

Appendix G: Detailed Assessment of Development Distribution Scenarios

Contents

- Development Distribution Scenarios 2
- Summary of Sustainability Appraisal scores 3
- Detailed Sustainability Assessment of Development Distribution Scenarios 4

Development Distribution Scenarios

The following development distribution scenarios have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal:

1. Business as usual
2. Town centre intensification
3. Mainly Rural Distribution
4. Proportionate growth of all settlements
5. Areas with greatest access to public transport infrastructure
6. Areas with greatest access to employment opportunities
7. Development away from international wildlife sites
8. Market led

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal scores

Scenario	A. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	B. LANDSCAPE	C. HISTORIC AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT	D. CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION	E. CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION	F. LAND RESOURCES	G. WATER RESOURCES	H. HOMES	I. HEALTH	J. WELLBEING	K. ACCESS TO SERVICES	L. JOBS AND LOCAL ECONOMY	M. TOWN CENTRES	N. CONNECTIVITY AND TRANSPORT
1. Business as usual	-	-	-?	-	0	-	0?	+	+	0?	+	+	+	+
2. Town centre intensification	-	-?	-?	0?	-	+	0?	++	+	0?	+	+	+	+
3. Mainly Rural Distribution	-	-	-?	-	0	-	0?	++	-	0?	-	-	-	-
4. Proportionate growth of all settlements	-	-	-?	-	0	-	0?	++	+	0?	-	+	0?	+
5. Areas with greatest access to public transport infrastructure	-	-	-?	0?	0	-	0?	++	+	0?	+	+	+	+
6. Areas with greatest access to employment opportunities	-	-	-?	-	0	-	0?	++	+	0?	+	+	+	+
7. Development away from international wildlife sites	+/-	-	-?	-	0	-	0?	++	+	0?	0	0	+/-	+
8. Market led	-	-	-?	-	0	-	0?	++	0?	0?	-	0	0?	+

Detailed Sustainability Assessment of Development Distribution Scenarios

<p>A. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</p> <p><i>To conserve and enhance the habitat, wildlife and landscapes of our natural environment</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Natural habitats and biodiversity; flora and fauna</i> • <i>Recreational and leisure opportunities compatible with conservation, and creation of multi-functional green infrastructure</i> • <i>Coast</i> • <i>Air Quality</i> • <i>Water Quality</i> • <i>Soil Quality</i> 	<p>Due to the limited amount of previously developed land potential in the district, it is inevitable that the majority of new development will require the use of undeveloped greenfield land. This will be the case for all scenarios and therefore a minimum level of c. 6,000 homes should be assumed as being required on greenfield sites under all scenarios. However, whilst the level of development assessed through each scenario does not differ, impacts on the various biodiversity designations, and Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in the plan area and surroundings will vary depending on their proximity to such features.</p> <p>Scenarios 1 and 6 would continue to distribute growth within the Heart of Teignbridge, Exeter urban fringe, and other towns in the District. All of these settlements are affected by national and international biodiversity sites. This includes the South Hams SAC, Dawlish Warren SPA, Exe Estuary SAC, Dartmoor SAC and the Torbay and Lyme Bay Candidate SAC.</p> <p>As such, it is expected that these scenarios have the potential to result in adverse effects in terms of biodiversity and on the natural environment depending on the specific sites chosen for growth. This may be as a result of species and habitats disturbance, habitat loss and fragmentation, pollution and soil degradation. The concentration of development within this limited range of settlements, alongside current strategies which have also seen moderate to high levels of development take place within these locations, will increase the potential for cumulative impacts on international biodiversity sites and other natural environments. This relates both to physical changes, such as to landscape features, habitats and soils, as well as to increased recreational impact of new residents. However, new development may allow for the enhancement of habitats through the incorporation of new green infrastructure and large sites in particular can potentially allow greater opportunities for diverting recreational pressure (e.g. through SANGS). Other on-site mitigation measures could also minimise the impact on natural habitats and environmental quality.</p> <p>There are AQMAs present in some of the settlements considered by Scenarios 1 and 6 (Newton Abbot, Teignmouth, Dawlish, Kingskerswell and Exeter) which could continue to be negatively affected by additional growth if not accompanied by alternative sustainable modes of transport. There are existing road building</p>

programmes to improve sustainable network corridors in Newton Abbot in particular, but no guarantee at present that this is going to result in an overall reduction in car use, particularly once new development is in place.

Scenario 2 would assume a similar distribution to Scenarios 1 and 6 but with a stronger focus on brownfield development. However, as noted above, the potential for brownfield supply is limited and therefore the majority of development would still be required to use greenfield sites. In this respect, this scenario therefore has similar potential impacts on the natural environment as described above. Nevertheless, maximising brownfield potential will facilitate the development of sites which are less sensitive in terms of biodiversity and furthermore may allow for opportunities for the incorporation of green infrastructure which is likely to provide new habitats and improve habitat connectivity within urban settings. In doing so, it would also reduce the level of growth which has to be located on greenfield sites and therefore reduce overall impacts on the natural environment. Development would intensify residential activity within the towns, some of which have active AQMAs. However, the location of new development close to public transport links, services and facilities could help to reduce car-based travel from these new developments which may not significantly worsen AQMA conditions.

By allowing for a mainly rural distribution of growth, **Scenario 3** would limit development taking place within the main towns of the district and on the Exeter urban fringe. This approach is less likely to make use of brownfield land which, in general, is in greater supply at urban locations considering the more developed character present there. The resultant higher amount of land take at greenfield locations is also likely to be detrimental to biodiversity in the plan area. There would be impacts on all designated AQMAs as a result of this distribution of development.

Many of the district's rural areas are also affected by the national and international biodiversity designations which constrain the larger settlements. **Scenario 3** would therefore also result in impacts on these designations, although the extent of impact would be dependent on specific sites chosen and potential mitigation opportunities. The more distributed nature of development under this scenario may reduce the cumulative impact of development within a particular location. The nature of more scattered rural development may result in a greater number of smaller sites being allocated rather than fewer, large scale options; this may not provide the scale of growth at given locations to provide opportunities for the incorporation of significant elements of green infrastructure.

Distributing growth proportionally around all settlements in the settlement hierarchy as per **Scenario 4** has the potential to affect natural environments and biodiversity designations across the whole of the district. The spatial

distribution of development under this scenario is very similar to **Scenario 8** (market led). While these scenarios would result in all settlements with defined settlement limits accommodating some level of new growth, the larger settlements in the plan area would still accommodate the highest level of growth. As per Scenarios 1, 2 and 6, these larger settlements are in close proximity to national or international biodiversity sites. So too are various other defined settlements, meaning that the impact of development on national and international designated wildlife sites would be spread more widely across the district. The emphasis on 'proportionality' could result in development being directed to more sensitive environments and designations rather than being restricted in certain areas because of particular sensitivities and/or an ability to mitigate or avoid impacts effectively. As with Scenario 3, a larger number of smaller sites may provide fewer opportunities to provide significant elements of green infrastructure for new habitats and improve habitat connectivity. There would be impacts on all designated AQMAs as a result of this distribution of development.

Scenario 5 allows for new growth mostly along the public transport infrastructure corridors and hubs in the plan area. This will see much of the development occurring within the main towns and Exeter urban fringe, as well as a couple of outlying rural villages (Ide, Exminster, Abbotskerswell). The majority of growth would focus more towards the north/south transport corridor between Exeter, Newton Abbot and Torbay with much of the new growth occurring along the bus and train service lines which extend from these places.

Although the future development pattern would be focused largely on existing larger settlements which should be favourable for existing biodiversity sites, at the same time there is more potential for new development to go beyond recognised settlement limits to cover land within nodal/transport corridor areas which would have some mitigation consequences for natural environment factors.

This approach may however have significantly adverse impacts in terms of level of growth which would be provided in close proximity to the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. It is expected that this scenario would provide similar opportunities to Scenarios 1, 2 and 6 for the re-use of brownfield and incorporation of new green infrastructure at the more urban locations of the plan area which may help to limit greenfield land take and provide habitats and habitat connectivity. There would be impacts on all designated AQMAs as a result of this distribution of development.

Scenario 7 focuses on locating development away from internationally designated wildlife sites. This significantly limits the locations for new development, and therefore focuses growth in the very north of the district (Tedburn),

	<p>the Heart of Teignbridge, and a small number of villages to the south west of Newton Abbot. This option has significant benefits for the key protected designations in the district, namely the Exe Estuary SPA, the Dawlish Warren SAC and the South Hams SAC (SSSIs and Sustainance Zones). However, evidence on the use of the wider landscape by Greater Horseshoe Bats associated with the South Hams SAC shows that GHBs use a much wider landscape area which supports the functionality of the SAC as a whole. As such, much of the area within this scenario where development would be located is within a designated Landscape Connectivity Zone. The concentration of development within this small area could have a significant cumulative impact on this supporting habitat. There would be impacts on all designated AQMAs as a result of this distribution of development.</p>
<p>B. LANDSCAPE</p> <p><i>To conserve and enhance the landscapes/seascapes of our natural environment</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Landscapes (including AONBs and National Parks) and landscape character</i> • <i>Coast</i> 	<p>The potential for different distributions of growth to have impacts on landscape has been considered at a high level in relation to how new development locations affect important landscapes and coastal areas. These specifically include the special landscapes of the Dartmoor National Park (and its fringe areas), the Undeveloped Coast, the Exeter urban fringe and the historic designed landscapes around the Haldon Hills of Mamhead, Oxton, Powderham and the Haldon Estates.</p> <p>Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6 are most notably focussed on delivering new growth towards the existing larger settlements. While there may be potential for the regeneration of a higher number of brownfield sites through these options, it is likely that the development of greenfield sites needed could have adverse impacts on existing local character. While the re-use of brownfield land is likely to present opportunities for the improvement of townscape and urban character, beneficial effects are unlikely to extend to include those relating to landscapes or seascapes in the natural environment. In particular, Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6 could result in adverse impacts on the Undeveloped Coast designation (affecting sites around Teignmouth and Dawlish), the Exeter Urban Fringe, and the Dartmoor fringe (affecting sites around Ashburton, Chudleigh and Bovey Tracey).</p> <p>In order to achieve the level of development required, some sites may be unavoidably located around these special landscapes. This is particularly likely under Scenarios 1, 2 and 6 because of the higher concentration of development required in these settlements as a result of the proposed distribution. This could result in a greater cumulative change to the affected landscapes which will have a greater overall impact on them. A change in the scale of development for these areas may therefore be required to mitigate impact.</p> <p>Scenarios 3, 4 and 8 propose a much wider distribution of development and as such, the availability of sites away from some of the these special landscapes might result in development being able to avoid the most sensitive</p>

	<p>locations/designations. Nevertheless, there are still settlements within this wider distribution pattern which are affected by the special landscapes, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teignmouth, Dawlish, Bishopsteignton, Shaldon, Cockwood, Starcross, Kenton and Exminster affected by the Undeveloped Coast designation; • Ide, edge of Exeter, Exminster, Kenn and Kennford affected by the Exeter Urban Fringe landscape; and • Tedburn St Mary, Chudleigh Knighton, Chudleigh, Bovey Tracey, Liverton, Ashburton and Buckfastleigh affected by the Dartmoor fringe. <p>The extent of impact on these landscapes will vary depending on their specific locations and therefore is unknown at this stage. However, the more dispersed nature of development and wider choice of sites could have less cumulative impact overall on changes to the most sensitive landscapes of the district.</p> <p>Scenario 7 focuses development in locations where there are fewer landscape sensitivities in terms of the defined special landscapes. Development in Tedburn St Mary could affect the setting of the Dartmoor National Park and some locations may have less of an impact than others. Under this scenario, a significant amount of development would be concentrated in a small number of locations. As such, although not as affected by the defined special landscapes, there is inevitably localised landscape character which such a high amount of development will have an impact on, with the cumulative nature of development having the potential to adversely affect the wider landscape character and setting of these particular settlements.</p>
<p>C. HISTORIC AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT</p> <p><i>To conserve and enhance our built and historic assets and promote high quality architecture, design and accessibility in new build development</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p>	<p>The potential for different distributions of growth to have impacts on the historic and built environment has been considered at a high level in relation to how new development locations might affect different areas. However, because of the widely dispersed nature of historic assets, it is very difficult to assess the impact of different distributions of development on this sustainability criteria. A more detailed analysis will therefore be required when undertaking sustainability appraisal of individual sites.</p> <p>Scenarios 1, 5 and 6 will result in high levels of greenfield development on the edges of the main towns in the district. All of these towns have one or more conservation areas and depending on the individual site locations, there is the potential for an adverse impact on these heritage assets. Edge of town development also has the potential to change the rural character surrounding the settlements, changing the way in which existing settlements are perceived as they are entered. The cohesion of new development linking with existing development on settlement edges will rely on good design, and respect for the transition from urban to rural</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Conservation of heritage assets within their setting, including Listed Buildings, Conservations Areas, Archaeological Sites and Scheduled Monuments</i> • <i>Safeguard cultural heritage and local character by conserving and enhancing existing built environment, and creating new high-quality built environment, including streets, spaces, public realm and detailing of new buildings</i> 	<p>settings. The concentration of development in fewer areas of the district has the potential to have a greater cumulative impact than other scenarios which disperse development more widely around the district.</p> <p>Scenario 2 proposes the highest concentrations of development within existing town centres. Such locations are most likely to contain a high level of heritage assets, such as listed buildings, conservation areas and local listings. However, the regeneration of such areas could make better use of existing brownfield land, offering opportunities for enhancement and better access to historic assets. This may benefit the character of these locations dependent upon the manner in which new development is delivered. As this scenario would be likely to achieve the highest concentration of growth in brownfield locations, it would furthermore limit the potential for development on greenfield sites which could adversely affect areas of particularly sensitive rural character where more outlying heritage assets and archaeological sites may be found. Overall effects will be dependent to some extent on the design of new development which may support mitigation and enhancement measures related to the character of a given area.</p> <p>Scenarios 3, 4 and 8 provide a more dispersed option for growth which would reduce the concentration of development in a smaller number of locations and therefore the cumulative impact of development on single townscapes/historic settings. The availability of sites across a wider area also increases opportunities to select sites which have less impact on sensitive historic and built environments. However, there are various settlements included under this scenario which have designated conservation areas and multiple listed buildings. Particularly in some of the villages where edge of village sites closely adjoin these conservation areas and historic assets, the potential for impact could be greater than sites on the edges of larger towns which are more detached from historic cores. As with scenarios 1, 5 and 6, the cohesion of new development linking with existing development on settlement edges will rely on good design, and respect for the transition from urban to rural settings.</p> <p>Scenario 7 focuses development in far fewer locations. Under this scenario, a significant amount of development would be concentrated in a small number of locations. As such, there is less opportunity for sites to be selected on the basis of minimising harm to the built and historic environment, with the cumulative nature of development having the potential to adversely affect localised historic, cultural and archaeological assets.</p>
<p>D. CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION</p> <p><i>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions</i></p>	<p>New policies in the Local Plan and/or the introduction of stricter energy efficiency requirements for new homes under the Future Homes Standard regulations will ensure that any new homes, under all of the scenarios, will be built to the same standards. In this respect, it is assumed that all scenarios will have a neutral impact on climate change mitigation in relation to the building itself.</p>

Factors to consider:

- *Development that minimises the need to travel by providing access to public transport, cycle and walking links to help reduce use of the private car*
- *Energy efficient developments and buildings, which make the best use of renewable and low carbon energy generation*
- *Multi-use green infrastructure which supports or creates transport networks*

However, the extent to which other scenarios have a more positive or negative effect on climate change mitigation is dependent on the ability to reduce carbon emissions from transport and to generate on site low carbon energy. Any new development will result in an increase in people and vehicle use. Until supporting low carbon infrastructure is in place (EV charging points, sufficient grid capacity, active travel networks etc.) it should be assumed that there could be a temporary negative impact on climate change.

The biggest contributor to greenhouse gases in Teignbridge is transport and therefore locating development close to existing services and employment hubs is likely to have the greatest impact on reducing emissions both in the short and longer term. As such, **Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6** are likely to have the greatest potential for reducing carbon emissions through reductions in car use. Well connected, and potentially larger scale, developments within these locations can maximise opportunities for active and sustainable travel, making use of existing walking and cycling networks, rail stations, and bus routes, and providing better connections to these.

In particular, **Scenario 2** which focuses growth on the regeneration of town centres is likely to provide a higher number of new residents with access to town centre services and facilities, sustainable transport links as well as the strategic road network. By maximising the proportion of new growth within town centres, this scenario could help to significantly encourage travel by more active modes of transport, considering the shorter journeys which would be required to services and facilities and employment opportunities.

The concentration of development in these better connected settlements will mean that larger scale developments are more likely, making on site low carbon energy generation more of a realistic prospect because of the scale of development envisaged and their proximity to the major energy/grid networks.

By significantly limiting the level of growth at the more rural locations of the plan area, **Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6** would limit the potential for dependency on travel by private vehicle.

Scenarios 3, 4 and 8 allow for a much wider rural distribution of growth in Teignbridge would limit development at the larger settlements. As such, there would be a larger amount of new residents having to travel longer distances to access services and facilities and employment opportunities. Many of these locations are isolated from sustainable transport links. This issue would be most extreme in **Scenarios 3 and 8** (Mainly Rural Distribution and Market Led). Under these two scenarios, allowing a wider distribution of growth in the plan area this approach

	<p>would also be less likely to deliver the critical mass at rural locations to support significant improvements to sustainable transport links in the plan area. It is likely that this approach would not directly promote modal choice/shift and conversely could result in increased dependency on travel by private vehicle. As such these scenarios may result in significant increases in greenhouse gas emissions in the plan area.</p> <p>Scenario 4 would be more proportional based on the level of existing services and therefore development would be naturally limited where there were fewer services. This would mean that a greater proportion of local trips could take place by foot, bike or public transport under Scenario 4 compared to Scenarios 3 and 8. Small amounts of development in rural settlements where existing services exist could also help to support local facilities, ensuring that they remain viable businesses in the longer term and therefore reduce the potential for services to cease and for existing local foot/cycle/public transport based trips to be replaced with longer car based trips.</p> <p>Scenario 7 focuses most growth in the Heart of Teignbridge and therefore has similar benefits to Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6. Some development is also directed to the villages of Tedburn St Mary, Ogwell, Denbury, Broadhempston and Ipplepen. All of these villages have at least a basic level of service provision which would mean that some development could benefit from accessing local services y sustainable means. However, in order for potential negative effects on climate change mitigation to be minimised, the distribution of development amongst these settlements would have to be mindful of existing services and therefore concentrate the highest levels of growth within the Heart of Teignbridge.</p>
<p>E. CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION</p> <p><i>To adapt to the possible effects of climate change</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Flood risk and the threat to people and property, and coastal change and adaptation</i> 	<p>The potential for different distributions of growth to have impacts on climate change adaptation has been considered at a high level in relation to how new development locations might affect different areas of potential flood risk. Without knowing where specific sites are likely to be developed, it is difficult to assess in any detail the impact of this scenario on the vulnerability of particular areas in the district which may be less able to adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>There are varying degrees of flood risk within each of the settlements and the potential for development to increase flood risk will depend on the specific sites chosen. In particular, there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs) affecting Teignbridge; these are located to the west of Newton Abbot and extending to Ashburton, the west of Bovey Tracey, the north and west of Dawlish and Torbay (affecting the Torbay urban fringe). All scenarios include some development in at least one of these settlements, although specific sites chosen may mean that the CDAs are not likely to be affected.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of high flood risk within the town centres of Newton Abbot, Kingsteignton, Teignmouth, Dawlish, Bovey Tracey and Chudleigh which are targeted for development under Scenario 2. Any development on sites affected by higher levels of flood risk have the potential to offset flooding issues elsewhere and will require careful flood risk management, alongside sequential and exception testing to ensure that they are suitable sites for development and that any adverse impact can be mitigated. • The east coast of the district will be affected in the longer term by Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA). These areas are likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast, including flooding. New development would not normally be permitted in a CCMA. All scenarios include some development in at least one of the settlements along the affected eastern coastline, although potential sites that fall within a CCMA are likely to be discounted from development at an early stage. <p>For the purposes of this stage of assessment, it is therefore considered that all scenarios are likely to have a minor negative effect on climate change adaptation, although it is noted that the impacts could be more or less significant depending on the specific sites chosen at allocation stage.</p>
<p>F. LAND RESOURCES</p> <p><i>To utilise our land resources efficiently and minimise their loss or degradation</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Soil quality</i> • <i>Safeguard mineral resources</i> • <i>Reuse of previously developed land</i> <p><i>Minimise waste (reuse, recycle, recover)</i></p>	<p>Due to the limited amount of previously developed land potential in the district, it is inevitable that the majority of new development will require the use of undeveloped greenfield sites - and subsequent loss of agricultural land. This will be the case for all scenarios and therefore a minimum level of c. 6,000 homes should be assumed as being required on greenfield sites under all scenarios. However, whilst the level of development assessed through each scenario does not differ, impacts on the Best and Most Versatile soils in the plan area and surroundings will vary depending on their proximity to such features.</p> <p>Given the significant likelihood of the majority of development taking place on greenfield sites, soils will be affected as a result of all scenarios, with the potential for soil quality to be worsened through over compaction or pollution, or reduction in the availability of high-medium quality agricultural land. This can be minimised by appropriate construction techniques and avoidance of highest value agricultural land where possible.</p> <p>Scenarios 1, 5 and 6 would continue to distribute growth within the Heart of Teignbridge, Exeter urban fringe, and other towns in the District. Greenfield land surrounding these settlements are mainly Grades 2 and 3 agricultural land value. There are areas of Grade 1 land surrounding Dawlish which may be lost through additional development in this location. As such, it is expected that these scenarios have the potential to result in adverse negative effects in terms of impact on land resources and soil quality.</p>

	<p>Scenario 2 seeks to maximise brownfield potential and therefore reduces the level of growth which has to be located on greenfield sites and overall loss of agricultural land. Nevertheless, a significant amount of development would still be required to take place on greenfield sites because of the lack of brownfield potential and therefore similar negative effects are likely as per Scenarios 1, 5 and 6.</p> <p>The continued concentration of development in the Heart of Teignbridge under Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6 has the potential to result in detrimental impacts on the potential extraction of minerals at Mineral Safeguarding Areas at these locations and /or favour the development of worked quarries over their planned restoration.</p> <p>By allowing for more dispersed and rural distributions of growth, Scenarios 3, 4 and 8 would limit development taking place within the main towns of the district and on the Exeter urban fringe. This approach is less likely to make use of brownfield land which, in general, is in greater supply at urban locations considering the more developed character present there. The resultant higher amount of land take at greenfield locations is also likely to be detrimental to biodiversity in the plan area. This scenario would see development take place on Grades 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>Scenario 7 would see development take place on Grades 2 and 3 agricultural land, avoiding any areas of the district where there is Grade 1 agricultural land.</p>
<p>G. WATER RESOURCES</p> <p><i>To utilise our water resources efficiently and minimise their loss or degradation</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Water quality and quantity</i> 	<p>The potential for different distributions of growth to have impacts on water resources has been considered at a high level because without knowing where specific sites are likely to be developed, it is difficult to assess in any detail the impact of this scenario on water quality and quantity.</p> <p>However, it is possible to look at the scenarios to see whether particular concentrations of development may affect nearby waterbodies both during construction and once built. For example, the Exe Estuary SPA is considered to be particularly sensitive to any change in water quality and as such the potential for new growth to affect this water course needs to be weighed. This would mean that Scenarios 1, 5, 6 and 8 would all have the potential to adversely affect this water resource.</p> <p>Further impacts on water quality may also be dependent upon the capacity issues at local sewage treatment works (STWs) to treat wastewater. However, South West Water has advised such locations can be connected to existing</p>

	<p>STW (some of which will require expansion), with no impact on the output water quality. The more dispersed scenarios (Scenarios 3, 4 and 8) are likely to result in a larger amount of smaller developments, with the potential for more local sewage treatment works to require upgrades to accommodate development. Larger developments focused in a fewer number of locations (as per Scenarios 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7) may make upgrades more feasible.</p> <p>For the purposes of this stage of assessment, it is therefore considered that all scenarios are likely to have a minor negative effect on climate change adaptation, although it is noted that the impacts could be more or less significant depending on the specific sites chosen at allocation stage.</p>
<p>H. HOMES</p> <p><i>To provide and maintain a sufficient supply of good quality, financially accessible homes of mixed type and tenure, suitable to meet the needs of Teignbridge</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Supply of housing</i> • <i>Housing mix and affordability</i> • <i>Housing delivery and diversity of supply</i> 	<p>Under all scenarios, the amount of new homes provided will meet the need identified through the standard method formula. As such, the supply of housing is assumed to be the same for each of the scenarios presented, having a positive impact on the provision of homes in the district.</p> <p>However, the mix, affordability, delivery and diversity will be affected to varying extents by the different scenarios chosen.</p> <p>Scenarios 1, 5 and 6 propose growth in a small number of key locations within the district. These are broadly those already having development under the 'Business as Usual' scenario and therefore the pattern of development would continue to focus new homes within the same localities, with the possible exception of Ide, Exminster and Abbotskerswell. This limits opportunities for more affordable homes to be built in the more rural areas which is likely to mean that the affordability of rural housing would not be directly addressed. There would also be fewer opportunities for people wishing to reside in settlements other than the main towns and edge of Exeter locations, and therefore enabling less choice and social mobility for families and support units to live in close proximity to one another. The focus on larger settlements could result in more larger sites being allocated which would reduce the diversity of supply in the market and may not serve to help increase the pace of development.</p> <p>However, there is a significant market for people wishing to live in these larger towns where services are more readily available, and where property values are more achievable, particularly for first time buyers. Policies which encourage diversity of supply within large sites (such as the 10% requirement for custom and self build plots) can also help to provide different options for people wishing to access the market in a different way. It is also likely that focusing growth in a smaller number of locations where larger sites are likely to be required may provide increased</p>

	<p>opportunities for the delivery of affordable homes as this may be more viable on larger sites. As such, Scenarios 1, 5 and 6 are considered to have a neutral impact on the Homes objective.</p> <p>Scenario 2 focuses development heavily on town centre locations. Whilst such locations are likely to be attractive to some, the nature of town centre development will inevitably result in mainly apartment-style buildings with communal, rather than private, outdoor space. This may be less attractive to some people, particularly families with children. As with Scenarios 1, 5 and 6, it would continue to focus development in the 'business as usual' locations, which would limit opportunities to address more localised housing needs and issues elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>Scenarios 3, 4 and 8 promote a much more dispersed distribution of growth and in so doing provide more opportunities to meet localised housing needs and issues elsewhere in the district. A larger number of smaller sites could help to increase the pace of development, with smaller sites generally having fewer overall constraints to overcome. As a result there would also be a wider choice of sites to help diversify the market, particularly under Scenarios 4 and 8 which is likely to see a more proportional distribution with a mix of large and small sites. The rural areas in general attract higher property values and while this may mean that some of the homes are out of reach for those on lower incomes, it should mean that the viability is better and therefore the delivery of more affordable homes as part of developments can be secured. In this respect, Scenarios 4 and 8 appear to have a minor positive effect on the Homes objective, through providing a mix of sizes and locations of development across the district. Scenario 3 may have a minor negative effect because of its reliance on development away from the main towns and edge of Exeter where a large amount of housing need and market demand exists.</p> <p>Scenario 7 significantly limits new housing development to only a few settlements. Although this includes the Heart of Teignbridge, it makes no provision for development dispersed across a wider area where the housing need and market demand exists (e.g. edge of Exeter and other larger towns). As such, it would not help to address rural affordability issues or substantially help to deliver a better mix of sites to increase the delivery and diversity of supply.</p>
<p>I. HEALTH</p> <p><i>To support healthy and active communities with</i></p>	<p>Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6 which continue to focus growth at the defined towns of the plan area is likely to provide a higher number of new residents with a good level of access to a wide range of recreation facilities and a high number of healthcare facilities. These option are also more likely to provide funding for the delivery of new healthcare infrastructure in the larger settlements by consolidating higher levels of growth at specific sites within</p>

<p><i>access to attractive environments and opportunities to enjoy and experience them</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cycle and walking networks</i> • <i>Open space and green space infrastructure in new developments and existing settlements</i> • <i>Public recreational, play and leisure opportunities</i> 	<p>these settlements. It is likely these scenarios could also encourage travel by active modes of transport considering the close proximity of new residents to services and facilities and employment opportunities within the larger settlements.</p> <p>Newton Abbot, Kingsteignton, Dawlish, Teignmouth and Bovey Tracey also provide access to national cycle routes. The larger settlements of the plan area also provide a good level of access to recreation opportunities at Dartmoor National Park as well as south Devon coastal areas.</p> <p>Conversely, Scenario 3, is much less likely to be able to deliver new cycle and walking networks, or areas of public open space and play which either new or existing residents can benefit from. This scenario would result in the majority of new residents having a poor level of access to the wide range of recreation facilities and the more substantial healthcare facilities within the plan area's town centres.</p> <p>Delivering growth to the settlements in a more proportionate manner (as per Scenarios 4 and 8) would provide higher levels of growth within the larger settlements of the plan area supported by smaller levels of growth in the villages, proportionate to their level of services. In this case, only larger levels of development would be supported where there were primary healthcare facilities available as well as active travel options. It would still, however, mean a greater amount of new residents having a poor level of access to the wide range of recreation facilities and the more substantial healthcare facilities within the plan area's town centres than under Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6.</p> <p>Scenario 7 would provide the majority of housing within the Heart of Teignbridge where the majority of new residents would have access to a good level of access to a wide range of recreation facilities and a high number of healthcare facilities. A smaller amount of development would be within settlements where there was no access to primary healthcare facilities or the wide range of recreation facilities provided by the main town's. As per Scenario's 4 and 8, this option would therefore have more of a negative impact on health than Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6.</p>
<p>J. WELLBEING</p> <p><i>To support positive, safe and healthy communities</i></p>	<p>Various locations within the district experience levels of deprivation. These are most notably within specific wards in the towns of Newton Abbot, Dawlish and Teignmouth. There is also some rural deprivation within the more isolated areas of the district.</p>

Factors to consider:

- *Social deprivation*
- *Air quality, noise and light pollution*
- *Safe and secure environment with reduced fear of crime*

Scenarios 1 and 5 would help to address deprivation arising from access to housing by focusing growth in the main towns and providing better access to better quality and more affordable new homes. **Scenario 6** would help to assist deprivation in Newton Abbot in this way, and Exeter to some extent, but with no growth located in Dawlish or Teignmouth there would be less opportunity to address deprivation caused by poor access to housing in these settlements as well as support the provision of new services.

More growth within the larger settlements and on the edge of Exeter may impact on the already designated AQMAs (Exeter, Newton Abbot, Teignmouth and Dawlish) and as such there is potential for existing air quality issues to be exasperated, particularly if growth is delivered in a manner which is not considerate of the potential for increased levels of congestion. However, opportunities to encourage travel by more active and sustainable modes of transport could benefit both air quality and access to services for both new and existing residents.

Scenario 2 is likely to directly provide new growth that helps address issues of deprivation within town centres, both through maximising the provision of affordable town centre housing as well as aesthetically improving the built environment in areas which could benefit from regeneration. More town centre housing can help to improve the viability of high streets and increase natural surveillance of town centres, helping them to become safer and more secure environments in which to live and visit. This approach is also likely to help encourage travel by more active and sustainable modes of transport which could benefit air quality and known AQMAs (in Newton Abbot and Teignmouth).

Allowing for a mainly rural distribution of growth in the plan area, **Scenario 3** would limit development at the larger settlements. As such this approach would fail to address the identified issues of deprivation at the more urban locations of the plan area, most notably at Newton Abbot, Dawlish and Teignmouth. While this scenario could help to address rural deprivation and the provision of new and affordable homes in particular, the overall impact on this issue will be dependent in part upon whether critical mass can be achieved to support the provision of new services and facilities. The wide distribution of growth at a high number of rural locations may mean that new residents may actually be housed at isolated locations which cannot support new services and facilities. A majority of new residents in Scenario 3 would have to travel longer distances to access services and facilities and employment opportunities which is likely to be detrimental to local air quality.

Scenario 3 is, however, considered less likely to adversely impact upon existing identified air quality issues within the AQMAs in the plan area.

	<p>By allowing a more proportional distribution of growth with a large amount of development still focused in the main towns, Scenarios 4 and 8 would provide new development in areas at which the highest levels of deprivation have been identified. It would also provide opportunities to address issues of rural deprivation through better access to affordable housing and helping to support rural services, whilst not placing too much development in more isolated rural locations where few services are available.</p> <p>Scenario 7 would help to assist deprivation in Newton Abbot but with no growth located in Dawlish or Teignmouth, or other more isolated rural areas, there would be less opportunity to address deprivation caused by poor access to housing in these settlements as well as support the provision of new services.</p>
<p>K. ACCESS TO SERVICES</p> <p><i>To provide accessible and attractive services and community facilities for all ages and interests</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Access to area wide services (education, healthcare etc)</i> • <i>Community facilities</i> • <i>Cultural buildings and facilities</i> <p><i>Access to high speed broadband</i></p>	<p>Focusing growth within and around the main towns of the plan area and the Exeter Urban Fringe is likely to provide a higher number of new residents with a good level of access to a wide range of services and facilities at the more substantial town centres. As such, Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6 provide the best opportunities to deliver this. This includes access to healthcare facilities, schools, higher education facilities and public transport links. Some of the locations within these scenarios (namely the Heart of Teignbridge settlements and the Exeter urban fringe) currently have the best access to ultrafast broadband speeds in the plan area, although it still remains patchy in some of these settlements.</p> <p>Conversely, Scenarios 3, 4 and 8 which spread development more widely across the district would reduce the amount of new residents living in close proximity to a wide range of services and facilities. This is most pronounced in Scenario 3 which focuses the majority of development in smaller rural settlements where fewer services exist. Some development in rural areas could help to support existing services, and may help in the longer term to increase local service provision, but unless development levels are significant within the villages then they are unlikely to facilitate the delivery of additional services directly or in the short term. As such, Scenarios 4 and 8 are likely to achieve a better overall balance, with the majority of new residents being in close proximity to the main service centres, whilst some proportional rural development would help to support existing local services.</p> <p>Scenario 7 would focus the majority of development in the Heart of Teignbridge where good access to services and facilities exist. The remaining villages all have at least a basic level of service provision to provide some day to day services for local residents.</p>

L. JOBS AND LOCAL ECONOMY

To foster a strong and entrepreneurial economy and increased access to high quality skills training to support improved job opportunities and greater productivity in Teignbridge

Factors to consider:

- *Employment land supply*
- *Economic generating uses (including housing and population growth)*
- *Improved and mixed employment offer*
- *Tourism/commercial cultural and leisure provision*
- *Access to education and skills training*

The location of new development will affect how easily residents would be able to access job opportunities at existing and proposed employment sites. In addition, proximity to the city of Exeter, Newton Abbot, Heathfield or Torbay could indicate good access to employment opportunities, which tend to be focussed mainly at the larger settlements. These locations also benefit from better public transport links, including railway connections. Overall, **Scenario 6** has the greatest potential to have a positive effect on this sustainability objective. However, **Scenarios 1, 2 and 5** also have positive effects on this sustainability objective due to the majority of new development being focused in and around the main towns and the Exeter urban fringe where most employment opportunities can be accessed. Allowing for the most development at these locations is also likely to provide opportunities for a higher level of economic value, considering the access to the strategic road network and other infrastructure which is provided from these locations.

Larger developments are more likely to take place in the main settlements under **Scenarios 1, 2 5 and 6** which by virtue of their scale are more likely to be able to generate on-site employment opportunities rather than smaller sites which may be more likely under the dispersed development scenarios.

Considering the more isolated character of the locations proposed under **Scenario 3**, it is likely that this distribution of development would result in new residents having a poor level of access to the areas of Teignbridge within which the highest number of employment opportunities are located, having a significant negative effect on this sustainability objective. Many of the rural locations of the plan area are likely to be unsuitable to accommodate high levels of employment growth due to a lack of supporting road and rail infrastructure and local workforce, and therefore this approach is unlikely in itself to stimulate the diversification of the rural economy.

Scenarios 4 and 8 which spread development more proportionally across the district will enable the majority of new residents to have access to the main employment opportunities within and adjoining the plan area, but the increase in the amount of people living in more isolated locations away from these opportunities would result in a minor negative effect on this sustainability objective.

Scenario 7 could have a minor to significant negative effect as although the majority of residents would be located in the Heart of Teignbridge, the lack of development in the other main towns or on the Exeter urban fringe would limit the amount of future local workforces living in close proximity to these employment locations. In addition, the location of new development in a small number of villages in the south of the district and Tedburn would increase the amount of people living in more isolated locations away from the main employment areas.

<p>M. TOWN CENTRES</p> <p><i>To safeguard and strengthen the vitality and viability of our town centres</i></p> <p><i>Factors to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Diverse town centre economy</i> • <i>Strengthen and safeguard the vitality and viability of centres</i> • <i>Relationship between new development and existing centres</i> • <i>Access to existing centres</i> 	<p>The location of new sites has the opportunity to support the vitality and viability of existing town centres by increasing the number of day-to-day visitors to the town centres and supporting businesses and services in those locations. Concentrating growth around the main towns, as per Scenarios 1, 2, 5 and 6 is likely to provide a higher number of new residents with a good level of access to a wide range of services and facilities at the more substantial town centres. As such the vitality and viability of these locations are likely to be strengthened, given that new residents will be more likely to travel the shorter distances to them.</p> <p>Scenario 3 is much more likely to have a significant negative effect on town centres, as most of the new population would be spread around the rural areas of the district. Although this approach may help to stimulate the provision of rural services and facilities in the plan area, it is unlikely to result in significant day to day support for town centres.</p> <p>Scenarios 4 and 8 which spread development more proportionally across the district will enable the majority of new residents to access and support the town centres, but the increase in the amount of people living in more isolated locations away from these opportunities would result in a minor negative effect on this sustainability objective.</p> <p>Scenario 7 could have a minor to significant negative effect as although the majority of residents would be located in the Heart of Teignbridge, the lack of development in the other main towns would limit the amount of able to access and support town centres.</p>
<p>N. CONNECTIVITY AND TRANSPORT</p> <p><i>To connect people and businesses digitally and physically through the provision of broadband, walking, cycling, public transport, road networks and other transport</i></p>	<p>Proximity to sustainable transport links will influence how accessible residential sites are in relation to services and job opportunities. There are several locations in the district where access to public transport hubs and corridors are greatest and these are set out in Scenario 5. Development focused in these locations would have a significant positive effect on this sustainability objective.</p> <p>Also having a positive effect, although slightly more minor, are Scenarios 1, 2 and 6. This is due to the inclusion of Chudleigh, Bovey Tracey and Ashburton which, although benefit from good bus links to the main service centres, having varying levels of active travel opportunities and are not connected to a railway station.</p> <p>Larger developments are more likely to take place in the main settlements under Scenarios 1, 2 5 and 6 which by virtue of their scale are more likely to be able to generate better active travel opportunities and support strategic transport and connectivity infrastructure.</p>

infrastructure both within Teignbridge and beyond

Factors to consider:

- *Access to major networks within and beyond Teignbridge*
- *Access to public transport, footpaths and cycleways*
- *Links between homes, services and businesses*
- *Reduction in congestion*

By significantly limiting the level of growth at the more rural locations of the plan area, these scenarios would furthermore limit the potential for dependency on travel by private vehicle. This approach would have to be delivered in a manner which is considerate of the potential for issues of congestion resulting at the more developed locations given the higher level of growth to be delivered and the large number of residents already accommodated here.

Scenario 3 which allows for a mainly rural distribution of growth in the plan area would limit development at the larger settlements. As such, the majority of new residents would have to travel longer distances to access services and facilities and employment opportunities. Many of these locations are isolated from sustainable transport links and do not provide immediate access to the strategic road network. By allowing for a wider distribution of growth in the plan area the approach would also be less likely to deliver the critical mass at rural locations to support significant improvements in sustainable transport links in the plan area. It is likely this approach would not directly promote modal choice/shift in the plan area and conversely could increase dependency on travel by private vehicle.

Scenarios 4 and 8 which spread development more proportionally across the district will enable the majority of new residents to access the main public transport hubs and corridors, and active travel opportunities. However, the increase in the amount of people living in more isolated locations away from these opportunities would result in a minor negative effect on this sustainability objective.

Similarly, **Scenario 7** would ensure the majority of new residents were within the Heart of Teignbridge where good public transport and active travel opportunities exist. However, it would also increase in the amount of people living in more isolated locations away from these opportunities and would therefore result in a minor negative effect on this sustainability objective.