the provision of access points should be determined in detailed applications. The Brief will be amended accordingly. However, disagree that it is unreasonable to insist upon a footpath/cycleway along the southern boundary. This is considered necessary to enable the sustainable development of the site. The Brief will be updated to include further information about the provision of the route, to provide certainty.	Amend Brief to state that "Figure 2 shows the potential location of access and egress points." Amend Brief to include further details of how the footpath/cycleway along the southern site boundary should be provided as part of the development.
	The viability of a Decentralised Energy Network is questionable, it is suggested that the requirement is reworded, deleting 'necessary on site infrastructure be put in place for connection of those systems to the network' and add the development will connect to a District Heating System if such a scheme is available.	A study by the Centre for Energy & the Environment at Exeter University and Parsons Brinkerhoff has demonstrated that an energy network is viable and feasible at SW Alphington. Teignbridge District Council is leading a work stream with major developers involved in the SW Exeter urban extension, including Devon County Council, to deliver District Heating. EON has presented a formal proposal to developers.	No change to Brief.
	It is unreasonable to insist that the S106 should be completed in 90 days as the content will be informed by the City Council's consideration of the application and will then go through the legal process.	Disagree. The Development Brief provides a significant degree of certainty over the required contents of the S106 Agreement. It should therefore be completed well within 90 days of the registration of any planning application.	No change to Brief.

		The content of the draft development brief is too aspirational, overly prescriptive and does not sufficiently refer to the need for compliance with existing adopted strategy. The majority of the site is already allocated within the Exeter Core Strategy, it should not be made to carry a disproportionate amount of the provision of facilities in the context of the wider development proposals for the Teignbridge area to the south.	Disagree. The Brief adds detail to the development requirements for the site set out in the Core Strategy. The Brief only seeks the provision of those facilities necessary to ensure the sustainable development of the site.	No change to Brief.
3	Jillings Hutton Planning on behalf of St. Bridget Nurseries	We support the authority's desire to successfully develop the area to the south west of Alphington. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF, National Planning Practice Guidance and Policies CP1 and CP19 of the adopted Core Strategy provide guidance on any development proposals that come forward working within the general policy support found in the Core Strategy. The Residential Design and Affordable House SPDs are both prescriptive. We question if the development brief provides any addition to the process of guiding the eventual planning application for the site. We consider that preparation of the document is unnecessary given the policy framework already in place. The Brief manages to be vague and prescriptive in equal measure and we consider that the successful development of the land to the south west of Alphington could proceed without reference to the brief but to the existing policy framework already in place.	Disagree. The Brief adds detail to the development requirements for the site set out in the Core Strategy.	No change to Brief.
		We question the use of the work 'exceptional' in relation to standards of design. The design is addressed through existing SPD and exceptional is subjective. We consider making reference to a high standard of design consistent with relevant policy.	Agree.	Amend Brief to state that "This Development Brief requires the site to be developed as a place which provides homes...that are of a high standard of design".

		<p>The brief states that a health centre and allotment 'must' happen without justifying this by reference to evidence. There is no reason why this is the only acceptable solution or that there is no other solution that is not better.</p>	<p>Allotments: Core Strategy Policy CP17 requires development to the south of Alphington to provide allotments to meet the needs of residents. The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners recommends the provision of 20 plots per 1000 population. The island site is of a size sufficient to accommodate the number of allotments that are estimated to be required as a result of the development, including a small amount car parking and circulation space. Doctors: There is a clear need for a doctor's surgery within the SW Urban Extension as a whole. At present there is no certainty that a surgery will be provided within Teignbridge. Until such a commitment is in place, it is prudent for the City Council to safeguard a site at SW Alphington.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
		<p>The local centre is shown as an approximate location, not informed by anything in particular that points towards this being the most appropriate solution.</p>	<p>A location on the main Chudleigh Road and close to existing housing is appropriate</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
		<p>We do not dispute the need for adequate publicly accessible open space but the provision of a LEAP and NEAP do not appear to be based on any detailed analysis of the constraints and hence capacity. The level of prescription is unhelpful in the event of an acceptable alternative being proposed, therefore, it should be removed from the document.</p>	<p>The exact amount and type of children's play space required cannot be calculated until housing numbers are agreed. However, given the size of the site and the density requirements of the brief, it is expected that there will be a need for a LEAP and NEAP as part of the development. The locational requirements of the LEAP and NEAP are only intended to be approximate.</p>	<p>Amend Figure 2 of the Brief to clarify that the location of the NEAP and LEAP are approximate.</p>

	<p>The reference to densities are vague and unhelpful and should be clearly expressed with suitable flexibility or deleted from the document. Being overly prescriptive on all matters without reference to the required flexibility inherent in the development management process is of no assistance to either applicants or decision makers.</p>	<p>Disagree. The density requirements are considered to be set out in sufficient detail to assist developers and decision makers.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>We do not believe that the site's topography is particularly challenging and it is unnecessary to both state that any buildings should not exceed 2 storeys in height and ask for a Travel Plan at this stage.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Exeter Fringes Landscape and Capacity Study states that "The area (i.e. the SW Alphington site) has some capacity for housing but this is limited to the north, retaining the southern area as a buffer to ensure development does not break the skyline when viewed from the south.". In view of this, it is entirely reasonable to require sections so that any impact on the skyline can be fully assessed and include a presumption against buildings of more than two storeys. It is entirely reasonable and in accordance with policy to expect any planning application to be accompanied by a Travel Plan.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>We do not believe that the local planning authority can be certain of the relevant sums at this point with regards to CIL. The requirements need to be justified by reference to CIL Regs and to capacity of the site and outline what precisely the money will be used for.</p>	<p>The CIL charge arising from any development is not set out in the Brief. It will be calculated at the Reserved Matters stage, in accordance with the CIL Regulations.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>There is no reason why the various arrows are optimal locations for access points and we are certain that a design solution can be found that provides the natural surveillance required but does not result in the houses near to Markham Lane all facing due south.</p>	<p>Agree that the location of access points should be determined in planning applications. The Brief will be amended accordingly. Orienting dwellings to overlook the pedestrian/cycle route is the optimal way to ensure natural surveillance.</p>	<p>Amend Brief to state that "Figure 2 shows the potential location of access and egress points."</p>

4	Mr T Keate, local resident.	<p>The brief states that 7 detailed reports be prepared and agreed at pre-application stage, further agreement also needs to be undertaken regarding CIL, S. 106 agreements and road access and layout. Therefore, I request that the planning authority organises a meeting of all land owners involved in the development of this site to ensure that they collectively agree.</p>	<p>Noted. It is desirable that all landowners and the planning authority work together to ensure the sustainable development of the site.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
		<p>The proposed health centre and recycling site on the eastern side of Chudleigh Road will be adjacent to a proposed access into the development and this will cause congestion on a presently high traffic road.</p>	<p>Location of access points is indicative (see above). Access to the health centre site and recycling facility is likely to be off the site access, not direct to Chudleigh Road.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
5	Mr J Keech. Devon County Council	<p>The principle of providing a brief to guide development in this area is supported.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
		<p>The brief would be improved by recognising that the site relates to a much wider development area which continues into Teignbridge. This is not reflected with enough significance, especially in relation to the proposed location of community facilities. The site should be considered as part of a 2500 dwelling urban extension rather than a single 500 dwelling development, therefore, facilities such as the doctor's surgery, recycling facilities and allotments should be located as appropriate to the wider context. The most suitable location for health facilities would be near to the proposed education facilities to the south, allowing people to make linked trips.</p>	<p>Noted. The Brief will be amended to clarify the relationship of SW Alphington to the wider SW Exeter Urban Extension. Core Strategy Policy CP17 requires the provision of allotments as part of any development at the site. In respect of other community facilities, there is a clear need for a doctor's surgery within the SW Urban Extension as a whole and the provision of new recycling facilities will help to meet community needs. At present the location/range of community facilities to be provided within Teignbridge is still to be determined. It is therefore prudent for the City Council to safeguard a site for a doctor's surgery and recycling facilities at SW Alphington. This site would be released if facilities come forward elsewhere in SW Exeter.</p>	<p>Update the information in section 4 about the relationship of the site to the wider SW Exeter development area. Move this information to section 1 of the Brief.</p>

	<p>The development requirements could reference with greater clarity the requirements set out in the Exeter Core Strategy, specifically relating to policies CP17 and CP19.</p>	<p>Disagree. Section 4 clarifies that the Brief is supplementary to Policies CP17 and CP19 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>The promotion of sustainable travel opportunities is strongly supported. It should be noted that the 3 specific projects, in a table on page 7 will be delivered using either S. 106 contributions or CIL levy receipts, as well as other funding streams, the village public realm enhancement scheme could not be funded through S. 106 as it appears on the City Council's regulation 123 list. It is felt that the detail on these schemes should be reduced and that instead of a table, a list of transport projects required to support the development of the site would be appropriate. The county council is adopting a new approach in which a 'per dwelling' contribution will be sought to fund travel planning. As such, it should read 'all residential developments make an agreed financial contribution towards residential travel planning.' Any non-residential development will still need a travel plan.</p>	<p>The 'Village Public Realm Enhancement Scheme' is a traffic calming project that can be funded through a Section 106 Agreement. Residential travel planning could be implemented by the developer or through a contribution to DCC.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>References to high quality pedestrian/cycle routes, natural surveillance, bus through route and low speed highways are supported.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>It is recommended that the specified location of all access points is clarified as being indicative and subject to further refinement as they will be determined through the site design and planning application process.</p>	<p>Agree that the provision of access points should be determined in detailed applications. The Brief will be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Amend Brief to state that "Figure 2 shows the potential location of access and egress points."</p>

6	Ms L Horner. Forward Planning Network on behalf of Natural England	It is our advice that there are likely significant environmental effects from the proposed plan. We can confirm that the development site will be in close proximity to the Exe Estuary SPA, Exe Estuary Ramsar and Exe Estuary SSSI.	The site is already allocated for residential development and associated infrastructure in the Exeter Core Strategy. The environmental effects of developing the site were considered in full during the preparation of the Core Strategy. Any development will be subject to the Council's adopted CIL charges. The Council's Regulation 123 List includes the mitigation of recreational impact on European designated habitats as infrastructure likely to benefit from CIL funding.	No change to Brief.
		We are not aware of significant populations of protected species which are likely to be affected but information should be provided supporting this screening decision to assess whether protected species will be affected.	The Brief requires an ecology survey to be submitted with any planning application, which must include the identification of any protected species. Compensation and mitigation measures must be identified were appropriate and agreed with the Council.	No change to Brief.
7	Humeira Yaqub. Office of Rail Regulation	We note that your proposals outline plans affecting the railway line, namely the 'Loram Way Cycle Walk'. If your plans relate to the development of the current railway network within your administrative area, we would be happy to discuss these with you once they have become more developed.	The approximate route of the proposed scheme is over 500m from the nearest rail line. The project is not yet under way, and Devon County Council are still in negotiation with the landowners to agree terms. Planning consent will also be required.	No change to Brief.
8	Mr I Turnbull. NHS England	NHS England have no provision to fund any new medical facility in the proposed development so I imagine that the health centre site is a speculative inclusion on the plans.	There is a clear need for a doctor's surgery within the SW Urban Extension as a whole. At present there is no certainty that a surgery will be provided within Teignbridge. Until such a commitment is in place, it is prudent for the City Council to safeguard a site at SW Alphington.	No change to Brief.

9	Ms K Plumb. Housing Development Officer, Exeter City Council	We would not insist on co-operative housing forming part of the affordable housing mix. Could the words 'co-operative housing must form part of the affordable housing mix' be changed to 'may form'.	Agreed.	Amend Brief to state that co-operative housing may form part of the affordable housing mix.
		Any extra care facility must meet the requirements of Exeter City Council's Housing Department and Devon's Extra Care Commissioning Strategy and follow the Housing LIN Design Principles for Extra Care.	Noted and agreed.	Amend Brief to state that the extra care facilities must follow the Housing LIN Design Principles for Extra Care.
10	Mr M Dunn. South West Water	With regards to foul drainage facilities, capacity is available within the public foul sewer in Chudleigh Road to which the western site would drain to support a maximum of 300 dwellings. We are aware of other possible development draining via this route and capacity can only be reserved by obtaining planning permission. If other sites come forward for planning and are approved in advance of this spare capacity, drainage improvements will be required which we will require potential developments to fund. The public foul sewer network to which the eastern site would discharge has insufficient capacity to support its development and therefore we would require developers to establish what improvements are necessary.	Noted. The Brief will be updated to include this information.	Amend Brief to include information on foul drainage provided by SWW.

11	Mr G Parsons. Sport England	<p>Please be aware, Sport England is a statutory consultee on planning application affecting playing fields. A planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities for sport is necessary. Sport England is currently supporting the Council in producing an evidence base for playing pitches. We are concerned that the Council has no evidence base for built sports facilities that includes swimming pools, shorts halls etc. Sport England supports the provision of sports facilities encouraging the planning authority to seek professional advice from the National Governing Bodies to ensure fit for purpose facilities in the right locations. Often, playing pitches are identified on a Masterplan but are not big enough or too close to housing. Sport England would encourage the new developments to be designed in line with the Active Design principles.</p>	<p>In the absence of a finalised evidence base for built sports facilities and the provision of playing pitches in Exeter, the City Council is unable to require the provision of such facilities as part of development at South West Exeter. Provision should be viewed in the context of the wider SW Exeter urban extension, within which significant outdoor and indoor sports and recreation facilities will be accommodated.</p>	No change to Brief.
12	Ms S Parish. Highways Agency	<p>A number of applications are currently coming forward in the area so a joined up approach is essential. The impacts of development in this location will be felt in Teignbridge District but co-operation between the two Authorities is not clear in this document. There are issues on the Strategic Road Network with poor journey reliability on the M5 between junctions 29 and 30. It is the 133rd worst junction of 2,497 nationally. It is important to ensure the phasing of transport infrastructure is in place before any development occurs with an agreed delivery and funding system with neighbouring authorities beforehand. Public transport, cycle and pedestrian routes are welcomed. An evidence base is required to understand impacts on the SRN and this should be produced at an early stage as it will inform the Travel Plan. We need to be involved as early as possible in discussions to ensure developers understand the highway network, especially impacts on the SRN.</p>	<p>SW Alphington is already allocated for residential development in the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Brief together require the provision of transport measures to ensure the sustainable development of the site. The City Council is working closely with Teignbridge District Council and Devon County Council to ensure that the necessary transport infrastructure is in place to enable the sustainable development of the wider SW Exeter urban extension.</p>	No change to Brief.

13	Ms H Jessop. Natural England	We recommend the addition of a requirement for the development to 'minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide a net gain in biodiversity.' This can be achieved by on-site habitat retention, creation, management and maximising the potential of built development together with biodiversity offsetting and CIL contributions.	This would not fall within the CIL 123 and so could not be funded through CIL. Otherwise agree with the suggested amendment.	Amend Brief accordingly.
		There is no mention of Public Open Space having biodiversity provision as one of its functions. We recommend the brief requires that the POS contributes towards biodiversity conservation and enhancement.	Agreed. The Brief will be amended accordingly.	Amend brief to state that "The POS must be an integral element of the site's overall design and located so as to maximise the use of SUDs and contribute towards biodiversity conservation and enhancement."
		With regard to allotments, fences provide little value whereas a hedge composed of a variety of species will provide wildlife habitat and enhance the local landscape. If a fence is essential, than a wire mesh fence alongside would provide security.	Agreed. The Brief will be amended accordingly.	Amend brief to state that the allotment should be bound by a hedgerow incorporating a wire mesh fence for security.
		We note the LEAP and NEAP will include buffer planting but it is not clear whether it will be of native species, non-native species should not be permitted.	Agreed. The Brief will be amended accordingly.	Amend brief to state the buffer planting should be of native species.
		We recommend the brief refers to relevant measures from guidance entitled 'Sustainable Drainage Systems- Maximising the Potential for People and Wildlife'.	Disagree. This is considered to be an unnecessary point of detail.	No change to Brief.
		CIL contributions will be required to fund mitigation of recreational impacts on international sites.	Agree. However, this does not necessitate any change to the Brief.	No change to Brief.
		Surveys should include a breeding bird survey, surveys for other species e.g. curlew, should be carried out if there are existing records of presence at or near the site.	Noted.	No change to Brief.
		Retained trees and hedges should be incorporated into a green infrastructure framework and should form links across the site.	Agreed. The Brief will be amended accordingly.	Amend brief to state that ""These must be incorporated into a landscape and green infrastructure framework for the new development...".

		We recommend the brief places more emphasis on recommendations made in 'Planning for a Healthy Environment'.	Disagree. This is considered to be an unnecessary point of detail. The Brief implicitly seeks to deliver a 'healthy development', through measures to encourage travel by non-car modes and the provision of public open space.	No change to Brief.
		The no. of built-in nest and roost sites per development should be approx the same as the no. of residential units.	Disagree. The Brief is SPD and cannot create policy. However, in accordance with the Residential Design Guide SPD, as part of providing for biodiversity in the new development, the developer will be encouraged to incorporate nest boxes and roost sites.	No change to Brief.
		We recommend the brief includes reference to phasing of development at South West Alphington with provision of the Ridge Top Park .	Disagree. The Ridge Top Park is to be provided within the Teignbridge element of the wider SW Exeter Urban Extension. It is not directly related to SW Alphington.	No change to Brief.
14	Mr S Bates. Exeter and East Devon Growth Point	We strongly support emphasis on public open space, biodiversity protection and sustainable transport. Please reword 'respects existing trees and hedgerows' to 'avoids damage to existing trees, hedgerows and associated species, then mitigates direct impacts and finally offset any unavoidable residual impacts, incorporating these within a green infrastructure framework.'	Support noted. Agreed.	Amend Brief accordingly.
		The phrase 'report must identify all existing trees and hedgerows that are worthy of retention' is rather subjective and a better phrase may be 'the report must identify all existing trees and hedgerows to be retained.'	Agreed.	Amend Brief accordingly.
		With regards to allotments, can you add 'a commuted sum will be required for maintenance.'	Disagree. It is anticipated that ownership of and responsibility for running the allotment site will be transferred to a local community group.	No change to Brief.

		Can you add that SUDs will be expected to maximise their biodiversity potential and not solely function as water management features and to involve local community, ecologists and landscape architects in the detailed design and management of public open space and SUDs.	Agree that SUDs should maximise their biodiversity potential. The detailed design and management arrangements for public open space and SUDs will need to be agreed with the local planning authority before any planning application is determined. The local planning authority will ensure that biodiversity is taken into account in this process.	Amend brief to state that "SUDs will be expected to maximise their biodiversity potential and not solely function as water management features."
		We would welcome a statement that applicants will be required to clearly set out the area and quality of habitats in the development site, clearly stating which are to be retained, enhanced or destroyed.	Agreed. Section 3 will include reference to the need for biodiversity offsetting.	Amend the Brief to more accurately reflect the need for biodiversity offsetting.
15	Mr T J Baker. on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd.	We welcome the list of development requirements set out in the brief but it must be for the market to respond to the need for open market housing, any attempt to preset the housing mix could mean development are not interested in the site.	Disagree. In setting out a requirement for a mix of housing, the Brief reiterates the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP5.	No change to Brief.
		There is an absence of any mention of education provision. ECC cannot rely on development proposed within Teignbridge to deliver education provision. Schools in the general area are either at or over capacity. The brief should include at least a reserve site for a primary school.	Disagree. ECC is working with DCC, TDC and landowners to ensure the provision of educational facilities to meet the needs of the SW Urban Extension as a whole. Work to date would suggest that there is no desire to locate a school within the SW Alphington site.	No change to Brief.
		We can find no evidence to support the assertion of the three off-site projects mentioned with regards to S106.	The projects are supported by the SW Exeter Transport Access Strategy.	No change to Brief.
		A financial contribution towards the car club must be justified.	Disagree. The Brief accords with the City Council's adopted car club policy, which is set out in the Sustainable Transport SPD.	No change to Brief.

		<p>We have seen no evidence that a Decentralised Energy Network is viable or feasible, therefore we are pleased there is an opportunity to implement alternative solutions.</p>	<p>A study by the Centre for Energy & the Environment at Exeter University and Parsons Brinkerhoff has demonstrated that an energy network is viable and feasible at SW Alphington. Teignbridge District Council is leading a work stream with major developers involved in the SW Exeter urban extension, including Devon County Council, to deliver District Heating. EON has presented a formal proposal to developers.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
		<p>The requirement to create a S106 within 90 days is unreasonable.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Development Brief provides a significant degree of certainty over the required contents of the S106 Agreement. It should therefore be completed well within 90 days of the registration of any planning application.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
16	Ms V Bankes Price. The Woodland Trust	<p>We would like the brief to more effectively incorporate woods and trees as no person should live more than 500m from accessible woodland of no less than 2ha and of woodland no less than 20ha within 4km. Woodlands help improve air quality and flood amelioration.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the City Council has no policy basis to require these standards to be met. The Brief requires the identification of trees and hedgerows to be retained and will be amended to reflect the need for biodiversity offsetting.</p>	<p>Amend the Brief to more accurately reflect the need for biodiversity offsetting.</p>

17	Bovis Homes	The document is an elongated version of the Local Plan policy for the site, it is a missed opportunity to seek to guide the form of development. Bovis would expect an indicative potential road network, some form of indicative landscaping and further detail with regard to potential buffer zones associated with adjoining ancient monuments. There is no reference to a masterplan for the site or for Teignbridge. There is no mention of co-ordinated delivery between this site and Teignbridge's plans, especially regarding health planning, the provision of open space and allotments and pedestrian/cycle links. We have concerns over education provision and local residents have a strong preference for some form of primary provision in the Alphington area.	Disagree. The Brief adds detail to the development requirements for the site set out in the Core Strategy. However, the Brief will be amended and updated to include details of how SW Alphington fits with development in the wider SW Exeter Urban Extension. As regards to education provision, the City Council has made strong representation on the issue of schools near Alphington to Devon County Council. It is within Bovis's gift to apply for planning permission for a new school on it's land.	Update the information in section 4 about the relationship of the site to the wider SW Exeter development area. Move this information to section 1 of the Brief.
18	Cllr M Clark. Alphington Ward Cllr	I am concerned that the width of Dawlish Road will not be sufficient for a bus and car to pass and that sight lines will not be adequate for buses. I would like a detailed highways assessment before this is considered as a safe route.	Noted. Detailed proposals for vehicular access on Dawlish Road will be fully considered by Devon County Highways in advance of the granting of any planning applications.	No change to Brief.
19	Mr J Cullen, local resident	My concern is the use of the top of Steeple Drive for cyclists and pedestrians. This is not a right of way and we will not allow this to be used for public access.	Disagree. The provision of pedestrian/cycle routes between the new development and adjoining residential areas is important to encourage travel by no-car modes.	No change to Brief.
		I am concerned about the Health Centre/Doctors Surgery, the building would be directly in front of 27 and 29 Steeple Drive, if it will be over one storey high, it will overpower our bungalows. I would like a planning officer to visit to discuss these points.	Detailed design and position will be considered at the planning application stage.	No change to Brief.
20	Mr & Mrs R P Nayler, local residents	Encouraging sustainable transport routes is laudable but details of how developer's proposals will be evaluated should be given.	The developer's proposals will be assessed primarily against the City Council's Sustainable Transport SPD.	No change to Brief.
		Not all ideas discussed with Alphington Village Forum have been included.	Correct. The requirements of the AVF have been included in the Brief wherever possible.	No change to Brief.

	<p>No. 72 Chudleigh Road is known locally as 'Silverlands'.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Amend Brief to include reference to Silverlands where No. 72 Chudleigh Road is mentioned.</p>
	<p>Specification of the location of allotments should not be given as it restricts their use and they would be better located along the ridge line. I think there is confusion between metric and imperial as 10 rods =257.7sqm and 5 rods=128.8sqm and I take it that it is intended that the plots will be 5 rods and not 10 rods as mentioned.</p>	<p>The island site is identified as the location for future allotment provision in order to provide certainty to developers. It is considered to be the optimal location for the allotments, given that it is the area of the site most affected by traffic noise from the A30, is of a size that would accommodate an allotment to meet the needs of future residents, and is the most elevated (and thereby visually the most sensitive) area of the site. Developing the island site for allotments would enable best use to be made of the remaining site. The Brief will be amended to clarify requirements as to measurement.</p>	<p>Amend Appendix A of the Brief as follows: "The amount of land allocated for the provision of allotments is based on the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners guideline of 20 plots (each measuring 10 poles or 250 ms sq) per 1000 households. Each plot provided within the new facility must measure a minimum of 5 poles (125 ms sq)..."</p>
	<p>With regard to pedestrian and cycle access, the access point to the west should be onto Shillingford Road to avoid the existing hedge and the central access point should connect with the existing road.</p>	<p>The exact location of access points will be agreed during the planning application process.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>Details of the expected philosophy regarding provision of car parking spaces is needed.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council's policy on the provision of car parking is set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD. Developers will be expected to comply with this policy. There is no need for it to be reiterated in the Brief.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>
	<p>With regard to existing housing, Veitch Gardens and Royal Close on the west of Chudleigh road have densities slightly lower than 20dph. The width of the boundary where densities of 20dph are required needs to be specified, I would suggest a band of 25 metres. These are built on the last site occupies by the famous 'Veitch Nurseries' should be added.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Brief cannot be overly prescriptive in relation to density. An element of flexibility is required. Reference to Veitch Nurseries would be superfluous.</p>	<p>No change to Brief.</p>

21	Ms S White, local resident	The widening of footpaths in Church/Chudleigh Road through Alphington Village would lead to more traffic congestion and the bus finds it difficult to negotiate the turn from Ide Lane into Church Road. There should be a roundabout at the junction of Shillington Road/Chudleigh Road/ Chantry Meadow. The area in Church Road outside the post office should have double yellow lines.	This comment relates to the Public Realm Enhancement Scheme, which development at SW Alphington will be expected to fund. The comment is a detailed point about the Scheme and is not directly relevant to the Brief. The comment will be forwarded to Devon County Highways.	No change to Brief.
22	Mr G Craig, local resident	The proposed location of local centre will require service traffic to drive through new estate and so it should be moved to the south, adjacent to Chudleigh Road access.	Exact location of access points will be agreed through planning applications. The site remains the most appropriate.	No change to Brief.
		The proposed housing mix is wrong for Alphington. It should be 20% 1 bed, 30% 2 bed, 30% 3 bed and 20% 4 bed.	Noted. In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP5, the Brief should make reference to the need for housing mix to be informed by context, as well as the most up-to-date Housing Market Assessment. However, to assist applicants, information on the housing requirement identified in the latest HMA should be retained.	Amend Brief to state that the development must deliver a mix of housing that is informed by context and the most up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment.
		I support the scheme in principle but there should not be a loss of 4 parking places on the triangle adjacent to the church.	This comment relates to the Public Realm Enhancement Scheme, which development at SW Alphington will be expected to fund. The comment is a detailed point about the Scheme and is not directly relevant to the Brief. The comment will be forwarded to Devon County Highways.	No change to Brief.
23	F Manterfield & J Baker, local residents	Concerns re. traffic calming measures. These could cause congestion at peak times. A roundabout should be installed at Chudleigh Road/ Shillingford Road/ Chantry Meadows junction and double yellow lines on these 3 roads. There should be a speed camera on Chudleigh Road.	This comment relates to the Public Realm Enhancement Scheme, which development at SW Alphington will be expected to fund. The comment is a detailed point about the Scheme and is not directly relevant to the Brief. The comment will be forwarded to Devon County Highways.	No change to Brief.

24	Ms A Craig, local resident	I disagree with the location of a health centre/doctor's surgery/ recycling centre and it should be further south at access point to Chudleigh Road to avoid traffic.	The location of will be agreed through planning applications. The site remains the most appropriate.	No change to Brief.
		The mix of housing is not suitable and should read 15% 1 bed, 30% 2 bed, 35% 3 bed and 20% 4 bed.	In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP5, the Brief should make reference to the need for housing mix to be informed by context, as well as the most up-to-date Housing Market Assessment. However, to assist applicants, information on the housing requirement identified in the latest HMA should be retained.	Amend Brief to state that the development must deliver a mix of housing that is informed by context and the most up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment.
		I agree with the footway widening plan but disagree with the proposed enlargement of the green triangle (intersection of Chudleigh and Dawlish roads) thus losing 4/5 parking spaces and left access to Chudleigh Road.	This comment relates to the Public Realm Enhancement Scheme, which development at SW Alphington will be expected to fund. The comment is a detailed point about the Scheme and is not directly relevant to the Brief. The comment will be forwarded to Devon County Highways.	No change to Brief.
		The existing route of the A bus must be maintained.	Disagree. Re-routing the A Bus is necessary to ensure the sustainable development of the site.	No change to Brief.
25	W H Bassett, local resident	I welcome the allotment site but urge the retention of the existing hedging around the site and the use of a covenant to preserve the site for allotments in perpetuity.	Agree that the allotment should be bound by a hedgerow, although this will need to include wire mesh fencing for security reasons. Developer will be required to make permanent arrangements for allotments.	Amend brief to state that the allotment should be bound by a hedgerow incorporating a wire mesh fence for security.
		It is not clear that the top, left hand side of Shillingford Road is included in the 20dph boundary and should be single storey to match existing with Markham Lane junction.	The island site (to the west of Shillingford Road) is identified in the Brief for the provision of allotments. A requirement for 20dph is considered unnecessary fronting Shillingford Road.	No change to Brief.

		The mix is too in favour of 1 bed homes.	Disagree. The mix set out in the Brief is based on the latest Housing Market Assessment, in accordance with planning policy. The final housing mix will be determined at pre-application stage, with reference to the context of the site and the latest Housing Market Assessment.	No change to Brief.
		The Environmental Impact Plan should be carried out in close collaboration with the Alphington Forum.	Disagree. The Environmental Impact Assessment is prepared by the developer and must be agreed by the City Council. It is not a document that is subject to public consultation.	No change to Brief.
		Shillingford Road already has problems with cars parked along one side making 2 lane passing impossible, attention needs to be paid to tackle the problem which will get worse. There is no mention of car parking in the new development and ECC has failed to address this at planning stages in the last decade.	The Council's policy on the provision of car parking is set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD. Developers will be expected to comply with this policy. There is no need for it to be reiterated in the Brief.	No change to Brief.
26	Mr M Welch, local resident	I believe the development will ruin the south west area. There will be little boundary distinction between the areas in Teignbridge creating urban sprawl. It will be dangerous for pedestrians and will increase air pollution. Our hospitals are overcrowded and there are insufficient medical centres to take care of existing residents. Unemployment will rise. I say no to the development.	The principle of development is established. South West Alphington is allocated for residential development in the Exeter Core Strategy.	No change to Brief.
27	Ms N Cole, local resident	I am pleased there will be extra care housing on the site. I am interested to understand if is suitable for me.	Noted.	No change to Brief.
28	Cllr M Clark on behalf of Mr & Mrs Cullum, local residents	Concerned that an access road may pass their bungalow.	The Brief stipulates that motor vehicle access must only be taken from Shillingford Road, Chudleigh Road and Dawlish Road (i.e. not from existing adjoining residential streets, including Steeple Drive).	No change to Brief.

29	Mr R Howell, local resident	This is a beautiful part of Devon that is becoming more like versions of Swindon or Basingstoke. The current plans are too broad to have real meaning. Developer's mission is to maximise profits and they do not care about existing residents.	South West Alphington is allocated for residential development in the Exeter Core Strategy. In addition to existing planning policies in the Development Plan, the Brief seeks to ensure sustainable and high quality development of the site.	No change to Brief.
30	Mr B Toze, local resident	There are too many pedestrian/cyclist access points. This will lead to vandalism and security issues. One access point, immediately north of the proposed local centre would pass directly in front of our house. It would be dangerous for pedestrians and they would have to share this driveway with vehicles.	The exact location of access points will be agreed during the planning application process, taking into account issues of residential amenity and safety.	No change to Brief.
		Visitors to the local centre and doctor's surgery will park at the top of Steeple Drive and cut through the pathway. This access point will also result in the removal of established trees and hedgerow which should be protected.	The local centre and doctor's surgery will have appropriate parking. There will be no reason for people to park in Steeple Drive. Footpath connections may necessitate some loss of trees/hedges.	No change to Brief.
31	Mr P May, local resident	Why is it proposed to give £0.7 million to a bus company to change their route. If any route improvements were combined with the bus to Kenn, there may be an opportunity to reduce overall subsidy.	The upgrade and extension to the A Service is considered essential to ensure the sustainable development of SW Alphington. £700,000 is the amount that Devon County Council advise is required.	No change to Brief.
32	Mr T Honey, local resident	I am opposed to all building on green field sites. There is enough space within built up areas which could be used for housing.	Disagree. The Core strategy seeks to focus as much development as possible on previously developed sites. However, due to the level of housing need in the City, it is also necessary to develop greenfield sites. The site is allocated for development in the Exeter Core Strategy.	No change to Brief.