

Teignbridge Proposed Submission Local Plan to 2040

Consultation Statement

December 2022

Appendix 1 Schedule 3b (Parts 2 & 3)

## Contents

Appendix 1 Schedule 3b: Summary of the representations, number made, and changes made between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 Proposed

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Submission Version .....   | 1  |
| Chapter 5: Coastal Towns.....  | 1  |
| Dawlish: Dawlish North.....  | 1  |
| Dawlish: Langdon Hospital.....   | 6  |
| Dawlish: Land at Warren Farm.....  | 11 |
| Dawlish: Land at Teignmouth Road .....                                     | 16 |
| Dawlish: Redundant Listed Buildings at 13 Weech Road, Dawlish .....        | 21 |
| Dawlish: Daw Vale Nursing Home.....  | 22 |
| Dawlish: Parking/Grassed Area to East of 1-50 Laherne .....                | 23 |
| Dawlish: Commercial Buildings South of Haldon Terrace, Hospital Hill ..... | 25 |
| Dawlish: Residential Garden at Badlake Hill / Weech Road .....             | 28 |
| Dawlish: Garden of Lyme Acre.....  | 29 |
| Dawlish: Land off Meadow Park .....  | 30 |
| Teignmouth: Part of Land at Buddleford Farm .....                          | 31 |
| Teignmouth: Higher Holcombe Farm.....                                      | 36 |
| Teignmouth: Land at Shepherds Lane, Bishopsteignton .....                  | 38 |
| Teignmouth: Land North of Higher Woodway Road.....                         | 41 |
| Teignmouth: Land to the East and West of Holcombe Road.....                | 46 |
| Chapter 6: Rural Towns .....   | 51 |
| Ashburton: Dolbeare Road.....  | 51 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Bovey Tracey: Bovey Tracey Golf Centre .....                      | 53 |
| Bovey Tracey: Bradley Bends .....                                 | 55 |
| Bovey Tracey: Depot South of Pottery Road.....                    | 58 |
| Bovey Tracey: Old Hospital Site, Moretonhampstead Road.....       | 58 |
| Bovey Tracey: Old Employment Sites, Cannon Road, Heathfield ..... | 59 |
| Bovey Tracey: Land off Moretonhampstead Road .....                | 61 |
| Bovey Tracey: Land South of Le Molay Littry .....                 | 62 |
| Chapter 7: Edge of Exeter.....                                    | 65 |
| Edge of Exeter: Peamore and West Exe.....                         | 65 |
| Edge of Exeter: Markham’s Farm.....                               | 69 |
| Edge of Exeter: Atwell’s Farm .....                               | 73 |

DRAFT

## Appendix 1 Schedule 3b: Summary of the representations, number made, and changes made between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Version

### Chapter 5: Coastal Towns

#### Dawlish: Dawlish North

Dawlish North is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

DRAFT

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on this large scale would be ecologically unsustainable due to harm to the nearby Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren.</li> <li>• Development would harm protected species of bats, dormice, badgers and reptiles from loss of habitat, light pollution and predation from domestic cats.</li> <li>• Compensation measures are ineffective</li> <li>• Protected species include Greater Horseshoe bats, grey long eared bats and cirl buntings</li> <li>• Land to the north of Orchard Lane is used in winter by feeding Curlew, an SPA Water Bird.</li> <li>• Green corridors must be included</li> <li>• Development will harm the landscape</li> <li>• Development should be sympathetic to the character of the landscape</li> <li>• Development will need to ensure it does not harm protected species present on the site</li> <li>• Concern about loss of hedgerows and habitats</li> <li>• Development would harm the beauty of and views from Dawlish Countryside Park.</li> <li>• Development would change the context of Dawlish Countryside Park from one set within countryside, which may discourage use and lead to increased use of Dawlish Warren with resulting harm to wildlife.</li> <li>• Drainage and flooding issues</li> <li>• The green fields are important to the character of Dawlish</li> <li>• Excessive scale of development proposed in close proximity to protected habitats.</li> <li>• The site is open to views from the A379 and Dawlish Countryside Park</li> <li>• Additional traffic from development will result in air pollution.</li> <li>• RSPB raises concern about increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC.</li> <li>• The RSPB raises concern that the proposed allocation will directly impact on at least five cirl bunting territories (as recorded in the last national survey in 2016), destroy habitat that is part of the Port Road County Wildlife Site as well as severing the link between the Dawlish Countryside Park and adjacent farmland.</li> <li>• RSPB is also concerned that development here may reduce the attractiveness of the Dawlish Countryside Park to users and so reduce the effectiveness of that site as a SANGS.</li> <li>• An overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on cirl buntings and what strategic measures to compensate for loss can be implemented is required.</li> <li>• RSPB considers it may be more suitable for land in this location to provide an enlarged Dawlish Countryside Park/SANG that can absorb the increase in recreational requirements from local and other development west of the Exe and Dawlish Warren as well as provide a larger safeguarded 'hub' for cirl buntings and other wildlife.</li> <li>• If this proposed site does go forward as an allocation (or an allocation for a reduced number of dwellings coupled with an extension to the existing Dawlish Countryside Park), we recommend up to date survey and maximum habitat compensation for impact on cirl bunting territories via a developer contribution to Teignbridge District Council as per the cirl bunting planning guidance.</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• We also note that the Dawlish North site option is adjacent to the Dawlish SANGs which may affect its attractiveness as a recreation site.</li> <li>• SANGS required both on site and connections to country park</li> <li>• Object due to loss of carbon sequestration</li> <li>• Existing boundary hedges and tree must be retained</li> <li>• Located within a CDA - it is likely that the CDA standards for this catchment will be changing to help the catchment adapt to climate change. The Shutterton Brook currently causes flooding to numerous residential, commercial and tourist properties, and the flood risks will significantly increase due to the impacts of climate change (i.e. sea level rise and increased flood flows). It is likely that we (EA) will expect every development in this catchment to provide a betterment by incorporating sustainable drainage.</li> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• We note the reference to 'biodiversity off-setting' - it is unclear whether this means compensatory habitat or Biodiversity Net Gain. Any habitat lost (only in circumstances where there is no alternative) should be replaced. In addition, a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain should be provided.</li> <li>• New development should respect the traditional development of Dawlish</li> <li>• Concern about loss of physical separation between Dawlish and Cofton/Cockwood</li> <li>• Archaeological interests must be respected.</li> <li>• The site will result in linear ribbon development along the A379.</li> <li>• Houses should be low level to not spoil landscape.</li> <li>• Development should reflect Devon cottage styles</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/> 12877658656<br/> 12877552206<br/> 12877542128<br/> 12877476781<br/> 12876893763<br/> 12876558415<br/> 12875620551<br/> 12875616398<br/> 12875613299<br/> 12875610657<br/> 12875606178<br/> 12875601650<br/> 12875593137<br/> 12875216621<br/> 12875211591<br/> 12875207384<br/> 12875204809<br/> 12875203091<br/> 12875200640<br/> 12875194107<br/> 12875190880<br/> 12875184518<br/> 12875176252<br/> 12875165103<br/> 12874834357<br/> 12871141307<br/> 12870736773<br/> 12870595464<br/> 12870560944<br/> 12870365271<br/> 12870412839<br/> 12870341079<br/> 12867617435<br/> 12863953262<br/> 12863868350<br/> 12862380263<br/> 12861974837<br/> 12860157559<br/> 12859137494<br/> 12858866173<br/> 12856180778<br/> 12856177148</p> <p>The comments include 40, submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |
|--|---|

- Site contains mound of uncertain date. Adjacent finds of prehistoric artefacts and other evidence suggests some archaeological potential. Requires assessment and evaluation to inform masterplan and mitigation.
- Strong and repeated objection to loss of grade 1 agricultural land
- Development is proposed on Green Belt land
- Object to loss of greenfield land
- **Brownfield land should be used for development**
- Affordable homes to buy or rent for local people should be a priority
- Affordable homes for young people are needed
- Housing should be appropriate for the older population
- Housing development should include a care home
- Homes should be restricted to permanent residences, not used as second homes or holiday let accommodation.
- Homes should be carbon neutral and of good quality
- A mix of open market and affordable, and mix of types and styles should be provided.
- Gypsy and Traveller pitches should not be required on site due to adverse impact on values.
- Affordable homes are not affordable to those on local incomes.
- Development should not include affordable housing or mass market housing, but should be limited to a small number of custom build homes only.
- Objection to all development other than affordable homes
- There is no need for new homes.
- Development would harm the health and wellbeing of existing residents by building on valued countryside.
- Development would result in pollution from construction and a worsening of air quality.
- Development would harm the peaceful enjoyment of Dawlish Countryside Park, which is enjoyed by many.
- **Although the site is close to Dawlish Countryside Park, it should provide green spaces within the development itself.**
- All new dwellings in Teignbridge in the plan period should provide for new or enhance existing sport and recreation facilities to help create opportunities for physical activity whilst having a major positive impact on health and mental wellbeing.
- Development will increase congestion through the town, especially during the already congested summer months.
- **The A379 cannot cope with additional traffic, especially during summer months**
- **Development will increase congestion on the already congested A379**
- Road infrastructure cannot cope with additional traffic
- A new link road to the A380 should be built
- Development in Dawlish will lead to additional traffic using the A379 bottlenecks at Starcross and Kenton.
- Access onto the A379 very difficult.
- Additional traffic on Shutterton Lane will increase conflict between vehicles and pedestrians
- The site is close to sustainable travel options and has access to services and facilities by sustainable travel.
- Agent for the site has included a highways technical note confirming that a safe access could be achieved with minor improvement works.
- Additional traffic will make the road dangerous to live by and travel on.
- Access to the site should not be from the A379 but should be from secondary roads.
- Investment into public transport will be necessary
- Buses are too expensive and infrequent.
- Lack of town centre parking will be exacerbated by additional residents
- New development would need to be provided with pedestrian links to Dawlish Countryside Park.
- Site is less than 1km from a local centre
- Within 500m of a frequent bus stop. Bus route passes adjacent to the site, to the west. 2km from Dawlish Warren station. Better access to Dawlish and D.Warren train stations subject to improvement of sustainable travel to these stations.
- 900m from South West Coast Path and national cycle route.
- No need for additional employment land as there are existing empty premises.
- Lack of local employment opportunities leads to out-commuting to Exeter

- Limited non-seasonal employment opportunities
- Harm to tourism due to harm to landscape from development
- No advantages to local economy – benefits limited to landowner and large scale national developers and builders.
- Support for the creation of more local job opportunities
- Development would have limited benefit to Dawlish town centre as the majority of shopping will be done at out-of-town supermarkets.
- New development will only benefit the town centre if links to it are provided.
- Additional employment development will harm the tourist appeal of the town.
- The site is reasonably close to Shutterton Industrial Estate, where there are employment opportunities.
- Questions where residents of new houses proposed will work.
- Too far from town centre
- Dawlish does not have a bank.
- A new large supermarket is required.
- Large Sainsbury's and Shutterton Industrial Estate close by.
- Sewage system/drains cannot cope with additional development, especially when under pressure in summer months.
- Water supply cannot cope with additional development, especially when under pressure in summer months.
- New development should include a new health centre and re-opening of Dawlish Hospital Minor Injuries Unit.
- The health centre is already at capacity and cannot cope with additional development.
- Development will result in undue pressure on health care, dentists and social care.
- Lack of capacity at local primary and secondary schools
- Lack of sixth form education of further education opportunities.
- Lack of local recreational provision
- All new dwellings in Teignbridge in the plan period should provide for new or enhance existing sport and recreation facilities to help create opportunities for physical activity whilst having a major positive impact on health and mental wellbeing.
- Questions whether a new primary school would be provided, as is set out in the draft plan.
- Consideration should be given to relocation and expansion of Cockwood School, which could serve the development.
- Object to any development in Dawlish due to lack of supporting infrastructure
- Concern about impacts on CDA
- Development should have adequate supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.
- Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more. (EA)
- SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment. (EA)
- Investigate opportunities for surface water separation. (EA)
- Pollution prevention measures to be incorporated into the construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.
- The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.
- However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.
- To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.
- The site should not be used for housing but part of it to the east of the A379 should be used for a new health centre and supermarket.
- The part of the site adjacent to Dawlish Countryside Park should be used as an extension to the park.
- There is a disproportionate level of development proposed for Dawlish in relation to Teignmouth
- Sites to the north of Dawlish are the most suitable for development, where a new school could be provided, closest to supermarket and closest to Exeter, where most job opportunities exist
- Support
- Scale of development proposed is too large
- Supporting masterplan work has been done by the agent for the site
- There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and stricter surface water drainage standards will also be required within the CDA to restrict runoff rates. Pollution prevention measures will be required to protect Bathing Water quality. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3. (EA)



**Dawlish: Langdon Hospital**

Langdon Hospital is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- Development would devastate local ecology and ecosystem, including species of Cirl Buntings, Fieldfares, Redwing and, Little Owls.
- Development would harm protected species of bats, dormice, badgers and reptiles from loss of habitat, light pollution and predation from domestic cats.
- Concern about of loss of habitats and harm to protected species.
- Development would result in the loss of a range of habitats
- Existing boundary hedges and tree must be retained
- Concern about proximity to Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC.
- Compensation measures are ineffective
- Harm to rural landscape
- Harm to landscape, particularly from development on western part of site.
- Loss of green fields to north of Dawlish
- Landscape will need to be enhanced sympathetically
- Green corridors must be included
- The RSPB considers that the Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.
- RSPB considers the scale of the proposed development (c1,000 new dwellings) for the Dawlish area will have a detrimental impact on the area's ability to continue to support significant numbers of cirl buntings. In our view, an overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on cirl buntings and what strategic measures to compensate for loss can be implemented is required.
- This will impact on at least two cirl bunting territories territory (as recorded in the last national survey in 2016) and a County Wildlife Site (Langford Fields) designated for cirl buntings. If this proposed site goes forward as an allocation, we recommend up to date survey and habitat compensation for loss via a developer contribution to Teignbridge District Council as per the cirl bunting planning guidance.
- Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.
- Step back development far enough from water to enable wildlife corridor and natural processes
- SANGS required both on site and connections to country park
- Protected species include Greater Horseshoe bats, grey long eared bats and cirl buntings
- Object to loss of carbon sequestration
- Opportunity to enhance the watercourse through the creation of a blue/green corridor to support adaptation/mitigation for climate change. This area could include sustainable drainage features. A Valley Park through the site and towards Shutterton Bridge should be considered to provide green and blue infrastructure, as well as additional floodplain. (EA)
- The site is partly located within Flood Zone 2 and 3. The effect of rising sea levels could impact the bottom of the site and the river flows through the area - the floodplain and river corridor will need to be protected by establishing a 'no build' contour, which will restrict the developable area. The site is also located within a CDA - it is likely that the CDA standards for this catchment will be changing to help the catchment adapt to climate change. The Shutterton Brook currently causes flooding to numerous residential, commercial and tourist properties, and the flood risks will significantly increase due to the impacts of climate change (i.e. sea level rise and increased flood flows).
- Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).
- Ditches and watercourses (together with wetland habitat) within the site should be kept as open water habitat and suitable buffer strips should be maintained alongside them. European eel (protected species) likely to be present and will need to be considered in any designs.
- No development should be located within the floodplain (including an allowance for climate change).
- Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.
- New development should respect the traditional development of Dawlish
- Scale is overdevelopment of a historic seaside town
- Would create a linear development from Dalwish to Cofton
- Only the south eastern part, closest to Juniper Drive, could be suitable for development
- Development should be limited to areas closest to Shutterton Bridge.
- Development will be poor quality and too high a density
- Should not allow mass housing estate development, affordable housing or homes top rent, but should be solely for small number of custom build homes.
- Archaeological interests must be respected.
- Object to the loss of Grades 1 and 2 agricultural land which should be retained for agriculture and grazing
- Object to loss of greenfield land.

12877720432  
12877658656  
12877552206  
12877542128  
12877476781  
12876893763  
12876558415  
12875620551  
12875616398  
12875613299  
12875610657  
12875606178  
12875601650  
12875593137  
12875216621  
12875211591  
12875207384  
12875204809  
12875203091  
12875200640  
12875194107  
12875190880

The comments include 40 submitted by email, in post, or in person.

- Brownfield sites should be prioritised
- Harm to amenity of users of local footpaths and country lanes
- **Harm to health and wellbeing of existing residents from new development and loss of fields and degradation of countryside**
- The site is required to be used as GI for the DA2 development, as is outlined in the adopted Local Plan.
- Development will be poor quality and high density which is not good for residents' health and wellbeing.
- **The scale of new development is making long term residents want to move elsewhere**
- All new dwellings in Teignbridge in the plan period should provide for new or enhance existing sport and recreation facilities to help create opportunities for physical activity whilst having a major positive impact on health and mental wellbeing.
- Increase in traffic will worsen air quality
- A379 cannot cope with additional traffic
- **A379 cannot accommodate more traffic, especially considering the bottlenecks at Starcross and Kenton.**
- A379 cannot cope with additional traffic as is already congested during rush hour
- Roads cannot cope with additional traffic
- Site is too distant from railway station
- Site is too distant from town centre
- Access must be from A379, not local roads which should be protected for pedestrian use through traffic calming measures
- Additional bus services would be required
- If bus routes are diverted through new development, this will increase travel time from Dawlish to Exeter, and discourage use.
- Additional traffic will increase risk of accidents, congestion and pollution
- Close to proposed Teign Estuary Trail.
- Town centre is becoming too congested to visit
- Site too distant from town centre to support it
- Lack of local employment opportunities, apart from seasonal, low paid work.
- **Harm to tourism due to harm to landscape from development**
- No advantages to local economy – benefits limited to landowner and large scale national developers and builders.
- Lack of capacity in GP and dentist
- **Lack of capacity in pharmacy**
- **Lack of capacity in local hospitals**
- **Lack of capacity in social care**
- Lack of capacity in schools
- New primary school would need to be built
- **New police station will be needed**
- **Lack of capacity in sewerage system**
- **High volume of development in CDA**
- All new dwellings in Teignbridge in the plan period should provide for new or enhance existing sport and recreation facilities to help create opportunities for physical activity whilst having a major positive impact on health and mental wellbeing.
- A bridge over Shutterton Brook would not be viable
- Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.
- Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more. (EA)
- Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).
- All new development should be safe from flooding over its lifetime and not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- It is likely that we will expect every development in this catchment to provide a betterment by incorporating sustainable drainage.
- SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.
- Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.
- The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.
- However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.
- To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.

- Excessive scale of development proposed for Dawlish
- There is no need for further development in Dawlish
- Concern about the safety of development so close to the hospital.
- Dawlish needs a bank
- Preferred site
- Supporting info from agent submitted.
- Only allocate if the Sequential Test can be satisfied. Only part of the site likely to be suitable for development.

DRAFT

**Dawlish: Land at Warren Farm**

Land at Warren Farm is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

DRAFT

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of habitats and harm to ecology, including Greater Horseshoe bats, grey long eared bats and cirl buntings</li> <li>• <b>Loss of a range of habitats</b></li> <li>• <b>Cirl Bunting zone must be protected</b></li> <li>• <b>Harm to Exe Estuary SPA from increase in visitor numbers</b></li> <li>• <b>Development would harm protected species from loss of habitat, light pollution and predation from domestic cats.</b></li> <li>• Landscape should remain as it is for future generations to enjoy</li> <li>• <b>Concern about loss of trees, hedges and scrub</b></li> <li>• Area benefits from views of the sea, which would be lost if developed</li> <li>• <b>Harm to setting and enjoyment of the south west coast path</b></li> <li>• <b>Site should be designated as Undeveloped Coast</b></li> <li>• <b>Development would harm the coastal landscape</b></li> <li>• <b>Concern about prominent coastal position</b></li> <li>• <b>Should remain as green buffer</b></li> <li>• <b>Should be opened up for public use</b></li> <li>• RSPB objects</li> <li>• The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.</li> <li>• Proximity to Dawlish Warren SAC and the Exe Estuary Special Protection Area will result in an increase of the use those sites, particularly Dawlish Warren, to provide their daily recreational needs, including dog walking.</li> <li>• It is unlikely that public open space provided</li> <li>• as part of housing development at this proposed allocation could be of a sufficient size and sufficiently attractive to prevent usage of the SAC instead.</li> <li>• The site’s potential as a SANGS should be re-investigated.</li> <li>• Ecological assessment should include survey for cirl buntings.</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• DWT would expect to see the area adjacent to Dawlish Cliffs SSSI taken out of this site and prioritised for restoration/creation maritime cliffs and slopes habitats in accordance with the SNA</li> <li>• Object as site is within Rebuilding Devon Nature Area</li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• Loss of separation between Dawlish and Dawlish Warren</li> <li>• Only the northern part of the site would be suitable for housing</li> <li>• Affordable homes should be closer to local amenities.</li> <li>• <b>Archaeological interests must be respected</b></li> <li>• No known assets in northern plot. Southern plot is in a location where prehistoric and/or Romano-British settlement evidence might be anticipated. Requires evaluation to inform masterplan and mitigation.</li> <li>• Object to loss of Grade 1 agricultural land</li> <li>• Good quality agricultural land which should be retained for agriculture</li> <li>• The use of brownfield land should be prioritised</li> <li>• Priority should be given to households on affordable waiting list and homeless people.</li> <li>• Particular risk of second home ownership or holiday lets on this site.</li> <li>• Housing should not include mass housing estates or affordable housing but should be limited to custom build.</li> <li>• <b>Support development of the site as there is a need for homes</b></li> <li>• <b>Objection to all development other than affordable homes</b></li> <li>• <b>No need for new homes</b></li> <li>• Loss of site that is used by walkers will harm health and wellbeing.</li> <li>• <b>Harm to setting of the south west coast path, which is well used by local residents</b></li> <li>• Additional traffic will cause harm to health and wellbeing of existing residents</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/> 12877658656<br/> 12877552206<br/> 12877542128<br/> 12877476781<br/> 12876893763<br/> 12876558415<br/> 12875620551<br/> 12875616398<br/> 12875613299<br/> 12875610657<br/> 12875606178<br/> 12875601650<br/> 12875593137<br/> 12875216621<br/> 12875211591<br/> 12875207384<br/> 12875204809<br/> 12875203091<br/> 12875200640<br/> 12875194107<br/> 12875190880<br/> 12875184518</p> <p>The comments include 35 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |
|---|--|



- Increased traffic will cause harm to air quality and health of existing residents
- Harm to amenity of local residents from noise and traffic from building works
- A379 cannot cope with additional traffic from new development
- Poor junction between Warren Road and A379
- Poor roads around Dawlish Warren cannot accommodate additional traffic
- Transport links are already under strain
- Poor access
- Increase in traffic will result in increase in risk of accidents
- The cycle trail and coastal footpath are unlit pathways and will need lighting if relied on for movement
- A new pedestrian crossing will be needed
- Additional traffic during summer months must be considered
- Frequent bus route along A379, which runs adjacent to western edge of the site. Less than 1km to Dawlish Warren station, 1.5km to Dawlish Station. adjacent to national cycle route and SW Coast path.
- Close to proposed Teign Estuary Trail.
- Insufficient local employment in relation to scale of housing proposed.
- Lack of local employment opportunities will result in additional traffic on congested A379, commuting to Exeter
- Harm to setting of the south west coast path which is well used by tourists
- Harm to local tourist economy resulting from harm to landscape in this coastal area
- Too far from town centre
- Roughly 1km from small local centre.
- Lack of capacity at GP and dentist
- Local schools unable to expand
- Lack of capacity in local hospitals
- Lack of capacity in social care
- Sewage infrastructure is at capacity
- Dawlish Warren health centre has limited opening hours
- Cockwood school has limited parking and drop off/pick up areas.
- Would need to protect railway line from new development
- Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.
- If surface water drainage is directed northwards then the CDA drainage standards will apply and we will expect every development in this catchment to provide a betterment by incorporating sustainable drainage.
- Dawlish: some evidence of hydraulic overload, SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment. No deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).
- Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- potential for more?
- SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.
- Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.
- The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.
- However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.
- To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.
- There is no bank in Dawlish – a bank is needed
- Siting on edge of coastal cliff is unsuitable
- Disproportionate level of development proposed in relation to Teignmouth
- Should be used as a country park
- Dawlish has been subjected to too much development without infrastructure improvements.
- The east side of Dawlish is already overdeveloped
- Support for development of the site
- Proximity to STWs would deter prospective residents

- The site should be used for a hotel

DRAFT

**Dawlish: Land at Teignmouth Road**

Land west of Teignmouth Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- Harm to coastal landscape
- Harm to undeveloped coast character
- Harm to AGLV
- Loss of a range of habitats and harm to protected species including Greater Horseshoe bats, grey long eared bats, Cirl Buntings, Dormice and bats.
- Concern because of loss of hedgerows, and a vast range of wildflowers, insects, mammals and invertebrates
- Concern about loss of wildlife corridor between Dawlish and Holcombe, which stretches from little Haldon to the cliffs
- Site contains habitat of a variety of large and small mammals such as Horseshoe, Pipistrelle, and other species of bats, hedgehogs, rabbits, foxes, wood mice and even deer, and a plethora of insect life
- The area is an important natural habitat for Cirl Buntings, Skylarks, Buzzards, Peregrines, Swallows, Swifts, House Martins and Red Kites.
- Existing trees and hedges must be retained
- The hedge line is a flight corridor for Greater Horseshoe Bats and the fields support a population of Roe Deer & Hares.
- Site supports vast number of bird species such as Lesser and Greater Spotted and Green Woodpeckers, Nuthatches, Sparrow Hawks, Kestrels, Finches, Tits, Blackcaps, Various Owl species, Pied Wagtails
- Object to loss of physical separation between Dawlish and Holcombe
- Object to the erosion of the undeveloped break between Dawlish and Holcombe
- Highly visible in the landscape
- The site includes a stream and has the potential to increase pollution to it
- Concern about potential harm to adjacent woodland
- Hard surfacing would increase run off to the stream and increase soil erosion and risk flooding
- Coastal landscape is important for wildlife and visitors alike
- Highly visible in the landscape
- Landscape is of high sensitivity
- Reference to appeal decision that restricted extent of the existing adjacent development in the interest of landscape, which was considered important.
- Local sewage sometimes outfalls into the sea – this would be made worse by new development
- There are ancient trees on the site which must be retained
- The South Hams SAC LCZ must be maintained
- Concern about proximity to UWSs
- A full ecology report will be needed
- The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.
- RSPB objects -
- This proposed allocation will directly impact on at least five cirl bunting territories (as recorded in the last national survey in 2016). If it does go forward as an allocation, we recommend up to date survey and maximum habitat compensation for impact on cirl bunting territories via a developer contribution to Teignbridge District Council as per the cirl bunting planning guidance.
- It is also close to the Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren, a proximity that will require mitigation measures including potentially additional SANGS provision.
- Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.
- Step back development far enough from water to enable wildlife corridor and natural processes.
- Opportunity to use steep land for priority habitat/NRN creation
- Opportunity to enhance the watercourse to support adaptation/mitigation for climate change.
- Opportunity to create green infrastructure and wildlife corridor alongside the watercourses. Biodiversity enhancements (including native tree, hedge and wildflower planting, bird and bat boxes etc.) should be incorporated.
- Ditches and watercourses (together with wetland habitat) within the site should be kept as open water habitat and suitable buffer strips should be maintained alongside them. European eel (protected species) likely to be present and will need to be considered in any designs.
- The extent of floodplain within the site will need to be assessed and mapped. No development should be located within the floodplain.
- All new development should be safe from flooding over its lifetime and not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- The culvert may need to be improved before any upstream development can be permitted.
- Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.

12877720432  
12877658656  
12877552206  
12877542128  
12877476781  
12876893763  
12876558415  
12875620551  
12875616398  
12875613299  
12875610657  
12875606178  
12875601650  
12875593137  
12875216621  
12875211591  
12875207384  
12875204809  
12875203091  
12875200640  
12875194107  
12875190880  
12875184518  
12875176252  
12875165103  
12874834357  
12871141307  
12870736773  
12870595464  
12870560944  
12870365271  
12870412839  
12870341079  
12867617435  
12863953262  
12863868350  
12862380263  
12861974837  
12860157559  
12859137494  
12858866173  
12856180778  
12856177148  
12850899200  
12850440089  
12850090517  
12849724385  
12848742221  
12847575201  
12846328749

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The physical separation between Dawlish and Holcombe is necessary to retain their individual identities</li> <li>• Development would harm the village character of Holcombe</li> <li>• There could be archaeological interests on site.</li> <li>• <b>Greater than 5% custom build should be required</b></li> <li>• <b>Houses should reflect existing properties of Dawlish</b></li> <li>• <b>Tourism relies on the built heritage of Dawlish as well as the countryside</b></li> <li>• Site contains possible kiln and historic water meadow. Requires assessment and evaluation to inform masterplan and mitigation.</li> <li>• Object to loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be prioritised over green field sites</li> <li>• Empty buildings should be brought into use before greenfield development</li> <li>• Likely to attract second home owners</li> <li>• Will not provide sufficient affordable housing to meet the need</li> <li>• Housing is not affordable for locals</li> <li>• <b>Support for self builders and affordable houses for locals</b></li> <li>• <b>Questions need for new homes</b></li> <li>• <b>Development should include homes for the elderly</b></li> <li>• <b>Objection to all housing that is not affordable</b></li> <li>• Development would harm the amenity enjoyed by local residents and tourists using the footpath that crosses the site and be detrimental to health and wellbeing.</li> <li>• Development would spoil the sea views enjoyed by those using the public footpath.</li> <li>• Increase in population numbers and densities will increase spread of diseases and infections</li> <li>• New development would have an overbearing impact on existing residents adjacent to the site</li> <li>• Harm to health and wellbeing of existing residents from noise and pollution during development</li> <li>• Harm to health from additional CO2 emissions from additional car use.</li> <li>• The overdevelopment will harm residents' health and wellbeing</li> <li>• The existing leisure centre cannot cope with additional pressure</li> <li>• Lack of play facilities on this side of Dawlish</li> <li>• Degradation of the countryside causes harm to health and mental well being.</li> <li>• A379 cannot cope with additional traffic</li> <li>• Local roads cannot cope with additional traffic</li> <li>• <b>Need to consider pinch points along the A379 and additional congestion during summer months</b></li> <li>• A379 is too busy for pedestrians to cross safely</li> <li>• <b>Additional traffic would add to existing congestion and put other road user, such as pedestrians and cyclists, at risk</b></li> <li>• A379 is congested through Teignmouth and Dawlish</li> <li>• <b>Additional traffic would increase risk of accidents</b></li> <li>• Unlikely that residents would walk to/from railway station as the path is unlit and steep</li> <li>• <b>Pedestrian and cycle movement unlikely due to steep topography</b></li> <li>• Lack of car parking at station to encourage use</li> <li>• Poor transport links</li> <li>• Residents would be reliant on car use due to distance from town centre services and facilities</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will add to the wear and tear of existing roads</li> <li>• Access must be via A379.</li> <li>• Access onto busy main road would be dangerous</li> <li>• Access via Southdowns Road would be dangerous due to the high number of cars parked along the road.</li> <li>• Bus services to Exeter and Torquay should be more frequent and run later</li> <li>• Trains are congested at peak travelling times</li> <li>• Multiple bus routes run adjacent to the site, to the east. 1.5km from Dawlish Station. Within 400m of the SW Coast path.</li> <li>• Close to proposed Teign Estuary Trail.</li> <li>• Harm to the coastal landscape from the development will harm tourism</li> </ul> | <p>12844571732<br/> 12841952128<br/> 12841914852<br/> 12834482843<br/> 12824608715<br/> 12812278040<br/> 12806940355<br/> 12798081187<br/> 12793340890<br/> 12793339796<br/> 12793337761<br/> 12793327169<br/> 12793257861<br/> 12791871089<br/> 12790176185<br/> 12778502291<br/> 12776093708<br/> 12772688676<br/> 12765632557<br/> 12762994373<br/> 12759687519<br/> 12759388698<br/> 12757096476<br/> 12756293284<br/> 12756229103<br/> 12756216904<br/> 12755098092<br/> 12754979809<br/> 12754924653<br/> 12754851850<br/> 12754775829<br/> 12754761728<br/> 12752596284<br/> 12752443388<br/> 12750562676<br/> 12744319484<br/> 12744044281<br/> 12743978382<br/> 12742289233<br/> 12741225498<br/> 12790396203<br/> 12866914812<br/> 12877619874<br/> 12877857219<br/> 12877852501<br/> 12877819328<br/> 12877846347<br/> 12877835154<br/> 12877846878<br/> 12877822941</p> |
|--|---|

- Lack of local employment for residents of new homes proposed.
- Distant from town centre
- Dawlish town centre has limited facilities
- Services and facilities of town centre would be put under undue pressure
- Additional homes will create greater competition for local jobs due to lack of local employment opportunities and will increase unemployment
- Need to develop the local tourism industry not build housing
- Roughly 1.5km to Dawlish local centre.
- Lack of capacity at GP surgery and dental practices
- Lack of capacity in local schools which cannot expand
- Lack of local primary or secondary schools in this part of Dawlish
- Will need new schools to serve development
- Lack of capacity in social care
- Lack of capacity in local hospitals
- Lack of capacity in drains and sewage system
- Holcombe lacks and services or facilities to support development.
- Surface water run off may flood A379
- New development must pay for the infrastructure it requires
- Some parts of Dawlish have poor mobile phone and broadband connection
- Concern about more frequent power cuts
- Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.
- Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more.
- Dawlish: some evidence of hydraulic overload, SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment. No deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).
- Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- potential for more?
- While the site is not mapped as floodplain, a watercourse flows through the site and part of the site may actually fall within Flood Zone 2. The risk from the watercourse is picked up by the flood risk from surface water maps. There is also some flood history in this area. The culvert may need to be improved before any upstream development can be permitted.
- All new development should be safe from flooding over its lifetime and not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- The culvert may need to be improved before any upstream development can be permitted.
- Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.
- The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.
- However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.
- To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.
- All building between Dawlish and Teignmouth should be prevented
- There are no banks in Dawlish
- Least preferred site
- Development should be limited to a small area adjacent to existing development.
- Development to the north of Dawlish is considered more appropriate due to the proximity to a supermarket and land available to provide a new school.
- Site should be used to create additional woodland or public open space
- There is enough new development in Dawlish already and more development is not needed
- Development of the site would reduce the value of existing adjacent properties
- Development will increase the carbon footprint of the site
- Preferred site is at 13 Weech Road

12877831294  
12877820734  
12877824781  
12877822121  
1287784766  
12877800245  
12877739254  
12877794913  
12877725796  
12877795768  
12877813075  
12877807257  
12877801090  
12877811077  
12877802410  
12877808504  
12877782262  
12877805615  
12877800542  
12877807101  
12877791561

The comments include 119 submitted by email, in post, or in person.

**Dawlish: Redundant Listed Buildings at 13 Weech Road, Dawlish**

13 Weech Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID  |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The garden of the property should be sympathetically restored</li> <li>• Site should be maintained for wildlife</li> <li>• Development should include bat and bird boxes</li> <li>• The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed development (c1,000 new dwellings) for the Dawlish area will have a detrimental impact on the area's</li> <li>• ability to continue to support significant numbers of curlew buntings. In our view, an overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on curlew buntings and what strategic measures to compensate</li> <li>• for loss can be implemented is required.</li> <li>• Redevelopment of these buildings within legal restraints will be very challenging and needs many conditions to protect the 6 species of bats using the building as roosts.</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Opportunity to remediate contamination. Previous uses within the site may have resulted in contamination with potential to pollute controlled waters.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• The existing building should be restored but no new buildings added</li> <li>• New buildings on the site would harm the setting of the listed building</li> <li>• Should provide a single dwelling only</li> <li>• <b>The building is now so dilapidated it should be demolished and a new housing scheme built</b></li> <li>• Listed Building. Requires assessment to inform restoration and conversion proposals.</li> <li>• Historic England notes the intention of this allocation to find a solution for this redundant grade II listed buildings on this site and its location in close proximity to the Dawlish Conservation Area and its identification as making an outstanding contribution to the character of the Dawlish Conservation Area in the adopted Dawlish Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008).</li> <li>• We consider that the suitability and the capacity of this site for an allocation of seven homes – both within the listed buildings and within its immediate setting - needs to be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). The HIA should seek to understand the impacts of the proposed allocation on the significance and settings of all affected heritage assets. It should make recommendations for ways in which negative impacts on the significance of affected</li> <li>• heritage assets can be avoided, minimised and/or mitigated and opportunities for</li> <li>• enhancements maximised. In our view, the HIA should then be used to inform the preparation of a masterplan for the site</li> <li>• and to better understand its suitability and capacity for development.</li> <li>• Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that these should include the need to conserve and enhance the significance and settings of the grade II listed buildings within the site and any other design or other mitigation measures as maybe identified in the HIA. The site requires should also cover</li> <li>• the need to conserve and enhance the setting of the Dawlish Conservation Area and may also address matters related to townscape, local character and distinctiveness. Reference to the adopted Dawlish Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) may help with the latter.</li> <li>• We also query if the archaeological potential of this allocation site has been assessed as</li> <li>• appears to have been done for most sites in the HELAA. If not, this should be undertaken with an indication of whether any archaeological assessment and evaluation should be carried out now to inform the allocation and its policy or if it can be prepared at a later date to inform development proposals.</li> <li>• Should not be used as a brownfield site</li> <li>• No objections as is brownfield development</li> <li>• Support as site is within the settlement boundary</li> <li>• Should not include social housing</li> <li>• Should be either open market or shared ownership for local families</li> <li>• If existing dilapidated building was demolished the suite could be used for older people's homes</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/> 12877658656<br/> 12877552206<br/> 12877542128<br/> 12877476781<br/> 12876893763<br/> 12876558415<br/> 12875620551<br/> 12875616398<br/> 12875613299<br/> 12875610657<br/> 12875606178<br/> 12875601650<br/> 12875593137</p> <p>The comments include 27 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |



| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to all housing that is not affordable</li> <li>• No need for new houses</li> <li>• Should not include social housing which would negatively affect amenity of existing homes.</li> <li>• A379 cannot accommodate additional traffic</li> <li>• Access is possible from Weech Road</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require improved link to A380, bus routes and parking.</li> <li>• Lack of local employment opportunities</li> <li>• Too far from town centre</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require additional supermarket, doctors, dentists and schools.</li> <li>• Increase of population during summer months must be considered</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in schools, GP surgeries and dentists.</li> <li>• <b>Concern about lack of capacity in Dawlish STWs</b></li> <li>• Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.</li> <li>• Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more.</li> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.</li> <li>• Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably. To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Dawlish does not have a bank</li> <li>• Concern about any development in Dawlish and impacts on infrastructure</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish</li> </ul> |                        |

**Dawlish: Daw Vale Nursing Home**

Daw Vale is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published

| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID   |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Concern about impacts from development on TPO trees adjacent to site</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• Urban greenspace – must retain as wildlife stepping stone – we would not support the loss of this green space</li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• Historic Environment</li> <li>• No known assets. Low potential.</li> <li>• No objections as it is a brownfield site</li> <li>• Object to all development unless it is affordable</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish due to lack of need for houses</li> <li>• Concern about impacts from 18 properties on the amenity of adjacent occupiers</li> <li>• Concern about additional traffic close to the school and impacts on safety of children</li> <li>• Local road network cannot accommodate traffic from the additional dwellings</li> <li>• A379 cannot accommodate additional traffic, especially at bottlenecks and during summer months</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require improved link to A380, additional bus routes and parking.</li> <li>• New development will detract from Dawlish's attraction as a small coastal town.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in town centre and car parks during summer months</li> <li>• Too far from the town centre</li> <li>• Lack of local employment opportunities</li> <li>• The infrastructure of the area cannot accommodate a large number of dwellings</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in GP surgeries, dentists and schools</li> <li>• Will create undue pressure on existing infrastructure</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in sewage treatment works</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require additional supermarket, doctors, dentists and schools.</li> <li>• Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.</li> <li>• Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more.</li> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.</li> <li>• Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.</li> <li>• To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Dawlish does not have/needs a bank</li> <li>• Concerned about any development in Dawlish due to the increase in population during summer months from visitors.</li> <li>• Concern about scale of development proposed in Dawlish</li> <li>• Support for redevelopment of the site</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/>12877658656<br/>12877552206<br/>12877542128<br/>12877476781</p> <p>The comments include 14 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |

**Dawlish: Parking/Grassed Area to East of 1-50 Laherne**

1-50 Lanherne is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building on the site would spoil current sea views</li> <li>• Harm to wildlife</li> <li>• Will need buffer to protect SSSI</li> <li>• The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed development (c1,000 new dwellings) for the Dawlish area will have a detrimental impact on the area's ability to continue to support significant numbers of curlew buntings. In our view, an overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on curlew buntings and what strategic measures to compensate for loss can be implemented is required.</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• <b>We object to this site as the area adjacent to Dawlish Cliffs SSSI – should be prioritised for restoration/creation of maritime cliffs and slopes habitats in accordance with the SNA</b></li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Opportunity to remediate contamination. Previous uses within the site may have resulted in contamination with potential to pollute controlled waters.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• Fully support development which gives opportunity to improve the adjacent footpath, currently bounded by close boarded fencing</li> <li>• No objection/support as is brownfield development</li> <li>• Historic England notes the heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA and draft Local Plan, and we support the associated proposed site requirements (assuming these are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy. Support in part</li> <li>• Brownfield land should be targeted before developing open space</li> <li>• Historic Environment</li> <li>• No known assets. Low potential.</li> <li>• Development should not include housing estate or affordable homes, but should be limited to a small number of custom build homes.</li> <li>• New homes are not sold to local people</li> <li>• Object to all development unless it is affordable</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish due to lack of need for houses.</li> <li>• <b>Development would result in loss of open space used by the public</b></li> <li>• A379 is already congested and cannot accommodate additional traffic</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require improved link to A380, additional bus routes and parking.</li> <li>• Development on the site will harm tourism, which relies on pleasant environment</li> <li>• Too far from town centre</li> <li>• Lack of local employment opportunities</li> <li>• The infrastructure cannot accommodate a large number of dwellings</li> <li>• Lack of local employment opportunities</li> <li>• Health service is already under too much pressure</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require additional supermarket, doctors, dentists, and schools.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in local schools</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in GP surgeries</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in STWs</li> <li>• Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.</li> <li>• Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more. Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.</li> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/>12877658656<br/>12877552206<br/>12877542128</p> <p>The comments include 22 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |

| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Concerned about any development in Dawlish due to the increase in population during summer months from visitors.</li> <li>• Dawlish does not have a bank.</li> <li>• Concern about scale of development proposed in Dawlish</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish</li> </ul> |                        |

**Dawlish: Commercial Buildings South of Haldon Terrace, Hospital Hill**

Hospital Hill is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about loss of trees</li> <li>• Concern about loss of wildlife habitat and harm to wildlife present on site</li> <li>• The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed development (c1,000 new dwellings) for the Dawlish area will have a detrimental impact on the area's</li> <li>• ability to continue to support significant numbers of curlew buntings. In our view, an overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on curlew buntings and what strategic measures to compensate</li> <li>• for loss can be implemented is required.</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• Existing trees must be retained</li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Opportunity to remediate contamination. Requirement for site investigation and remediation of any contamination.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• Concern about harm to Conservation Area from building on the open space and loss of trees</li> <li>• Development would harm the setting of the grade II listed Haldon Terrace</li> <li>• Affordable housing will not be in keeping with the character of the surrounding historic buildings</li> <li>• <b>Relocation and development of the site of the vets would improve the appearance of the area.</b></li> <li>• Historic Environment</li> <li>• Grassed area is part of setting of Listed Haldon Terrace. No issues with redevelopment of commercial buildings</li> <li>• though.</li> <li>• Historic England notes the heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA regarding the setting of the grade II listed buildings to the north of the site and the Dawlish Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Assuming the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific</li> <li>• allocation policy, we agree with these including the conservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area. However, we could also usefully encourage development in accordance with the adopted Dawlish Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008), e.g. design and materials for new buildings.</li> <li>• We are also concerned that the site requirements do not include the need to conserve and enhance the setting and significance of the listed buildings and exclude development from taking place on the green space/grassed area.</li> <li>• We also query if the archaeological potential of this allocation site has been assessed as</li> <li>• appears to have been done for most sites in the HELAA. If not, this should be undertaken with</li> <li>• an indication of whether any archaeological assessment and evaluation should be carried out</li> <li>• now to inform the allocation and its policy or if it can be prepared at a later date to inform</li> <li>• development proposals.</li> <li>• Empty premises in the town centre should be prioritised for development (former Lloyds and Nat West banks buildings)</li> <li>• Good use of brownfield site (vets) within an existing residential area with good access to local services and amenities</li> <li>• The site is too small to help with the provision of affordable housing for locals</li> <li>• Development should not include housing estate or affordable homes, but should be limited to a small number of custom build homes.</li> <li>• Homes are not sold to local people</li> <li>• <b>Development of several houses would assist in providing homes for local people</b></li> <li>• Object to all development unless it is affordable</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish due to lack of need for houses</li> <li>• Loss of open space used by residents of Haldon Terrace and harm to health and wellbeing of residents.</li> <li>• Important green space within the built up area</li> <li>• Poor access and poor condition of road</li> <li>• <b>Lack of capacity on the A379</b></li> <li>• Poor junction</li> <li>• Building would increase existing congestion</li> <li>• <b>Local roads could accommodate additional traffic from a small scale development (vet site).</b></li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/> 12877658656<br/> 12877552206<br/> 12877542128<br/> 12877476781<br/> 12876893763<br/> 12876558415<br/> 12875620551<br/> 12875616398<br/> 12875613299<br/> 12875610657</p> <p>The comments include 19 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |

| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require improved link to A380, additional bus routes and parking.</li> <li>• Lack of local employment opportunities</li> <li>• If the vet site is developed, it is important that the vets practice is relocated.</li> <li>• Too far from town centre</li> <li>• There may be drainage problems from the underground spring</li> <li>• <b>Lack of capacity in STWs</b></li> <li>• Schools are at capacity and unable to expand</li> <li>• Health care services and dentists are at capacity</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require additional and supermarket, doctors, dentists, schools.</li> <li>• Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.</li> <li>• Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more.</li> <li>• Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.</li> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.</li> <li>• To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Questions impacts on operation of vet practice if its car park was built on</li> <li>• There is no bank in Dawlish</li> <li>• Questions why privately owned land has been included as a potential site</li> <li>• Concerned about any development in Dawlish and Teignmouth due to the increase in population during summer months from visitors.</li> <li>• Concern about scale of development proposed in Dawlish</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish</li> </ul> |                        |

**Dawlish: Residential Garden at Badlake Hill / Weech Road**

Badlake Hill/Weech Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about loss of trees and harm to wildlife</li> <li>• Site is visible in landscape from various focal points in Dawlish</li> <li>• The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed development (c1,000 new dwellings) for the Dawlish area will have a detrimental impact on the area's</li> <li>• ability to continue to support significant numbers of curlew buntings. In our view, an overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on curlew buntings and what strategic measures to compensate</li> <li>• for loss can be implemented is required.</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• Must retain existing trees</li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• Possible impacts on Listed Buildings at bottom of Badlake Hill</li> <li>• Historic Environment</li> <li>• Setting of Listed Buildings at south-east side of site.</li> <li>• Historic England notes that the heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA identify the need to conserve the setting of the grade II listed buildings adjacent to the site and the retention of trees to assist with this. These comments also note the archaeological potential of the site.</li> <li>• While we support the associated site requirements related to tree retention and for</li> <li>• archaeological assessment and evaluation, we consider that they should also include the need to conserve and enhance the settings and significance of the adjacent listed buildings and the setting of the Dawlish Conservation Area (assuming these are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy). Reference to the adopted Dawlish Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) may also assist with this.</li> <li>• No objections as is brownfield development.</li> <li>• Development should not include housing estate or affordable homes, but should be limited to a small number of custom build homes.</li> <li>• Houses built will not be affordable to local people</li> <li>• Object to all development unless it is affordable</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish due to lack of need for houses</li> <li>• Construction traffic will result in pollution to existing residents</li> <li>• Poor access in congested area with steep and narrow roads</li> <li>• Development will increase risk of accidents</li> <li>• <b>Narrow local roads cannot accommodate additional traffic</b></li> <li>• Lack of footways make pedestrian travel unsafe</li> <li>• <b>The steep topography will deter sustainable movement</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of capacity on A379</b></li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require improved link to A380, additional bus routes and parking.</li> <li>• Lack of local employment opportunities</li> <li>• Too far from town centre</li> <li>• Development will add pressure to the infrastructure of the town, which is at capacity, especially during summer months</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in schools and GP services.</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require additional supermarket, doctors, dentists and schools.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity in STWs</li> <li>• Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.</li> <li>• Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more. Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/> 12877658656<br/> 12877552206<br/> 12877542128<br/> 12877476781<br/> 12876893763<br/> 12876558415<br/> 12875620551<br/> 12875616398</p> <p>The comments include 18 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |

| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.</li> <li>• To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Dawlish does not have/needs a bank</li> <li>• Subsidence risk to existing properties from development of a steep site</li> <li>• Concerned about any development in Dawlish and Teignmouth due to the increase in population during summer months from visitors.</li> <li>• Concern about scale of development proposed in Dawlish</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish</li> </ul> |                        |

**Dawlish: Garden of Lyme Acre**

Lyme Acre is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.



| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID   |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building along this area would once again ruin an open space enjoy by the community &amp; would also destroy the scenic views the land offers.</li> <li>• The Dawlish allocations will result in increased recreational pressure on the Exe Estuary SPA and Dawlish Warren SAC. In our view this necessitates more SANGS on the west side of the Estuary.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed development (c1,000 new dwellings) for the Dawlish area will have a detrimental impact on the area's</li> <li>• ability to continue to support significant numbers of curlew buntings. In our view, an overarching assessment of the potential impact of these allocations on curlew buntings and what strategic measures to compensate</li> <li>• for loss can be implemented is required.</li> <li>• Must retain existing trees</li> <li>• Dawlish is located close to the Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Dawlish Warren SAC. Particular care should be taken to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied carefully to the site options closest to the protected sites.</li> <li>• Flood Zone 1 - sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Pollution prevention measures construction phase to prevent deterioration of Bathing Waters.</li> <li>• <b>Historic Environment</b></li> <li>• <b>No known assets. Low potential.</b></li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be prioritised</li> <li>• Support as is brownfield site</li> <li>• Development should not include housing estate or affordable homes, but should be limited to a small number of custom build homes.</li> <li>• Object to all development unless it is affordable</li> <li>• Object to any development in Dawlish due to lack of need for houses</li> <li>• Concern about difference in ground level between site and adjacent property, whose amenity would be harmed from loss of light and privacy</li> <li>• Development will increase traffic and worsen air quality</li> <li>• Development will create congestion</li> <li>• Development will increase risk of accidents</li> <li>• A379 cannot accommodate additional traffic</li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require improved link to A380, additional bus routes and parking.</li> <li>• <b>Too far from town centre</b></li> <li>• Development will add pressure to the infrastructure of the town, which is at capacity, especially during summer months</li> <li>• <b>Lack of capacity in GP surgeries, dentists and schools</b></li> <li>• Any development in Dawlish will require additional supermarket, doctors, dentists and schools. Lack of capacity in STWs</li> <li>• Development must be provided with supporting infrastructure such as pedestrian and cycle links.</li> <li>• Dawlish recently had some surface water separation carried out- there may be some potential for more. Investigate opportunities for surface water separation.</li> <li>• Some evidence of hydraulic overload of the sewage system. It is also important that there is no deterioration to the Bathing Waters in Dawlish as a result of further development (Current Bathing Waters status: Dawlish Warren = excellent; Dawlish Town = good; Dawlish Coryton Cove = excellent).</li> <li>• SWW would need to confirm that they can take the additional flows without increasing risk to the environment.</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.</li> <li>• To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Concerned about any development in Dawlish and Teignmouth due to the increase in population during summer months from visitors.</li> <li>• Dawlish does not have a bank</li> <li>• Concern about scale of development proposed in Dawlish</li> </ul> | <p>12877720432<br/>12877658656<br/>12877552206</p> <p>The comments below include 17 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |

**Dawlish: Land off Meadow Park**

Meadow Park is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harm to biodiversity of the site and ecology, including bats, birds and reptiles and, including Cirl Buntings.</li> <li>• Harm to the landscape setting of Dawlish form skyline development/prominent in landscape</li> <li>• Harm to the Undeveloped Coast landscape.</li> <li>• RSPB advises that site lies within an important area for cirl buntings. Surveys recorded a breeding territory within 150m of the site.</li> <li>• 2. Recommends compensatory habitat as necessary.</li> <li>• 3. Concern on developments in Dawlish in general due to current and potential impacts on local cirl bunting population.</li> <li>• 4. Developments that impact on loss of habitat used by cirl buntings will require compensatory habitat provision.</li> <li>• Within the recreational disturbance IRZ for Exe Estuary, Dawlish Warren and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC and East Devon Heaths SPA (existing measures apply, subject to review). (EA)</li> <li>• Steep topography will make development difficult</li> <li>• Houses will sit on elevated land and affect the skyline of Dawlish</li> <li>• Concern about loss of Grades 1 and 2 agricultural land</li> <li>• The land is too steep to be used for agriculture, therefore, is unsuitable for residential development.</li> <li>• <b>Housing must be affordable and energy efficient, with plenty of open space.</b></li> <li>• Harm to safety of children playing in road from additional development and construction traffic</li> <li>• Construction will cause disruption for existing residents</li> <li>• Site is too small to accommodate additional homes without causing a loss of privacy to existing residents.</li> <li>• Access is via a steep hill</li> <li>• Access road is congested with parked cars</li> <li>• Lack of local bus routes will result in additional journeys by car</li> <li>• <b>Difficult access for construction traffic</b></li> <li>• <b>The site lacks footway connection to town centre</b></li> <li>• <b>Local roads cannot accommodate additional traffic</b></li> <li>• <b>Cycle/pedestrian links should be provided with new development.</b></li> <li>• <b>Good location close to town centre</b></li> <li>• <b>Poor access via single track roads with no pavements</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of local employment</b></li> <li>• Surface water run off would be created</li> <li>• GPs have excess capacity as of January 2022, however, consented and commenced sites in the catchment reduce capacity considerably.</li> <li>• Sites in Part 2 will lead to overall capacity shortfall.</li> <li>• To mitigate the capacity issue a primary care developer contribution will be required.</li> <li>• Site is close to services, facilities and transport</li> <li>• The NHS confirms that the GP surgeries that serve these potential sites have an excess of capacity as of August 2021.</li> <li>• However, consented and commenced sites such as Land at Langdon and Gatehouse Farm that are also in the catchment of these surgeries, reduces that capacity considerably.</li> <li>• To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential sites in and around the Dawlish area.</li> <li>• Concern about development proposed as development previously refused</li> <li>• Excavation required to build houses could make ground conditions unstable</li> <li>• The site should be used for tree planting, which may help to stabilise the steep land</li> <li>• Building practicalities of the site are difficult.</li> <li>• Concern of precedent being set if the site is allocated.</li> <li>• Site was discounted in previous LP.</li> <li>• Appeal previously refused due to topography</li> </ul> | <p>395470931<br/>395450716<br/>395419529<br/>395322911<br/>394850684<br/>394617935<br/>394599137<br/>394180792<br/>393980031<br/>393915078<br/>393974472<br/>381614511<br/>381285019<br/>379519735<br/>393980031</p> <p>The comments below include 7 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |

**Teignmouth: Part of Land at Buddleford Farm**

Buddleford Farm is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

- The proposed site within the consultation is adjacent to and in addition to a site that currently has outline planning permission to be developed to the North West of Teignmouth. The site with outline planning permission is currently in the process of being explored for development, but has many currently unresolved issues. Until these issues are addressed then further sites to the North West of this site at Buddleford Farm should not be included. Species present at the site including protected Cirl Buntings, Dormice and Bats. Ancient Devon Hedgerows are present at part of the site. The proposed additional site contained within the consultation would be likely to further exacerbate these outstanding unresolved issues, but is also in an area of Undeveloped Coast; has major topographical constraints and is highly visible as part of the landscape due to its elevation and located close to a prominent ridgelines. Visible, visually attractive and undeveloped sites such as this, in what is a significant tourist area, add significantly to the visitor appeal of the area in their current state and this site is highly visible from major tourist accommodation areas in Shaldon and from visitor focal points such as Teignmouth backbeach. The visitor economy is currently worth around £265m annually in Teignbridge alone. A consideration in allowing any further significant development in Teignmouth is the likely additional impact on traffic volumes through the main arteries of the town. Any proposal should be considered in light of impacts on the year-round traffic congestion issues experienced throughout the town, including and especially the increased post-Covid volumes throughout much of the day.
- Development of this prominent 'stand-alone' site will have a very negative impact upon the natural environment, ecology, and landscape. It will be highly visible from Teignmouth, Shaldon and the Coast.
- The Valley has many springs and streams and absorbs a lot of rain and surface water, the impact of increased run off could cause a high flood risk for homes downhill. The building of additional houses would be overbearing and dominant in the landscape and have a major detrimental effect on landscape (EN2 Undeveloped Coast).
- It would be a shame to enclose Coombe valley nature reserve by housing. It would be good to extend this reserve up the valley including the site under consultation.
- I do not believe we should be looking at developing any sites which are known habitats for protected species. Biodiversity is in crisis in this country, and no matter how it is mitigated, any development will disturb and lessen the ecology and biodiversity of a previously green site. This site will also impact the appearance of Teignmouth and its boundaries, and will eat into yet more of our greenbelt land.
- Many species of wildlife can be found in this area, including deer, many species of birds and mammals. Development will destroy their habitat. This development will negatively impact on the local environment, any development in this area will be seen from miles around and will encroach further on the surrounding countryside.
- Mitigation work must be completed before work starts to avoid any extinction of local species. All hedges must be protected along with buffer strips beside any footpaths esp. adjacent to the stream. Protection of bat flight paths must be enhanced along with the corridor to the SSCI/CWS site. No pollution from the development must occur.
- Over 25% of this land is part of the Buddleford Farm/Coombe Valley OSWI (see below).
- Minerals -The opportunities section refers to the 'Mineral Consultation Zone'. This terminology is incorrect and should be amended to refer to the 'Mineral Consultation Area'. Historic Environment -Potential for prehistoric and Romano-British settlement evidence. Requires assessment and evaluation to inform masterplan and mitigation.
- NE - Buddleford Farm is within the 1km IRZ for Little Haldon Heaths SSSI. The site is also adjacent to Combe Valley Local Nature Reserve.
- DWT - We object to this site - High nature value farmland adjacent to LNR and CWS and near SSSI. Supports priority habitats and species – GHB, cirl buntings. Land should be prioritised for habitat restoration/creation as part of NRN
- RSPB - There is no public access to this area so RSPB cirl bunting surveys will not have been able to determine if cirl buntings are present. However, it is near to a cirl bunting hotspot (including adjacent to Bishopsteignton County Wildlife Site, identified for cirl buntings) and the description suggests potentially suitable habitat. The RSPB recommends cirl bunting survey.
- WT - We accept inclusion of parts of the site in the local plan which are considered developable, provided that existing woodland, species-rich hedges and trees are retained.
- There remains a need to provide safe Highways access onto the B3192, which has currently not been resolved. A consideration in allowing any further significant development in Teignmouth is the likely additional impact on traffic volumes through the main arteries of the town. Any proposal should be considered in light of impacts on the year-round traffic congestion issues experienced throughout the town, including and especially the increased post-Covid volumes throughout much of the day.
- The whole purpose of this area is for a rural environment and building on this land will severely detract from one of the attractions to this area for tourism and these needs protecting at all costs.
- Old hedgerows; partly adjoins site of Romano-British villa (E of Shepherds Lane); (we are told) iron age fort.
- **Questions viability of development due to topography and lack of interest from developers in this part of Teignmouth as demonstrated by lack of development of Exeter Road Site.**
- There remains significant potential, which is unresolved, for increased flood risk downstream along the banks of Bitton Brook, due in part to water displacement, as the site is one of the spring sources of Bitton Brook - flooding has occurred in recent years at properties adjacent to Bitton Brook and on Bitton Park Road and this risk is likely to increase further with increases in extreme weather events.
- It is agricultural land which should be used as such. Being steep and close to the Coombe Valley Nature Reserve it could benefit from the new agricultural subsidies which will reward farmers for rewilding and farming in sustainable ways to support the local ecology.
- Part of the site could be included as Coombe valley nature reserve.
- **Local agricultural land must be preserved if we're to have any chance of farming sustainably to help offset climate change.**
- **Brownfield land should be targeted as opposed to agricultural land which should be preserved for that purpose alone, especially as this country needs to self - support now we are independent to the EU.**
- **A wooded area that houses much of the natural habitats and remains a vestige for protected animals such as bats. it can and will cause undue stress on the natural biodiversity.**
- **Stop second home sales - before it kills Teignmouth.**

12877720432  
12877658656  
12877552206  
12877542128  
12877476781  
12876893763  
12876558415  
12875620551  
12875616398  
12875613299  
12875610657  
12875606178  
12875601650  
12875593137  
12875216621  
12875211591  
12875207384  
12875204809  
12875203091  
12875200640  
12875194107  
12875190880  
12875184518  
12875176252  
12875165103  
12874834357  
12871141307  
12870736773  
12870595464  
12870560944  
12870365271  
12870412839

The comments include 18 submitted by email, in post, or in person.

- Housing of all these categories are needed in Teignmouth but this would be a very costly site to develop, given the constraints to overcome, for only an estimated 50 - 60 homes. To make development profitable (if that is even possible) the houses built would have to be very expensive: not affordable or suitable for social housing.
- Affordable housing should be built closer to the town and local amenities.
- Affordable houses are essential for local workers and their families. All new developments provide an opportunity to demonstrate new technologies to produce energy efficient housing.
- No houses should be built of agricultural land. This is an inherent part of the areas character. This is not Exeter but a beautiful rural, coastal area.
- If this area is developed, which would be absolutely horrid, then housing needs to be affordable and made affordable to locals. Not potential second homes.
- I think we need extra houses - the housing in Teignmouth is too competitive and driving prices through the roof. This is making it too difficult to buy, which I would love to have the opportunity to do.
- Housing would be quite a distance from medical facilities and the site too steep for much in the way of cycle and walking paths.
- Open spaces and nature are important for health and wellbeing.
- Building in this region will increase the risk of accidents and worse so do not see how this will contribute to the wellbeing of residents living here. Increased developments will also increase not only congestion but pollution impacting the health of resident's health.
- Major outstanding concerns include: The need to provide safe Highways access onto the B3192; due to the topography cycle and walking access into the town and to facilities being really difficult for those not in peak physical fitness; A consideration in allowing any further significant development in Teignmouth is the likely additional impact on traffic volumes through the main arteries of the town. Any proposal should be considered in light of impacts on the year-round traffic congestion issues experienced throughout the town, including and especially the increased post-Covid volumes throughout much of the day.
- A consideration in allowing any further significant development in Teignmouth is the likely additional impact on traffic volumes through the main arteries of the town. Any proposal should be considered in light of impacts on the year-round traffic congestion issues experienced throughout the town, including and especially the increased post-Covid volumes throughout much of the day. There remains a need to provide safe Highways access onto the B3192, which is currently unresolved and may prove expensive.
- No access - other than a possible route over what would be a `ransom' strip.
- The access for traffic on/off the B3192 have not been adequately addressed. The future residents on this site are likely to have between 500-600 cars.
- I am most concerned about even more traffic using Moor View Drive. It is a very busy road and stop start when you drive it due to cars parked on both sides, motorhomes and large vans cause visibility problems now and it is also bus route - all this passes a primary school at the bottom near to the junction of Fourth Avenue. Another further 60 houses with probably 120 cars up and down this road would be a serious hazard to schoolchildren and residents alike.
- The Lovell estate transport link directs traffic to fourth avenue, mill lane, Coombe vale road and deer park road. These estate roads are highly congested already and in places are single lanes only due to parked cars. Apart from the congestion this further building of 50-60 houses would cause there is also a pollution issue for surrounding houses on these roads and Bitton park Road where some of the traffic would emerge.
- Increased public transport would be a requirement, but any increased transport will negatively impact on the environment.
- By feeding into Teignmouth via Moorview Drive and Forth Avenue and subsequently Bitton Park Road there will be a huge increase into an area that is already congested the pollution of which exceeds the recommendation.
- Visible, visually attractive and undeveloped sites such as this, in what is a significant tourist area, add significantly to the visitor appeal of the area in their current state and this site is highly visible from major tourist accommodation areas in Shaldon and from visitor focal points such as Teignmouth back beach. The visitor economy is currently worth around £265m annually in Teignbridge alone.
- The majority of local employment relies on the tourist trade and health and social care. There is unlikely to enough local employment for an increased population.
- There is significant potential for increased flood risk downstream along the banks of Bitton Brook, due in part to water displacement, as the site is one of the spring sources of Bitton Brook - flooding has occurred in recent years at properties adjacent to Bitton Brook and on Bitton Park Road and this risk is likely to increase further with increases in extreme weather events.
- Teignmouth's facilities and roads are currently at full capacity and the town has under provision of essential facilities including for swimming, for which I believe there is a statutory obligation on Teignbridge.
- Poor infrastructure in surrounding roads, four lanes of traffic on Deep Park Avenue, Fourth Avenue, Coombe Park Road and more development, doctors and schools at full capacity
- I fail to see how the transport infrastructure is suitable for this many homes in this area.
- These potential sites are primarily served by two GP Practice in Teignmouth. These surgeries have an excess of capacity as of August 2021 to absorb a patient list size increase from these potential sites. Whilst it appears unlikely that based upon this village a developer contribution would not be required, due to all the other potential developments in nearby towns and villages that share the same GP footprint, it is very likely that a primary care developer contribution will be required.
- Teignmouth badly needs more housing, privately owned, affordable and rented. To give Teignmouth the housing allocation it needs and can accommodate, Teignbridge should revisit the more ambitious proposal for Teignmouth (Broadmeadow, Headway Cross, Shepherds Lane) which it put out to consultation previously. Only by bold decisions to allocate more Greenfield land to development can housing needs be met. This Buddleford farm site is unsuitable, too costly to develop and probably not deliverable. As a resident of Teignmouth, I and many others expected the Shepherds Lane to be allocated. It would accommodate significantly more housing at lower cost and minimal visual impact.
- There is a school on the route from the Lovell estate (Our lady St Patrick). The increased traffic could cause further danger to the primary school children at peak times.
- Lighting must comply with recommendations for night flying insects and bats.

- It's an absolute atrocity that this site is being considered for so called 'development' otherwise known as ticking boxes, sacrificing the environment and the needs of the locals - inviting urban-to-rural migration and second-home owners. Schools in the surrounding areas are at capacity as it is and until schools, GPs and hospitals are given the due care they deserve no more development should be considered.
- The OSWI should be compulsorily purchased and added to the existing Coombe Valley LNR. The OSWI contains much wildlife and some notable Devon species - the golden-ringed dragonfly, the corky fruited water dropwort, and the silver streak fritillary. Adding households to this area will increase pressure on the popular Haldon SSSI and the already over-used Coombe Valley LNR.
- Object due to lack of safe access onto B3192, potential harm to Dormice, Cirl Buntings and bats, risk of flood to Bitton Brook from run off, loss of hedgerows, harm to Undeveloped Coast character, steeply sloping and highly visible, and would exacerbate existing congestion through town centre.

DRAFT

## Teignmouth: Higher Holcombe Farm

Higher Holcombe Farm is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undeveloped Coast designation. Close to the ridgeline and highly visible from the tourist areas of Shaldon and Teignmouth seafront. The site, if developed, would head towards the further coalescence of the settlements of Teignmouth, Holcombe and Dawlish leaving little space in terms of strategic urban breaks. Species present at the site include protected Cirl Buntings, Dormice and Bats. Ancient Devon Hedgerows are expected to be present at part of the site.</li> </ul>  | 12877720432<br>12877658656<br>12877552206   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposed site contained within the consultation is in an area of Undeveloped Coast; has major topographical constraints and is highly visible as part of the landscape due to its elevation and abuts the ridgeline. Visible, visually attractive and undeveloped sites such as this, in what is a significant tourist area, add significantly to the visitor appeal of the area in their current state and this site is highly visible from major tourist accommodation areas in Shaldon and from visitor focal points such as Teignmouth seafront. The visitor economy is currently worth around £265m annually in Teignbridge alone. The site, if developed, would head towards the further coalescence of the settlements of Teignmouth, Holcombe and Dawlish leaving little space in terms of strategic urban breaks. Species present at the site include protected Cirl Buntings, Dormice and Bats. Ancient Devon Hedgerows are expected to be present at part of the site.</li> </ul>   | 12877542128<br>12877476781<br>12876893763<br>12876558415<br>12875620551   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development of 5 or 40 homes would have a negative impact on the area, increasing traffic on roads which are narrow &amp; struggle with existing traffic levels. Biodiversity would be reduced and the landscape would be permanently affected. Trees and native hedgerows would be lost forever which go against all plans to tackle Climate Change &amp; the reduction of CO2 emissions in Devon.</li> </ul>   | 12875616398<br>12875613299<br>12875610657   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural Environment: Developing the proposed site would significantly compromise the ecology of the area, which is an Area of Scientific Interest, with potential impact on rare and protected species such as a Cirl Buntings, Pipistrelle and Lesser Horseshoe Bats and various species of butterflies, all, of which have been sighted in and around the area proposed. In addition to this the houses on Higher Holcombe Road already suffer from water seepage from the fields behind despite the landscape being soil, grass and trees. When you consider the recent local flooding in Teignmouth town at the bottom of the Dawlish road following heavy rains (July 2021) any proposed development is only going to put even more pressure on an already overwhelmed sewerage and storm system fed from this area down into town via Dawlish Road. The 1 in 200 Year Storm requirement (Environment Agency) is particularly concerning given the loss of permeable areas and replacement with hard surfaces on such a steep slope. The water damage to the roads at the front of the house from water flowing down the hills is already severe with several large potholes in the road and pavements which remain despite some recent limited resurfacing works in the area. Landscape: The land in question, when viewed from Teignmouth and Shaldon (particularly the Teignmouth war memorial which is a Teignbridge Planning mark to measure this) forms the skyline as a distinctive green horizon at the top of Higher Holcombe Hill. Should any development of this land be granted, even that of single story houses designed to be aesthetically sensitive, that green border to Teignmouth would be lost forever. The white triangles of the existing houses on Higher Holcombe Road backed by the green field on which this development is proposed forms part of the beauty and character of the town. Previous applications and appeals have been dismissed by Teignbridge planning inspectors based on the appropriateness of the site for residential developments given the planning policy aims for the locality and the effect of the schemes on the character and appearance of the area (Reference No. 14/00018/REF 10/07/2014). Further, if this land was added to the local plan it would constitute a precedent that could lead to 'unrestricted urban sprawl' between Teignmouth and Holcombe.</li> </ul> | 12875606178<br>12875601650<br>12875593137<br>12875216621<br>12875211591<br>12875207384<br>12875204809<br>12875203091<br>12875200640<br>12875194107<br>12875190880<br>12875184518<br>12867617435 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed site is on an Area of Undeveloped Coast and on the skyline from Teignmouth so would have a detrimental impact upon the natural environment and landscape, by virtue of its size and elevated and exposed position near to the ridge line of the hill. The development and paving over of these fields would increase the flooding risk for the area. The ecology of the region would also suffer from the destruction of the established hedgerows and field boundaries. This area is adjacent to the Bishopsteinton County Wildlife Site, an area of land rich in wildlife, supporting rare or threatened habitats and species. This area of south Devon is particularly important for the threatened Cirl Bunting, as well as various species of bats and butterflies.</li> </ul>  | 12875176252<br>12863953262<br>12875165103<br>12863868350  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is visible from several parts of the town, the Teign estuary and Shaldon, as well as the countryside to the north. The site would extend development into an area of attractive countryside in a prominent position that will fundamentally change the skyline forever to its detriment.</li> </ul>  | 12874834357<br>12862380263  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not only should all the boundaries be protected for wildlife, but corridors need to link with the sites of SSSI/CWS which are nearby.</li> </ul>  | 12871141307   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DCC Minerals: The opportunities section refers to the 'Mineral Consultation Zone'. This terminology is incorrect and should be amended to refer to the 'Mineral Consultation Area'. Historic Environment - Potential for prehistoric and medieval archaeological evidence. Requires assessment to inform mitigation.</li> </ul>   | 12861974837<br>12870736773  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NE - Buddleford Farm is within the 1km IRZ for Little Haldon Heaths SSSI. The site is also adjacent to Combe Valley Local Nature Reserve.</li> </ul>  | 12860157559   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WT - We accept inclusion of parts of the site in the local plan which are considered developable, provided that existing woodland, species-rich hedges and trees are retained.</li> </ul>   | 12870595464   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site, if developed, would head towards the further coalescence of the settlements of Teignmouth, Holcombe and Dawlish leaving little space in terms of strategic urban breaks.</li> </ul>   | 12859137494   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building on this site would negatively impact the green ridgeline which is a prime characteristic of Teignmouth Town.</li> </ul>  | 12870560944   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is the source of a number of springs flowing into Brimley Brook in Teignmouth. When building works at the adjacent recent development took place, displacement of these springs occurred and has caused issues with water ingress into neighbouring properties, including into buildings during high rainfall events, which did not previously occur.</li> </ul>  | 12858866173<br>12870365271  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Being on such a hilly site means that this new development would certainly rise over the houses below it on Higher Holcombe Road and invade their privacy. This cannot be negated by fencing or tree planting, since both will not be able to withstand the exposed windy conditions at this site, in the long term, or possibly even the short term.</li> </ul>  | 12856180778<br>12870412839  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This environmental landscape should be left as agricultural fields to preserve the boundary of Teignmouth.</li> </ul>   | 12856177148<br>12870341079  |

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This land has always been agricultural land.</li> <li>• All brownfield sites in the Teignmouth area should be considered instead of destroying any greenfield sites. There is little infrastructure this high up, which means more land would need to be destroyed to develop new amenities. Currently residents use the services within the town &amp; manage without the need for additional building of 'play areas' 'allotments', &amp; do not need more drs/dentists/schools, etc.</li> <li>• Concerned that the site could be used for food production. This will be an essential need in the future.</li> <li>• The area is already over built; more homes, even 5 new homes on this site, would impact on the privacy of residents and affect the appearance of the area. Noise levels would be increased and there would be additional disturbances to existing neighbours, who currently enjoy peace &amp; quiet, appreciating the wildlife around them.</li> <li>• I am extremely dubious that any developer will stay true to their word on building affordable housing, rather than the possibility of maximising their profit. Especially in such a sought-after part of the county, with sea views.</li> <li>• There will never be enough housing, the population of Teignmouth is growing year on year.</li> <li>• <b>This is not an appropriate site for affordable housing as it is a distance away from the town. It would be more appropriate for this type of housing to be developed closer to town and local amenities.</b></li> <li>• <b>Houses must be affordable for the majority of housing. The design of new developments demonstrates the use of new technologies for energy efficient housing.</b></li> <li>• <b>Please set a high ratio of shared ownership. We are getting priced out of the market.</b></li> <li>• The existence of the surrounding fields is the reason many people bought homes in this area. The loss of privacy will be massive. There will be increased noise pollution and light pollution (from the new homes &amp; additional street lighting), which will affect both humans and indigenous animals in the surrounding area. Air pollution will increase (current air quality levels are good as indicated by healthy lichen on local trees). Increased traffic will negatively impact pedestrians, cyclists and disabled people due to increased traffic on the roads and additional parking requirements, reducing road safety in the area. Parking is already a problem in the surrounding area with on-road parking causing visibility difficulties - this will only increase as visitors to the proposed site would seek additional parking in the neighbouring roads.</li> <li>• Health and wellbeing would be adversely affected by disrupting the local countryside further, disrupting the wildlife and urbanising the environment further.</li> <li>• Fine for the fit and healthy who are able to walk up and down steep hills in order to access amenities. Lovely spot on the edge of town for new house however this would directly impact the health and wellbeing of those currently living in the area.</li> <li>• Poor cycle access due to the topography of the site and its elevation.</li> <li>• The impact of up to 40+ new homes could be up to 80+ additional cars (most homes are now 2 car households) which would significantly impact morning &amp; evening traffic congestion which is already considerable. This will also negatively impact pedestrians, cyclists &amp; those with disabilities, as there are many points in the surrounding area where there are no/narrow pavements &amp; are forced to move into the road. Any building of roads to access the site &amp; within the site itself will destroy the vital wildlife corridors that are a natural asset to Teignmouth. Connecting roads would cut across the natural hedgerows leading to a significant biodiversity loss to established bird populations (currently a popular breeding area for buzzards, sparrow hawks, owls, pheasants &amp; native species) as well as insects and smaller native creatives like dormice, foxes &amp; hedgehogs. As the proposed site is well over a 30 minute walk down steep hills into town, most people will use cars increasing emissions, reducing air quality, and adding to the existing lack of parking in the town centre. Building on top of the hill is not suitable for many elderly people due to the steep 30+minute walk down to the town &amp; back up again. Likewise young people would require transporting down into the town for activities (&amp; lack of pavements means many areas are not safe for young pedestrians). Similarly, wheelchair users &amp; those with limited mobility/visual problems would find it difficult to navigate down to town unless using a car. There is a limited bus service, which still means a steep, final walk back up the hill.</li> <li>• This area of Teignmouth atop of a steep hill is not easily accessible to the amenities of the town for cyclists or pedestrians - it is a long uphill slog to walk back up the hill from the town centre. This would mean that the new residents would have to rely heavily on private vehicle use. The bus that serves the area goes on a very circuitous route into the town, so is not an appealing option for travel. The access road to the site through Higher Holcombe Road would bring a volume of traffic that this quiet residential circular road is not suitable for. Cars and vans are frequently parked on the roadside, sometimes blocking the route, and the road would become dangerously congested with this increased amount of traffic. Emergency services could not be guaranteed a route through to the new development.</li> <li>• <b>There is absolutely no access to the site - how do you propose to build in from Higher Holcombe Road, there is only just enough room for two cars passing let alone an additional 80 cars (41-47 proposed households).</b></li> <li>• <b>Any access to bus links is down a steep hill. The bus stops are situated further along New Road. Access to train station is even further down a steep hill. There is a shuttle bus to Morrisons that would benefit those who are able to walk down a steep hill to the stop (more than 500m).</b></li> <li>• There is little employment in the area, which means new residents would be commuting out of the area, increasing the already congested roads - the narrow lanes around are not suitable for additional traffic. Another reason to only build on brownfield sites in &amp; around the town centre where people will be able to access jobs, shops &amp; services.</li> <li>• No employment in Teignmouth now, new people coming to the area will only put stress on the existing narrow roads in and out of Teignmouth, which already experience many tragic accidents. The reputation of our local roads is abysmal.</li> <li>• Most people will shop at out of town centres. Employment is mainly in the tourist industry and health and social care. Other employment usually means commuting which the transport infrastructure cannot cope with.</li> </ul> | <p>12850899200<br/>12850440089<br/>12850090517<br/>12849724385<br/>12848742221<br/>12847575201<br/>12846328749<br/>12844571732</p> <p>The comments include 22 submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |



| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly out of Teignmouth, so again would require access to transport.</li> <li>• There is little infrastructure in the surrounding proposed area. The existing residents use the services in the town. There is no available land to build more additional services, nor are any required for the current residents.</li> <li>• All schools in Teignmouth, particularly the local primary school at Hazeldown are running close to / at capacity. The Local Plan should include provision for School places.</li> <li>• This scheme will certainly add to the burden of an already oversubscribed education and healthcare system (the current wait for an NHS dentist is currently over two years.)</li> <li>• There is a very outdated infrastructure within Teignmouth that the local authority cannot keep up to date with, healthcare and education here is appalling, we have very bad access to both adding families to this site will only suffer.</li> <li>• The new development would put increased pressure on the local schools, and healthcare services.</li> <li>• The roads and pavements already existing in Teignmouth are in shocking conditions, it's embarrassing- how do you propose to maintain the proposed development built on even a higher landscape. TDC have no funds to look after their obligations to the Council Tax payer as it is</li> <li>• NHS - These potential sites are primarily served by two GP Practice in Teignmouth. These surgeries have an excess of capacity as of August 2021 to absorb a patient list size increase from these potential sites.</li> <li>• Whilst it appears unlikely that based upon this village a developer contribution would not be required, due to all the other potential developments in nearby towns and villages that share the same GP footprint, it is very likely that a primary care developer contribution will be required.</li> <li>• These proposals have been put forward twice before and didn't pass the planning, nothing has changed since then so how can this have passed now?</li> <li>• TTC - Object to harm to Undeveloped Coast, highly visually prominent on skyline, harm to tourism from harm to landscape, potential flooding to Brimley Brook from run off, coalescence of Teignmouth and Holcombe, potential harm to Cirl Buntings, Dormice and bats and loss of hedgerows.</li> <li>• Ransom strip could render site unviable.</li> </ul> |                        |

**Teignmouth: Land at Shepherds Lane, Bishopsteignton**

Shepherd's Lane is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|---|
| There is a lot of water run-off from the fields, and surely there wouldn't be suitable drainage, which would cause a large problem for residents in and around Moor View Drive.  | 12877720432   |
| The fields and surrounding lanes are beautiful, and as a regular walker in these areas - along with many others - it be a huge shame to lose them, even for a small site, as it would encroach on the divide between Bishopsteignton and Teignmouth.   | 12875620551   |
| And if a smaller number of houses would be built now, what if more are built and the development increases in size and in a few years.   | 12877658656   |
| Any housing would have a terrible impact on nature, there are lots of different birds, including cirl buntings, at times it sounds like a nature reserve, but all that would be lost.  | 12877552206   |
| A number of trees in around the site are protected also.   | 12875613299   |
| This area has a rural setting, with lanes and hedgerows, protected trees next to the proposed site, and so does not suit a housing development.  | 12877542128   |
| Any impact on local habitats must be approached with extreme caution.  | 12875610657   |
| Damage to the environment in and around the Coombe Vale Nature Reserve, home of the Cirl Bunting.  | 12877476781   |
| I am a homeowner on Haytor Close and often see bats flying over my garden and have wild amphibians including newts in my pond. I have mature trees and hedgerow on my boundary which are precious commodities. I am concerned that Teignmouth will lose critical wildlife and the beauty of the hills will be lost forever, never to be replaced. Our planet is being destroyed by over - development.   | 12875606178   |
| Though the site from the sea front of Teignmouth may appear to be below the skyline however it is on the skyline if you live near to the site.   | 12876893763   |
| Land is available and no ransom strips.  | 12875601650   |
| Promoting four fields to East of Shepherds Lane in total and one of them is this site.   | 12876558415   |
| Remaining three plots can be used for biodiversity mitigation.   | 12875593137   |
| Previous landscape concerns are not considered relevant. Site and remaining three plots are not more visible than the surrounding residential areas.   | The comments include 15, submitted by email, in post, or in person. |
| Result in loss of cirl bunting territories.  |   |
| Site lies within 250m of six cirl bunting territories.   |   |
| Whole site is within a County Wildlife Site designated for its farmland wildlife interest and cirl buntings in particular between Teignmouth and Bishopsteignton.  |   |
| Object to previous proposals to develop farmland in this area because of the serious impact on cirl buntings and therefore this development.   |   |
| Site is 180m from Coombe Valley LNR.   |   |
| Site is 200m to the east of Ashill RSPB Reserve.   |   |
| Within the recreational disturbance IRZ for Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren (existing measures apply, subject to review).   |   |
| ALC Grade 3a and 3b.   |   |
| Site would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Teign Estuary.   |   |
| I believe there are roman ruins under the soil in this field from previous tests made.   |   |
| The old lanes and hedgerows would be ruined that have been there for 100s of years. We are losing our history slowly all over.   |   |
| Historic England notes from the HELAA that the proposed allocation site is an area of known Romano-British settlement and has archaeological potential. We further note that the site has been partly evaluated and requires significant mitigation, while the remainder of the site requires further archaeological assessment and evaluation prior to determining planning applications. These archaeological matters are not mentioned in the draft Local Plan. |   |
| Assuming that the Site Requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation (as necessary).   |   |
| Archaeological mitigation may be required given the proximity of the site to known prehistoric activity in the immediate vicinity.   |   |
| Any grade 1 and 2 agricultural land must be preserved.   |   |
| <b>This land is good agricultural land. Building should be on brown field sites first!!!</b>   |   |
| We need to grow crops locally to reduce our carbon footprint. This field is used to grow crops including recently wheat 2020 and Rapeseed Oil 2021.  |   |
| Also it is planted with grass/crop during the winter to reduce water run off -loss of topsoil. - also a food source and habitat for local birds and mammals.   |   |
| I'm unaware that the site in the local and neighbourhood plan has not been earmarked for housing. It forms a natural green belt to Teignmouth and Bishopsteignton.   |   |
| I understand that housing is in need, even though it seems to mainly serve people moving to the area rather than local people. But this site is just not the right one. There are already large housing developments in Newton Abbot and Kingsteignton.  |   |
| Housing must be affordable and energy efficient with adequate green space.   |   |
| The absence of the social infrastructure in Teignmouth to support it.  |   |
| I am a 48-year-old teacher who has to live with my parents as nothing is 'affordable' to buy!<br>If 100 percent of the houses were affordable, they would all be bought by second homeowners.<br>I will still have no chance!!!  |   |

| Summary of comment  | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------------|
| Site has been subject of previous refusals.   |                        |
| Cycling and walking provision needs to be provided together with a regular bus service.   |                        |
| Very dangerous to walk and cycle around this area - Headway cross is a death trap.  |                        |
| The site is up a steep hill so is not accessible to anyone with walking or mobility issues.   |                        |
| The roads around this site are not in any way suitable for any development, and one of reasons the previous development didn't go ahead. Even though this could be smaller, the situation is still exactly the same. There is no proper access, and the roads are already busy enough.  |                        |
| The Shepards lane us too narrow already.  |                        |
| The roads surrounding this site are completely inadequate for any residential development and would need considerable work to make them usable for any development, which could not be possible as it would require land from private landowners and even eat into residents' gardens, something I would certainly not want to consider. The lanes around the site are far too busy during peak times - school times for instance - and considering how many cars each property has nowadays this problem would be made considerably worse. During busy times cars can be parked all the way up Headway Cross, and filling any available space on Headway Rise. Fourth Avenue can be difficult to navigate - and dangerous - with parked cars along most of the road all the time and even more during busy times. The roads up around the golf course are treated like a rat-run, with vehicles trying to squeeze past each other, and the junctions on to Exeter Road are dangerous at best. Mill Lane is just as bad, including the junction on to the main road. Coombe Vale and Deer Park Road have too much traffic as it is. |                        |
| Any highway alterations must be done with caution to avoid damage to habitats.  |                        |
| Only the bare minimum widening can be accepted where there is no other alternative.   |                        |
| More houses mean even more cars trying to get in and out of Mill Lane junction - often takes me 10 minutes to get out at Shaldon bridge/ Mill lane junction at rush hour. Fourth avenue is regularly blocked up. Buses can't get around and are often late.   |                        |
| Using two narrow back roads that already get gridlocked around the peak times. The added traffic on the roads that are in use know (single track road that are both narrow) would not be suitable for extra traffic. For the number of cars that people will need to get anyway as no public transport up in this area. The local bus only goes to moor view.   |                        |
| Cannot see how the area will be improved as suspect many second owners will buy.  |                        |
| This would not add to the economy, and there isn't enough employment in the town. You would have to travel elsewhere for work.  |                        |
| The town does not have a lot of employment opportunities, meaning anyone living in any proposed housing would need to travel, meaning more cars and more pollution.   |                        |
| Not too far from the centre of Teignmouth for cycling.  |                        |
| Our local services are under pressure already, there are no more spaces in our primary schools, and health services would not cope with further development.  |                        |
| Reasonably close to healthcare and schools.   |                        |
| When there is slack space in the infrastructure then build. You are trying to put the cart before the horse.  |                        |
| I have not seen a doctor in 15 years - can never get an emergency appointment when I need it so don't bother anymore. Even before the Covid pandemic there were no appointments available. More houses mean more strain on doctors' surgeries. Dentists are full. Hospitals at full capacity all the time. We cannot cope with any more people. Sewage is overflowing into the River Teign at times from Shaldon pumping station - more houses will make this worse.  |                        |
| Dr surgery's dentists already struggling with the number of patients they have already.   |                        |
| We only have three schools in Teignmouth with two being near this proposed field. They are already full with 30 children in each classroom.   |                        |
| I would like reassurance that Local GP surgeries and dentists have capacity to take further patients.   |                        |
| GP has excess capacity as of January 2022 and will likely be able to absorb users from potential sites. Situation may change if new residents register with GPs that have capacity issues. Unlikely that a developer contribution would be required for this area. However, due to other developments nearby that share the same GP footprint a primary care developer contribution will be required.   |                        |
| Yes, why not use for wind power as could still then keep the field as arable.   |                        |
| As much as I am not against new housing, this site is just suitable, it would add to the current pollution issues, and cause even more traffic problems. Please reconsider.   |                        |
| Previous development has been refused on this site, although this is smaller, the same issues as before are relevant to this. Even with a smaller site, what is to say that in years to come, more of the surrounding fields are taken up, in another 'small residential site'?   |                        |
| Solar panels should be mandatory on new builds to limit the amount of agricultural land/natural habitat required for solar energy panel fields.   |                        |
| My rear garden in Haytor Close backs directly onto Headway Cross Road. I often hear road rage and bad language from this section of the road because essentially this country lane was not designed to be used by heavy traffic. This would be made worse with additional residential and 'rat run' use. Furthermore, I highly object to any potential need to acquire land from my garden. I have mature trees and an abundance of wildlife in my garden which would be jeopardised.   |                        |

| Summary of comment   | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|------------------------|
| This is all very stressful! I have contributed to past Local development plans and the most recent one. We thought that our beautiful part of the world was already protected until 2040. And yet again it is all up in the air again. It is so stressful! It affects house prices and sales! These constant reviews our ruining our lives! Surely the previous statements and decisions and hours of research and work that us locals have always submitted still count! Nothing has changed?? Please help us protect our wonderful places. |                        |
| Site is more preferable to TE2 due to the reduced scale. Would go against current policy in maintaining a break between settlements (physically and visually). Site would require new access and current highways network is not suitable. Pedestrian routes are not suitable.   |                        |
| Site was included as part of TE2 allocation from previous LP. Site is suitable in all other regards and issues can be overcome. Would like to see the wider site included as opposed to the current smaller site.  |                        |

**Teignmouth: Land North of Higher Woodway Road**

Land north of Higher Woodway Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- Any building on this land will have a significant impact on the skyline as outlined in previous declined applications.
- Building any accommodation here would increase noise, air & light pollution, which would negatively affect the existing wildlife in this rural area.
- Wildlife corridors would become fragmented, affecting this cirl bunting breeding ground; resident bats and barn owls would be disturbed, as would dormice & other identified native species if their habitats were damaged & lost.
- As this area comprises of sloping fields, there is potential for soil loss & flooding with the removal of the existing fields, which currently protects the houses below. The fields act as a natural soakaway and carbon sink & have been left fairly fallow (with some grazing of sheep), encouraging plant and insect species to flourish. There are large oak trees and hawthorn/native tree species within the hedgerows, providing navigation for bats, nesting opportunities for local birds and shelter for migrating birds.
- We should therefore be encouraging more rewilding of this area & planting more trees, not covering it in concrete buildings if we are to achieve net zero emissions in Devon.
- Disturbance of habitats and animal foraging. Loss of wildlife corridors.
- This area has been the subject of a number of applications by landowners over the past 20 years or more.
- Each has been vigorously opposed and rejected by residents, Teignmouth Town Council and Teignbridge Council itself, plus the Planning Inspectorate in Bristol, in no uncertain terms on (amongst many others) the irreversible damage done by Skyline developments. Much has been made (quite rightly) of the importance of 'The Green Collar' that frames Teignmouth as seen from various points. Don't lose it and the wildlife that depend upon it.
- Would need to be low level development as otherwise would break the skyline.
- It is with great frustration that again local residents will have to battle over this site again. For years Teignbridge have thrown out plans for development of this site. It is home to so much nature Cirl Buntings included. My son and I have even seen an Otter believe it or not emerging from this site, taking an interest in the large ponds nearby. A family of Buzzards are also resident. This is part of Teignmouth's valuable green belt and wildlife corridor. I can't understand why this and other green field sites are being earmarked for development. Did Teignbridge not announce a climate crisis, but on the other hand want to rip up unsullied land. Once it is gone it is gone. The field above is in the Coastal protection zone we thought this was as well.
- Local Road widening as suggested under the Highways heading would result in the loss of ancient hedges which provide important nesting sites for a variety of birds.
- The site is within 500m of cirl bunting territories. Recommends site assessment as per cirl bunting planning guidance and appropriate compensatory habitat provision.
- Within the recreational disturbance IRZ for Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren (existing measures apply, subject to review).
- The rural character of Teignmouth will continue to be ruined.
- This is an area of archaeological potential; there are known prehistoric Romano-British activities in the wider landscape which has not been explored & more detailed information & searches would be needed to prevent the destruction of potentially important sites. Flint scatters and a funerary monument have already been found in nearby fields. The rural character of Teignmouth will be lost forever if further building along the Coastal Preservation area is permitted - resulting in an 'urban sprawl' of houses and roads, instead of the patchwork medieval fields visitors view from the incoming trains and roads, and residents currently enjoy, benefitting both our physical and mental wellbeing.
- Development must fit in with the topography of the area.
- Historic England notes from the HELAA that the site lies in an area of archaeological potential and that a programme of archaeological investigation and recording is required through a condition of consent. These archaeological matters are not mentioned in the draft Local Plan. Assuming that the Site Requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation (as necessary).
- Lies outside historic and proposed settlement limit. Site is not included within the proposed settlement limit. Site has been refused previously and appeal dismissed in 2014.
- It is a Grade 3 agricultural land. All previous applications have failed due to their unsuitability.
- This area is Grade 3 agricultural land - numerous previous planning applications have been refused in the past due to the unsuitability of the site.  
Ref: 13/02636/MAJ: 13/09/2013 - 40 dwellings  
Ref: 07/04522/MAJ: 24/10/2007 - residential development  
Ref: 17/00055/CERT 13/06/2018 - Appeal dismissed for caravan for human habitation.
- It states there is easily accessible public space nearby. Only space near there is Shaldon/Teignmouth cricket pitch and school fields. All about a mile away. I do not class a public footpath as public OPEN space. In lock down lack of open space in this area has been limited. Walks in the cemetery have provided accessible open space.
- This is good grazing land for sheep or paddocks for horses.
- Any grade 1 or 2 agricultural land must be preserved.
- It is on a slope. Totally impractical for children, elderly, disabled, no nearby amenities.
- As the site is on a slope and visible on the skyline, housing would be very limited and therefore would need to be of a higher cost to make it economically viable - this would therefore not include affordable housing. The site is at the top of the hill which means it is not suitable for elderly or disabled-adapted housing due to poor access.
- Grade 3 agricultural land, previous housing and caravan applications have been refused due to unsuitable land quality.
- The houses to be built will not benefit Teignmouth residents only newcomers. To make a difference really proper council houses need to be built to allow local people to live and work in their hometown rather than being priced out of the market by more affluent newcomers.
- Housing must be energy efficient, affordable and have plenty of green space.
- There's absolutely no point in building houses in Teignmouth because it's not solving the local council housing crisis, my landlord is selling up, I have no guarantors to rent another property locally, I'm classed as disabled due to health deterioration, my 9 yr old is autistic and is very lucky to have a place in local school, it took him being out of school 19 months for him to get that

12877720432  
12876893763  
12875610657  
12875211591  
12877658656  
12876558415  
12875606178  
12875207384  
12877552206  
12875620551  
12875601650  
12875204809  
12877542128  
12875616398  
12875593137  
12875203091  
12877476781  
12875613299  
12875216621  
12875200640

The comments include 15, submitted by email, in post, or in person.

place, I am on the housing list yet I am getting nowhere because each week the number of people bidding is at around 224 for each property, I have to stay in Teignmouth as my son may be out of school permanently if we have to move again, yet you want to build more houses for the likes of second home owners to purchase as holiday homes, when local people are in such need.

- Additional houses in this area would be inadvisable. The road infrastructure in the area is poor and barely sufficient for existing developments let alone any additional. Car owners in the surrounding roads need to park on the pavements as there is insufficient room for cars to park without causing problems for through traffic.
- Will homes be given adequate parking i.e. for more than one car and will there be adequate green spaces within the development for residents and wildlife.
- Support.
- There is one bus route serving this area - it's a walk up/down a steep hill on Higher Woodway Road to the stop. Families/Older people would therefore be more likely to use their own cars, increasing the traffic congestion and air pollution.
- Mention made of parking for bikes. I wonder how many people would fancy the ride anywhere from here... the topography is not suitable. Walk to and from bus stop would be difficult. Again because of topography.
- we already have too many houses for parking in this area.
- Cycling provision must be provided and if possible, a regular bus service.
- The position of the site means that access to and from the site will be mainly by car or similar.
- The comment that the "site lies within close proximity to a pavement and bus route into the town centre" is misleading. Whilst the nearest bus stop to the site is approximately 400 yards it is on a very steep hill. The four hundred yards uphill on a return journey from town discourages the use of public transport and results in the use of cars as a matter of course.
- Currently any commuting from Teignmouth is mostly by car due to poor or irregular public transport. All major access roads into/out of Teignmouth have in recent years become extremely busy such as Bitton Park.
- Narrow lanes, increased traffic flow on unsuitable roads.
- There is insufficient road access in this area. The narrow lanes around cannot cope with the existing traffic now. Increased housing on this land would lead to higher traffic emissions, which goes against the Local Plan to reduce the climate emergency.
- Walking on Higher Woodway Road is already dangerous with insufficient width to allow cars to pass & many blind spots, which puts pedestrians in greater danger due to poor visibility of oncoming traffic.
- The road is also used by farmers, so tractors & farm machinery are often present in the area, causing traffic congestion.
- Many roads in Teignmouth seem nowadays to be more inclined to parking use rather than the means of getting from A to B. Indeed, there have been some vehicles adjacent to Teignmouth cemetery that have not moved for some years.
- The town cannot and should not develop any further until the necessary infrastructure is bettered.
- The road infrastructure is not suitable for increased traffic. Access roads would not be wide enough. New Road is already a busy rat run with dangerous access from feeder roads.
- The site bounds the top of Higher Woodway road which reverts to a steep single-track lane. This lane would have been an early salt road linking to markets at Exminster and Exmouth. From the number of species found in the hedgerows it is clear they are hundreds of years old. More traffic on this lane would destroy it.
- The minimum amount of highway alteration should be adhered to in order to preserve habitats and the character of the area.
- If access is via the private road off Higher Holcombe Road this would result in a huge increase in the volume of traffic compared to current usage entering and leaving Higher Holcombe Road through an access with extremely poor visibility on a blind corner. This access route is clearly not suitable for any further increase in traffic.  
If access is via Higher Woodway Road, the inadequate width of the access road connecting the site to Higher Woodway Road will cause traffic congestion. The nature of this access road and the poor visibility means this is also unsuitable for any additional traffic.  
Any increase in traffic leaving Higher Woodway Road and entering onto New road would result in additional dangers for all road users due to inadequate visibility from and of emerging traffic.
- There is no mention of the impact of the increase in the number of cars in the area that the use of this site would have. At an average of 1.5 cars per household the increase would amount to between 36 and 54 cars using Higher Woodway Road which is already overused. The current usage is a constant cause of potholes which will only worsen with more traffic. Local roads are already overcrowded resulting in Teignmouth becoming frequently gridlocked.
- There is minimal employment. It will only serve as a commuter hub!!
- There is little employment in this area, mostly down in the town centre, which people would probably need to access via cars or would just use this housing site to commute to Exeter, which would not benefit the local businesses.
- Reasonably close to Dawlish and Teignmouth (Approx halfway).
- There is no realistic infrastructure. All roads and pavements are too narrow to sustain more traffic.
- All services are down in the town (a 30-minute walk down/up a steep hill) with many parts without pavements, which is therefore unsuitable for elderly/disabled/mothers with prams & toddlers, etc.
- Improve this before future enlargements. Teignmouth is just 2 roads that intersect at the foot of Exeter Rd. The traffic jams are already manifest, even in winter. In summer months they go up the Dawlish Road. Teignmouth cannot expand much being hemmed in by the sea and the estuary. There is nowhere to go. Government officials are aware of this - I hope.
- Our health centres are struggling as it is. Dentists too. Cannot comment on capacity of school. Where would childcare facilities be?

- The statement that "the site lies close to a public open space" is not understood as the document does not state where that space is. There is a public right of way but no public open space. Whilst the document states that the site is close to an existing primary school it is not close enough to discourage parents from driving their children to school which will cause even more mayhem outside Haseldown School and along Maudlin Drive.  
The statement under "Likely Requirements" for "Open space and Children's Play area" is a false aspiration as it is mentioned in most planning applications but rarely manifests itself in the final plan such as that in Holcombe.
- GP has excess capacity as of January 2022 and will likely be able to absorb users from potential sites. Situation may change if new residents register with GPs that have capacity issues. Unlikely that a developer contribution would be required for this area. However, due to other developments nearby that share the same GP footprint a primary care developer contribution will be required.
- As usual, councils see the need to 'tick boxes' to please their quotas and funding without looking at the bigger picture of redeveloping existing brown sites which are becoming more and more due to the change in shopping and working habits.
- Priority should be for only brownfield sites to be developed in the Teignmouth area - this greenfield site lies within designated countryside with existing public footpaths that the local community and visitors can enjoy. There are many existing buildings/plots that need redeveloping and new buildings required to regenerate the tired and run-down, town centre, as they are unsightly and let the town down. Providing housing in & near the town centre ensures the local businesses are well used. Services like doctors, pharmacy, bank, etc, are also within walking distance to reduce the reliance on cars as there is already a significant traffic congestion problem in and around Teignmouth.
- If it were to go ahead, access for construction site vehicles would be an issue.
- Continuing to over develop Teignmouth will lead to the destruction of its charm and uniqueness. We don't want Teignmouth to end up a huge sprawling conurbation like Torquay and Paignton.
- I cannot understand as this land has had two applications for planning both gone to appeal and failed due to skyline and outside green belt what is different now.
- Solar panels should be mandatory on new builds to limit the amount of agricultural land/natural habitat required for solar energy panel fields.
- The sloping nature of the site makes it unsuitable for any development and could provide an additional flood risk due to urbanisation and lack of drainage.  
There is also believed to be a covenant in place which restricts the use of the land to the west of the site to agricultural use only.
- In the past 20 years there have been several applications to build on this land, all of which have been rejected, despite appeals being made by the applicants.
- The rejections have been based on sound judgement taking into account all the factors relating to the site in question. None of the reasons for rejecting the applications have changed. The current decision to include the site in this review is, I assume, a result of Government pressure on Councils to build more houses willy-nilly, despite there being good reasons not to build in certain well-defined areas such as this one. Building on this site after so many rejections would indicate that the Planning Department and the Council have either got it all wrong in the past or are just bowing to Government pressure.
- All houses will not be for local people Teignmouth people rentals are ridiculous in price and landlords feel they have the upper hand with tenants due to not many if any properties out there and these people can't get on the property ladder either due to not being able to save due to extremely high rent prices.
- Planning is limited on the site until 2033 due to 2 previous refusals and court decisions.



**Teignmouth: Land to the East and West of Holcombe Road**

Land east and west of Holcombe Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- The building on this land will negatively impact the existing local residents and the wider community, destroying valuable natural habitats for wildlife. This will increase air, noise and light pollution.
- Currently well-farmed grazing fields, with hedges on all boundaries which are well maintained. Consequently, any ecology is likely to be limited to the hedgerows. The fields are gently sloping to the south. There will be some visual impact in the immediate surrounding area but the development will be screened by existing housing to the South of the site and will not be visible from the A379. The site could be developed with minimal impact on the surrounding hedgerows other than the need to remove a limited section of the hedge to create access points. Hedgerow removal would potentially be offset within the site.
- Any impact on local habitats must be approached with extreme caution to avoid damage
- An immediate and negative impact on the current agricultural use, being that of open fields and wild hedgerows. Loss of wildlife and the potential to open up further land for the same use.
- We are astonished and dismayed that this site has been put forward for possible housing development.  
Our reasons are as follows:
  1. Development of land classified as "Undeveloped Coast" under policy S17 of existing structure plan. The fields are part of greatly valued landscape. This is a key factor in making the area attractive to visitors and residents alike. Loss of this land to housing would greatly detract from this.
  2. Housing on this land would effectively be skyline development from most of the population of Holcombe and for people travelling along the A379.
  3. Development of these fields would destroy the strategic break between the settlements of Teignmouth and Holcombe. Such strategic breaks are of great importance in preserving the nature of settlements and preserving the countryside and is contrary to policy EN1 of the current structure plan.
- RSPB - Result in loss of curlew territories. Site falls wholly within a curlew breeding territory. Development will reduce the habitat available to curlews immediately to the south of Holcombe such that it is unlikely birds may be retained. Recommends site assessment as per curlew planning guidance.
- NE - Within 500m IRZ of South West Coast National Trail (Residential trigger = 5 or more new residential buildings outside existing built-up area of town/village).
- Within the recreational disturbance IRZ for Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren (existing measures apply, subject to review).  
ALC Grade 3a.
  - Detracts from the concept of Holcombe as 'settlement' and obviously detracts from rural views for existing houses in the area.
  - The rural look of Teignmouth will be lost as more countryside is lost to large housing developments like this proposal.
  - The DCC Historic Environment Team (HET) were consulted, and their comments are as follows: The HET have no comments to make on these sites.
  - Development must fit in with the topography of the area.
  - Iron age settlement and patchwork of medieval fields and hedgerows.
  - The closing of the green boundary between Teignmouth and Holcombe is in contravention of policy S17.
  - It is noted that the farm in Holcombe is recorded in the Domesday Book in 1086.
  - A mix of housing is needed or there will be a dormitory of wealthy elderly people with no services and no carers.
  - Keep it original and traditional. In keeping with the historical and beautiful buildings in Devon as covered above.
  - We should be preserving our heritage, not destroying it. Farmers are even more important now that we are not in the EU. Devon County Council farms are invaluable for the progression of introducing new blood to farming, especially as the cost of land is so expensive.
  - Historic England notes the Heritage and Archaeology comments in the HELAA. However, there are grade II listed buildings located to the south (Minadab) and north (Lower Holcombe Farmhouse) of the proposed allocation site as well as the Holcombe Conservation Area to the north. We note in particular from the adopted Holcombe Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2013) that the remaining open fields to the south and southwest of the Conservation Area provide a valuable green setting to the Conservation Area given the loss of agrarian setting to the north, east and west (p7).
  - Given this, Historic England considers that a heritage impact assessment (HIA) should be undertaken to understand the impacts of the proposed allocation on the settings and significance of these listed buildings and the Holcombe Conservation Area.
  - The HIA should make recommendations for ways in which negative impacts on the significance of affected heritage assets can be avoided, minimised and/or mitigated and opportunities for enhancements maximised.  
In our view, the HIA should then be used to inform the preparation of a masterplan for the site and to better understand its suitability and capacity for development  
Assuming the outcome of the HIA supports the site's allocation and that the Site Requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site specific allocation policy, we consider that these should include the need to conserve and enhance the significance and setting of affected listed buildings and the Holcombe Hill Conservation Area, as well as any design or other mitigation measures as may be identified in the HIA, e.g. retention of existing vegetation, landscaping, and design to reflect local vernacular.
- For further information and advice, please see The Historic Environment in Local Plans Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 1 (2015), The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (2015), and Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017).
- Without an up-to-date and proportionate historic environment evidence base for this proposed allocation and a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, we remain concerned about the soundness of the emerging Local Plan in light of paragraphs 31,189, 190 and 192 of the NPPF 2021. In its current form, Historic England objects to the inclusion of this proposed allocation.
- This is currently a beautiful area of countryside enjoyed by all in the local community.

12877720432  
12876558415  
12875601650  
12877658656  
12875620551  
12875593137  
12877552206  
12875616398  
12875216621  
12877542128  
12875613299  
12875211591  
12877476781  
12875610657  
12875207384  
12876893763  
12875606178  
12875204809

The comments below include 36, submitted by email, in post, or in person.

- As the land has historically only been in agricultural use, currently the fields are pasture/ grassland used by the Devon County Council farm tenant on a short-term basis.
- Any grade 1 and 2 agricultural land must be fully protected.
- The area identified is open farmland rather than an infill opportunity and as such there is both the loss of agricultural land and new housing on land that has no suitable access to facilities.
- If the fields are for housing, then the current crops being grown will disappear along with various birds and animals. Also, very ancient hedgerows will be destroyed to enable vehicular access to the fields in question.
- The land by Hall Lane should be returned to nature - as an amenity to locals as well.
- Land use on small sites would be more beneficial as allotments, trees, or wildlife havens, which is far greener.
- The land is grazed by predominantly sheep currently. Wildlife is in abundance and buzzard's circle. Cirl bunting are evidently in these fields as are many other species of birds and migratory bats it is a privilege to have these green field sites on Teignmouth's doorstep. The fields act also as a sponge for Teignmouth town in order to prevent possible future flooding when climatic change brings potentially increased heavy rainfall.
- The landowner is amenable to residential development including affordable, custom/ self-build, and, if commercially viable, homes for rent.
- All housing should be affordable, energy efficient and fit in with the topography of the area with plenty of green space.
- New estate in Holcombe village already.
- Holcombe has already been subject to increased housing (35) and the resulting increased traffic. It is noticeable how often the roads are blocked already by vans and lorries and how much traffic has increased in small country lanes with no pavements.
- Affordable homes are sorely needed in this area.  
Self-build/eco / low-cost innovative housing is needed.
- There should be the opportunity for shared ownership for local families and not encouraged for single occupancy, or social housing. The social housing you already have in place should be re shuffled, so that homes that no longer have growing families in, be swapped for smaller properties and so forth. Reduce, reduce, recycle! No more ex local housing to be bought by tenants, but left as social housing, so there is no need for more to be built.
- If a development is inevitable, then I suggest the houses should be ring fenced for local residents only. Second home ownership should not be allowed.
- Being out of town, any new residents in the proposed area will probably have to use cars, increasing the traffic problems, parking issues, air & noise pollution.
- There are multiple, frequent bus services along Teignmouth Road, on the edge of the proposed site, with regular services to Newton Abbot, Torbay and Exeter. Regular train services are available from Dawlish 1.4 miles away and Teignmouth station 1.9 miles away. The site is well served by local footways and cycleways both into the surrounding urban and rural areas. The County Council could provide a footpath link from the eastern site to Teignmouth Road through land within its ownership.
- Adequate cycling and walking provision should be provided together with a bus service to connect with the neighbouring towns of Dawlish and Teignmouth.
- The bus frequency is once every 80 minutes then 40 minutes alternatively up to 6pm per daytime. The walk to bus stop is 5/10 minutes, on a steep gradient. If you were to walk into town it is 30 minutes (Downhill). Return journey, to walk, is up a steep hill and would be unsuitable for the elderly, disabled or people carrying shopping. A private vehicle will most likely be required based on the location and leading to increased traffic and parking.
- Busy Teignmouth Rd, few busses no cycle path or room for one. Long way to train station.
- There is a bus service, but most people will use cars. Uncertain as to where people will find employment if unable to work from home, and if travelling to Exeter, the road up to the A380 is already dangerous due to sharp bends and often subject to traffic jams on Higher Holcombe Rd. due to single track road.
- Good links locally - the cycle route is supposed to be extended to join up Newton Abbot to the Exe system.
- I use the road between these two proposed developments to walk a dog. If the sites were to be approved, it would make the walk to Mules Park from Holcombe much more dangerous.
- The access from the fields to local travel providers is poor. Residents will automatically get in their cars and join the queue!
- Teignmouth is already suffering with traffic congestion, especially in this area. This development would increase existing problems and increase emissions, going against the aim to reduce Carbon emissions.
- The site runs parallel to the A379. The Holcombe Road junction is a well-constructed junction which allows two-way traffic flow and has a good visibility splay along the A379 in both directions. We would propose that access is achieved via Holcombe Road and in order to improve the access the road is widened for the first 150 metres to include a footway on the existing Highway Maintained at Public Expense land, by using the verges outside of the houses on the western side of the road. Where Holcombe Road reaches the site to the west of Holcombe Road, we would propose the estate road access is created at the earliest feasible point. We would propose that the estate road then loops back into the Holcombe Road some 150 metres later, providing access to the eastern field.
- Minimum highway alterations must be adhered to for the safeguarding of wildlife habitats.
- No alterations should be made unless absolutely necessary and then to the minimal extent.
- Highways have already refused, the same developers, (Skyline Park) on the grounds of poor access and visibility. Increase traffic would provide increased risk to resident and pedestrians.
- Holcombe Road as approached from Teignmouth has no pedestrian path or room to create one and the subject sites are at a pinch point in the road where it narrows to a single track. The road that continues to Holcombe is single track, undulating and with few areas for cars to pass or to create any pedestrian/cycle path. Visibility on such a narrow road is poor for access and increasing traffic will only compound the issue.

- There is little employment in the area, mainly linked to tourism so new residents would probably have to drive to work outside of Teignmouth, again adding to the current traffic congestion problems.
- Both Teignmouth and Dawlish provide local employment opportunities within 2 miles of the site, and Newton Abbot, 8 miles away. The Exeter area, some 15 miles to the north of the site, provides substantial employment opportunities as the major centre within Devon. Newton Abbot is 12 minutes away from Dawlish Station by train, and Exeter under 20 minutes.
- Both Dawlish and Teignmouth provide a range of facilities and retail sites.
- Adequate distance to Dawlish and Teignmouth for work and shopping by cycle and bus.
- **Aside from construction employment what is likelihood of local employment or economic support for either Dawlish or Teignmouth, aside greater use of the supermarkets?**
- **Nothing close by, no shops etc**
- **Easy access to local towns and city.**
- **Lower/realistic business rates to encourage and help local shops to thrive.**
- **Employment will be short lived, lasting the duration of the construction of the homes only.**
- The area is served by local primary schools and a secondary school in both Dawlish and Teignmouth. Bus services on Teignmouth Road include a direct bus South Devon College. The area has a wealth of sporting facilities including leisure centres, swimming pools, and local beaches. Both towns have a range of retail outlets, supermarkets, pubs, restaurants and cafes. There are multiple places of worship in both Dawlish and Teignmouth. There are a range of doctors' surgeries and dentists in both Dawlish and Teignmouth. There are nearby hospitals in Dawlish, Torquay, and Exmouth.
- Not too far from the healthcare and educational outlets in the neighbouring towns.
- No local facilities with greater reliance on private car use. All facilities/education venues beyond a reasonable walking distance.
- **More doctors needed - Teignmouth and Dawlish are at breaking point - dentists too.**
- **Each development adds to an already pressurised healthcare system which is currently hardly able to cope.**
- **Teignmouth and Dawlish are already overwhelmed by the excessive requirements from the existing population. Services will be watered down yet again.**
- **NHS - GP has excess capacity as of January 2022 and will likely be able to absorb users from potential sites. Situation may change if new residents register with GPs that have capacity issues. 3. Unlikely that a developer contribution would be required for this area. However, due to other developments nearby that share the same GP footprint a primary care developer contribution will be required.**
- Brownfield sites should only be developed in and around Teignmouth. The surrounding and existing greenfield areas should be left to encourage more wildlife, provide spaces for residents to relax and enjoy this part of Devon. The look of Teignmouth will be destroyed by these new builds. The whole town needs to be regenerated with affordable housing on brownfield sites & older properties to bring life back into the town centre.
- Building on this site would negatively impact on wildlife and ecology, increase congestion on roads, put further strain on local infrastructure, further reduce the gap between Holcombe and Teignmouth. Please don't develop this site.
- The site is not affected by conservation areas, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, SSSIs or Listed Buildings. The current TDC proposed site on the western side of Holcombe Road does not appear to follow an obvious boundary demarcation and we would ask whether the existing field boundaries would provide a clearer demarcation.
- **Solar panels should be mandatory on new builds to limit the amount of agricultural land/natural habitat required for solar energy panel fields.**
- **Increase climate change and flooding has not been referenced. Building additional concrete/tarmac footprint on agricultural land on a steep gradient has not been accounted for. I have witnessed first-hand excess water-run off and flooding on Higher Woodway Road and New Road.**
- **This site has been deemed unsuitable before and is even less suitable now.**
- **All this additional housing destroys the very reason why people want to live in a village in the first place and destroys the character of the village.**
- **With the impact of global warming why is the council ever considering yet another development that will have a devastating impact on the existing properties, especially the poor access via Holcombe Road creating even more queuing traffic in Teignmouth.**
- **Highways concerns regarding access to the site and concern around potential increase in traffic.**
- **Site is on a prominent ridge (landscape impact). Encourage a separation between Teignmouth Road and Holcombe should be retained (natural break).**
- **Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land.**
- **Concern on potential impact on railway line (drainage and runoff) which may cause further destabilisation.**

## Chapter 6: Rural Towns

### Ashburton: Dolbeare Road

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|--|---|
| Outside DNP and can be well screened with trees. Include tree planting. Not an important site for wildlife as next to A38.   | Dolbeare Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published. | 12877720432   |
| Negative impact on landscape. Not appropriate next to DNP.   |  | 12876893763   |
| Conservation area 1km from site. Sensitive Parish church and St Lawrence chapel.   |  | 12861974837   |
| Some distance from listed buildings which are in town centre.  |  | 12848742221   |
| No brownfield sites available. Minimal impact as alongside A38.  |  | 12743978382   |
| Site mainly used for horses.   |  | 12877658656   |
| Well located for access to Ashburton shops, schools, etc.  |  | 12875601650   |
| Not suitable for social housing as too far out of town.  |  | 12860157559   |
| Affordable housing to rent and buy for local people, not luxury executive homes. No family homes under £350k.  |  | 12847575201   |
| 2015 Housing Needs Assessment requirement for 33 affordable homes. 39 new affordable home are under construction in Ashburton at Longstone Cross.  |  | 12742289233   |
| Concern over residential space standards.  |  | 12877552206   |
| Provide affordable housing with green public space. Access into the countryside.   |  | 12875593137   |
| A38 noise will need barriers. A38 cuts off town. Prevailing wind will increase noise and pollution on homes.   |  | 12859137494   |
| Would require improved medical facilities. Access safe by foot/cycle is important.   |  | 12824608715   |
| Site is close to town with good bus links to Newton Abbot and Exeter/Plymouth. However, all bus stops are on the opposite side of the A38 in Ashburton.  |  | 12877852501   |
| Support need for walking routes. Benefit to existing dwellings by creating safer walking route into town. Support need for cycle links as close enough to town centre. Need a green bridge.  |  | 12877542128   |
| Site is 1.8km (20 mins walk) from the town centre. There are no safe, dedicated, level routes to the town centre and the likelihood is that most people would therefore use their car to access basic services. In particular the potential shortcut down the slip road to south carriageway of A38 and across the dual carriageway to the footpath on the NW side runs the risk of pedestrian fatality (considering especially the location of primary school). |  | 12875165103   |
| Provide some small workshops to support growing small craft enterprises. Support need for some industrial units.   |  | 12856177148   |
| Strong town centre with good local internet speeds to allow home working. More homes will support town centre.   |  | 12776093708   |
| Not sufficient employment for people already living here.  |  | 12877846347   |
| <b>Need a convenience store.</b>   | 12877476781  |   |
| New homes will add pressure on existing services.  | 12862380263  |   |
| Support subject to increased school capacity. Dartmoor Local Plan identifies primary school capacity is a problem.   | 12849724385  |   |
| Need for more car parking in the town.   | 12754761728  |   |
| Secondary school needs more children.  | 12877835154  |   |
| Regarding the Consultation on The Draft Local Plan (Part 2) 2020-2040: Creating Quality Places-Site Options  |  | The comments include 16, submitted by email, in post, or in person. |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|------------------|------------------------|
| <p>I am concerned that the planned development sites in Bovey Tracey outlined in the draft plan above do not take into account sufficiently the need for additional infrastructure capacity. The sites identified could provide for 400 homes affecting in particular the provision of a primary school and the provision of health facilities. I wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>Devon County Council recognises that Bovey Tracey Primary school is at capacity and has been for some years. In the Local Plan it is proposed that a replacement 420 place primary school be built on a 1.8ha site on Le Molay Littry Way which has been earmarked for this purpose (BT4). Yet the Teignbridge IDP (2016) identifies 2025 – 2029 as the period during which a new school is likely to be built. The replacement school is categorised as “important” rather than “critical” on the IDP because there is an “alternative option for meeting the school place pressures associated with development growth in Bovey Tracey”. In my view, these alternative options (co-location; expansion on existing site; sending kids to Heathfield) are nowhere near adequate to meet primary school provision in the town. There must be a commitment within this Local Plan review for building a replacement school before these sites are developed, not as scheduled for 2025-2029. The Plan indicates you will use CIL money towards the school, but admits it is not enough and it is up to DCC to make up the shortfall.</p> <p>The availability of primary school places is of critical importance to the families who will come and live in the new sites identified. Young families will not choose to move here if no school places are available. New residents on these developments are therefore likely to be in an older age group, so the average age of Bovey residents is likely to keep rising. This in turn will affect primary health provision in the town. There should be provision in this Plan for assessing the need for more health infrastructure with an influx of new residents, both in terms of the greater numbers and also if they are older how to address more complex health needs.</p> |                  |                        |
| <p>Contrary to Dartmoor Local Plan. Significant increase in size of town. Not a suitable location as next to DNP and could result in increased recreational pressure within the NP.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>Concern over impact of any retail / commercial space on town centre.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>Ban second homes.</p>   |                  |                        |
| <p>All homes should have solar panels.</p>   |                  |                        |
| <p>Need for cemetery space.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>Plot sizes should be larger.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>Glendinning Ltd: Regarding the site being within the Mineral Safeguarding Area: the underlying geology is limestone, which is quarried here at Linhay Hill Quarry. However, at Dolbeare the limestone is already sterilised by the narrowness of the deposit.</p>   |                  |                        |
| <p>Dartmoor National Park Authority objects to development in this location. The site is distant from the town centre and functionally divorced from Ashburton by the dual carriageway. Development in this location would be reliant upon private car use to access town centre amenities. Significant infrastructure improvements needed to encourage walking and cycling. The scale of the development option would require additional education infrastructure. Development in this location requires detailed assessment of any impact upon the South Hams SAC, the landscape setting of the National Park, and the recreational impact of a potentially significant population increase in one of Dartmoor’s gateway towns.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>Site contains medieval field systems and possible gallows site. Requires assessment.</p>  |                  |                        |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------|------------------------|
| EA - There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and stricter surface water drainage standards will also be required within the CDA to restrict runoff rates. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The development of this site may also result in enhancement of floodplain and watercourses. |                  |                        |
| DLP2:E:007 owns part of site and wishes that their land is removed.   |                  |                        |

#### Bovey Tracey: Bovey Tracey Golf Centre

| Summary of comment  | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID  |
|---|---|---|
| Natural England – All of the site options for Bovey Tracey are located within the setting of the Dartmoor National Park (which is recognised in the site description notes). The allocation should be supported by an assessment of landscape evidence to demonstrate whether development of this site can protect and enhance the character and natural beauty of the Protected Landscape.   | Bovey Tracey Golf Course is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published. | 12876558415<br>12863868350<br>12793337761<br>12756229103<br>12877822941<br>12875613299  |
| Woodland Trust - We ask that careful consideration is given to the inclusion of the site dependent on the results of ecological surveys. All available measures should be taken to retain the existing broad-leafed woodland on the site, and where possible to enhance the biodiversity of the conifer plantation through the gradual conversion of this woodland to broad leaf species. We commend the planned retention of existing boundary hedges and trees.   |   | 12856180778<br>12791871089<br>12754851850<br>12877820734<br>12875216621   |
| RSPB - The RSPB notes that several proposed allocations will require assessment of the likely impacts on greater horseshoe bats and the South Hams SAC as any development will need to avoid adverse impact on foraging and commuting habitat, including from light spill.<br><br>While the RSPB has not recorded cirl buntings at any of the proposed allocations, as the last survey was in 2016 and that recorded several increases in range, with birds recorded at some new sites. We therefore recommend assessment of habitats on site for their suitability to support cirl buntings then consultation with RSPB for our recommendation for any specific cirl bunting survey. |   | 12850899200<br>12790176185<br>12754775829<br>12877822121<br>12875194107<br>12850090517<br>12778502291<br>12752596284<br>12877784766 |
| Concern that the site is too close to the National Park and would ruin the entrance to the Wray Valley.   |   | 12875176252<br>12846328749  |
| Concern over the impact on wildlife and ecology.  |   | 12765632557   |
| Why are Teignbridge building on green space when there is a climate emergency?  |   | 12750562676   |
| Green fields and recreation grounds are needed  |   | 12877800245   |
| Your report highlights multiple environmental and ecological reasons why the site is unsuitable for development I don't understand why this site is being considered .  |   | 12871141307<br>12841952128  |
| Historic England<br>Given the proximity of several listed buildings to the south of site, Historic England considers that a heritage impact assessment (HIA) should be undertaken to understand the impacts of the proposed allocation on their significance and settings.<br><br>The HIA should make recommendations for ways in which negative impacts on the significance of affected heritage assets can be avoided, minimised and/or mitigated and opportunities for enhancements maximised.   |   | 12762994373<br>12744319484<br>12877801090<br>12870595464<br>12834482843<br>12759687519<br>12877819328<br>12877808504<br>12870341079 |



| Summary of comment   | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|------------------|---|
| <p>In our view, the HIA should then be used to inform the preparation of a masterplan for the site and to better understand its suitability and capacity for development.</p> <p>Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that these should include the need to conserve and enhance the significance and settings of nearby listed building and any design or other mitigation measures as may be identified in the HIA. We also consider that the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation should be included given the recommendations of heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA. However, we welcome the inclusion of other site requirements concerning the retention of existing vegetation, landscaping, and design to reflect local vernacular and conserve the setting of Bovey Tracey.</p> <p>For further information and advice, please see The Historic Environment in Local Plans Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 1 (2015), The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (2015), and Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets(2017).</p> <p>Without an up-to-date and proportionate historic environment evidence base for this proposed allocation and a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, we remain concerned about the soundness of the emerging Local Plan in light of paragraphs 31,189, 190and 192of the NPPF2021. In its current form, Historic England objects to the inclusion of this proposed allocation.</p> |                  | <p>12793340890<br/>12759388698<br/>12877846878<br/>12877782262</p> <p>The comments include 20, submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |
| <p>Southbrook Hamlet would become surrounded by this development. Historic listed buildings would lose their rural positioning.</p>  |                  |   |
| <p>There are already various new estates around Bovey and planning further estates will dilute the historic appearance and countryside tone of Bovey further.</p>  |                  |   |
| <p>Concern over the potential impact on the character and setting of adjacent and nearby listed buildings.</p>   |                  |   |
| <p>Would prefer to see brownfield sites used above any greenfield sites.</p>   |                  |   |
| <p>The site is a golf course. the NPPF says that for open space, sport &amp; recreation land &amp; buildings (including playing fields) paragraph 99: Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use. It will need to be protected or replaced.</p>  |                  |   |
| <p>More social and affordable and stop building little boxes with no outdoor space.</p>  |                  |   |
| <p>I think this location would create an isolated housing estate cut off from the community. There is no safe access to Bovey via either very fast A road or Moretonhampstead Road which is very busy, goes from double to single lane without sidewalk and has to accommodate on road parking for the existing residents.</p>   |                  |   |
| <p>Consideration should also be given to turning the present school site into semi-sheltered housing for older people, as there is almost no provision for this group at present. Has there been any consideration of building a retirement village in the vein of McCarthy and Stone style settlements?</p>   |                  |   |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|------------------|------------------------|
| Concern that the site lies outside the settlement limit.   |                  |                        |
| Concern over the increase in traffic resulting from new development  |                  |                        |
| Residents of the new builds will need at least one car per household to access any amenities including the school, nursery and secondary school. The town cannot support 200-300 new homes with narrow roads, fixed school and nursery spaces and very limited parking that is already exhausted by those with on road parking and those needing easy access to shops (who frequently park of double yellows as the shops aren't disability friendly) and those parking illegally in order to safely collect their children. |                  |                        |
| Need for improved public transport.  |                  |                        |
| The site is isolated and is not walking distance from the town and the rest of the community.  |                  |                        |
| Good IT and fast internet connections are needed.  |                  |                        |
| Don't put industrial spaces near housing.  |                  |                        |
| NHS Comment - GP has capacity problem as of January 2022. To mitigate a primary care developer contribution will be required.  |                  |                        |
| Lack of facilities in the town which are already over stretched eg school.   |                  |                        |
| Bovey really needs a small hospital, which it once had and a bigger health centre. The school is creaking at the seams and proposals place a new one in the flood zone.  |                  |                        |
| EA - Sequential Test required. It is likely that only a part of the site will be suitable for residential development (if the requirements can be met). There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and a contribution may be required to address this. The development of this site may result in enhancement of floodplain and watercourses.  |                  |                        |
| The site in its current use directly employs a number of people in running the golf course, in the cafe and maintaining the grounds. As a golf centre which welcomes visitors, it attracts tourists, including families, therefore providing indirect support for tourism generally in the area and thereby supporting local employment.   |                  |                        |

#### Bovey Tracey: Bradley Bends

| Summary of comment  | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID  |
|---|---|---|
| Natural England – All of the site options for Bovey Tracey are located within the setting of the Dartmoor National Park (which is recognised in the site description notes). The allocation should be supported by an assessment of landscape evidence to demonstrate whether development of this site can protect and enhance the character and natural beauty of the Protected Landscape. The Bradley Bends site is within the 500m IRZ for the Chudleigh Knighton Heath SSSI. The Old Hospital site is also within the South Hams SAC Landscape Connectivity Zone. | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EN10-EN16 and RT2: Bradley Bends, which contains the following criterion: Design and layout solutions to conserve or enhance the landscape setting of the Dartmoor National Park, informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. | 12870736773<br>12841914852<br>12870560944<br>12806940355<br>12867617435<br>12755098092<br>12863953262 |
| Woodland Trust – We request that careful consideration is given to the inclusion of this site, and it should not be included if sites with fewer ecological features can be found elsewhere. Retention of existing boundary hedges and trees is commended. We would urge that a preliminary ecological appraisal of the site is carried out before any decisions as to whether this site is allocated for development are made.   | This has been considered and the policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EN16 and RT2.  | 12877739254<br>12850440089<br>12877811077   |
| RSPB - The RSPB notes that several proposed allocations will require assessment of the likely impacts on greater horseshoe bats and the South Hams SAC as any development will need to avoid adverse impact on foraging and commuting habitat, including from light spill.  | This has been considered and is required in accordance with Policies EN10-EN13.   | The comments include 17, submitted by email, in post, or in person.                                   |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|--|------------------------|
| While the RSPB has not recorded cirl buntings at any of the proposed allocations, as the last survey was in 2016 and that recorded several increases in range, with birds recorded at some new sites. We therefore recommend assessment of habitats on site for their suitability to support cirl buntings then consultation with RSPB for our recommendation for any specific cirl bunting survey.  |  |                        |
| Concerns about how this proposed extension will affect a high level of biodiversity in the area.   | This has been considered and is reflected in Policy EN10-EN13.   |                        |
| All residents of this estate have a covenant written into their title "Not to obstruct or interfere with the Bat Corridor nor to damage remove or otherwise interfere with any part of the Bat Corridor but at all times abide by the requirements of any regulation affecting the use and enjoyment of the Bat Corridor. Means of access to the proposed site will need to be reviewed.   | This has been considered and will be required in accordance with Policies EN11 and EN12.   |                        |
| This site lies directly opposite Little Bradley Ponds Devon Wildlife Trust Reserve, which has already suffered much additional human (and canine) disturbance since the recent development immediately to the west. The inevitable additional disturbance would be intolerable for such a small, sensitive site.   | This has been considered and is reflected in Policy EN10-EN12.   |                        |
| <p>Historic England notes from the heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA and draft Local Plan that the site has archaeological potential.</p> <p>Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation (if necessary). However, we welcome the inclusion of other site requirements concerning the retention of existing vegetation, landscaping, and design to reflect local vernacular and conserve the setting of Bovey Tracey.</p> <p>For further information and advice, please see The Historic Environment in Local Plans Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 1 (2015), The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (2015), and Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017).</p> <p>Without the use of such site-specific policy criteria for this proposed allocation as part of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, we remain concerned about the soundness of the emerging Local Plan in light of paragraphs 31,189, 190 and 192 of the NPPF 2021. In its current form, Historic England objects to the inclusion of this proposed allocation.</p> | <p>This has been considered and is reflected in Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EN1, which ensures that development does not result in the loss of important natural features and conserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets and their settings, including historic landscapes, that individually or collectively contribute to local identity.</li> <li>• RT2: This requires that that the site layout must be informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, development will be subject to the provisions of Policy EN17: Heritage Assets, which sets out the approach to avoiding harmful impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their settings in line with the NPPF. This policy would relate to any development affecting a heritage asset or its setting, including all allocated development sites.</p> |                        |
| Bovey is a historic town described as the Gateway to the Moor. The town is being encompassed on all sides by housing and its healthy vistas eroded. The town is trying to develop itself as a good place for cultural and environmental sensitivity but yet more housing is ruining its historic feeling of a close community with rural historic links.   | <p>This has been considered and is reflected in Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EN1, which ensures that development does not result in the loss of important natural features and conserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets and their settings, including historic landscapes, that individually or collectively contribute to local identity.</li> <li>• EN17, which sets out the approach to avoiding harmful impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their settings in line with the NPPF. This policy would relate to any development affecting a heritage asset or its setting, including all allocated development sites.</li> </ul>   |                        |
| There are already brownfield sites in the area. These should be used first to clean up Bovey. At a time of climate change and food distribution issues globally we should be making more use of agricultural land not disposing of this important resource.  | The Local Plan Development Strategy requires that brownfield sites are identified and built on as a priority. However, there is insufficient capacity on these sites to meet the housing need as determined by Government. Therefore, the Council must also identify the most suitable greenfield land for development.  |                        |
| The need to build on greenfields is counterproductive environmentally and council should work harder to stop linear urban sprawl   |  |                        |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Concern that the site lies outside the settlement limit.  | The settlement limit automatically extends to cover new development allocations once a Local Plan is formally adopted.   |                        |
| There will never be affordable housing in Bovey. There are not enough flats or two and one bedroom homes to buy or rent in the town   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. The mix of affordable homes provided as part of new development will respond to the need for specific sizes of home(s) as identified on the local housing register. See Policies H2 and H3 and the Bovey Neighbourhood Plan   |                        |
| The previous plan suggested a requirement for 470 homes in Bovey and 650 were shown as possible. How is all this additional housing now required.   | Teignbridge District is required by Government to provide 763 additional homes each year, the majority of which will be located in, or adjacent to the main towns where local facilities and services already exist. The level of development will be proportionate to its current size the level of local services and facilities. The draft Local Plan has only 215 homes for Bovey Tracey across 2 sites. |                        |
| Is the council not able to influence aesthetics?  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies DW1-DW3 and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4).   |                        |
| Extremely dangerous to carry this out next to Bradley Bends which is already a very narrow and dangerous road.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy RT2. Improvements to highways and any potential traffic impact from development will be advised by the Highways Authority.   |                        |
| Give good green travel accessibility to town centres. Not everyone can ride bikes or walk, especially as they get older or have health issues.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy CC4 and the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan.   |                        |
| The access road is the B3344 not A3344 as stated in the Plan. This road is a narrow undulating road with bends and regularly floods becoming impassable on occasions.   | This has been considered and a flood risk assessment has be carried out on the site prior to allocation. See the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Policy EN6.  |                        |
| Concerns over the impact of increased traffic resulting from development.   | This has been considered in consultation with the Highways Authority, but no change has been made to policy based on their advice.   |                        |
| Bovey is not the big employer. Development should be where the employment is.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy places has been amended to reflect this issue by placing development in the most sustainable locations. See Policy GP2.   |                        |
| NHS Comment - GP has capacity problem as of January 2022. To mitigate a primary care developer contribution will be required.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been informed by the NHS and amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, RT2 and the Sustainability Appraisal.   |                        |
| Nothing for young people or the elderly to do.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies DW1-DW3, the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4).  |                        |
| Concern that the primary school does not have the capacity to accommodate additional growth.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5 and RT2 and the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan.   |                        |
| Bradley Bends consistently floods despite the council trying to fix this. Building on this land will only impact this further and cause more flooding. The river outside our house is already bursting its banks.   | This has been considered and a flood risk assessment has be carried out on the site prior to allocation. See the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).   |                        |
| The proposed increase of another 121 houses to the edge of Bovey at Bradley Bends will totally ruin the approach to Dartmoor from Chudleigh Knighton. It will eventually increase the chances of Chudleigh Knighton being absorbed into the town boundaries thereby posing destroying their own rural identity. The area of access from roads like Aggett Grove on the housing plan is dangerous and will increase noise and pollution. | This has been considered but no change has been made to the policy/plan as Bovey and Chudleigh Knighton will never coalesce as they are separated by an SSSI, where development is prohibited.   |                        |
| EA - There are concerns related to SWW infrastucture and a contribution may be required to address this. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy GP5. All development is required to financially contribute towards SWW infrastructure, and it is for SWW to then implement improvement works in accordance with their strategies.  |                        |

**Bovey Tracey: Depot South of Pottery Road**

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|--|
| Natural England – All of the site options for Bovey Tracey are located within the setting of the Dartmoor National Park (which is recognised in the site description notes). The allocation should be supported by an assessment of landscape evidence to demonstrate whether development of this site can protect and enhance the character and natural beauty of the Protected Landscape. The Bradley Bends site is within the 500m IRZ for the Chudleigh Knighton Heath SSSI.   | Depot South of Pottery Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published. | The comments include 9, submitted by email, in post, or in person. |
| Woodland Trust – We request that careful consideration is given to the inclusion of this site. Retention of existing boundary hedges and trees is commended. We would urge that a preliminary ecological appraisal of the site is carried out before any decisions as to whether this site is allocated for development are made.  |  |  |
| RSPB - The RSPB notes that several proposed allocations will require assessment of the likely impacts on greater horseshoe bats and the South Hams SAC as any development will need to avoid adverse impact on foraging and commuting habitat, including from light spill. While the RSPB has not recorded cirl buntings at any of the proposed allocations, as the last survey was in 2016 and that recorded several increases in range, with birds recorded at some new sites. We therefore recommend assessment of habitats on site for their suitability to support cirl buntings then consultation with RSPB for our recommendation for any specific cirl bunting survey. |  |  |
| Concern that the site lies outside the settlement limit.   |  |  |
| EA - There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and a contribution may be required to address this. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development of the site may also be an opportunity to remediate any contamination from previous uses.   |  |  |
| NHS Comment - GP has capacity problem as of January 2022. To mitigate a primary care developer contribution will be required.  |  |  |

**Bovey Tracey: Old Hospital Site, Moretonhampstead Road**

| Summary of comment   | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|---|--|
| Natural England – All of the site options for Bovey Tracey are located within the setting of the Dartmoor National Park (which is recognised in the site description notes). The allocation should be supported by an assessment of landscape evidence to demonstrate whether development of this site can protect and enhance the character and natural beauty of the Protected Landscape. The Bradley Bends site is within the 500m IRZ for the Chudleigh Knighton Heath SSSI.   | Old Hospital Site is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details. | 12798081187<br>12772688676<br>12790396203<br>12877824781<br><br>The comments include 8, submitted by email, in post, or in person. |
| Woodland Trust – We accept inclusion of this site in the Local Plan.   |   |  |
| RSPB - The RSPB notes that several proposed allocations will require assessment of the likely impacts on greater horseshoe bats and the South Hams SAC as any development will need to avoid adverse impact on foraging and commuting habitat, including from light spill. While the RSPB has not recorded cirl buntings at any of the proposed allocations, as the last survey was in 2016 and that recorded several increases in range, with birds recorded at some new sites. We therefore recommend assessment of habitats on site for their suitability to support cirl buntings then consultation with RSPB for our recommendation for any specific cirl bunting survey. |   |  |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|------------------|------------------------|
| <p>Historic England notes the close proximity of the site to the Bovey Tracey Town Centre and Mary Street Conservation Area, and two grade two listed buildings as well as its elevated position.</p> <p>Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need to conserve and enhance the settings and significance of the two listed buildings and the Conservation Area. However, we welcome the inclusion of other site requirements concerning the retention of existing vegetation, landscaping, and design to reflect local vernacular and conserve the setting of Bovey Tracey. Reference to the adopted Bovey Tracey Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) may help relation to the latter.</p> <p>We welcome clarification about what is meant by the Scheduled Monuments (Local Provision) area, which is mentioned in the heritage comments in draft Local Plan. We also query if the archaeological potential of the site of this allocation site has been assessed as appears to have been done for most sites in the HELAA. If not, this should be undertaken with an indication of whether any archaeological assessment and evaluation should be carried out now to inform the allocation and its policy or if it can be prepared at a later date to inform development proposals. This could then be added into the site requirements if necessary.</p> <p>For further information and advice, please see The Historic Environment in Local Plans Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 1 (2015), The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (2015), and Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets(2017).</p> <p>Without an up-to-date and proportionate historic environment evidence base for this proposed allocation and a positive strategy conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, we remain concerned about the soundness of the emerging Local Plan in light of paragraphs 31,189, 190 and 192 of the NPPF2021. In its current form, Historic England objects to the inclusion of this proposed allocation.</p> |                  |                        |
| <p>EA - There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and a contribution may be required to address this. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development of the site may also be an opportunity to remediate any contamination from previous uses.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>NHS Comment - GP has capacity problem as of January 2022. To mitigate a primary care developer contribution will be required.</p>   |                  |                        |

**Bovey Tracey: Old Employment Sites, Cannon Road, Heathfield**

| Summary of comment   | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Natural England – All of the site options for Bovey Tracey are located within the setting of the Dartmoor National Park (which is recognised in the site description notes). The allocation should be supported by an assessment of landscape evidence to demonstrate whether development of this site can protect and enhance the character and natural beauty of the Protected Landscape.</p> | <p>Cannon Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.</p> | <p>The comments below include 9, submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |
| <p>Woodland Trust – We accept inclusion of this site in the Local Plan.</p>  |   |   |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------|------------------------|
| <p>RSPB - The RSPB notes that several proposed allocations will require assessment of the likely impacts on greater horseshoe bats and the South Hams SAC as any development will need to avoid adverse impact on foraging and commuting habitat, including from light spill.</p> <p>While the RSPB has not recorded cirl buntings at any of the proposed allocations, as the last survey was in 2016 and that recorded several increases in range, with birds recorded at some new sites. We therefore recommend assessment of habitats on site for their suitability to support cirl buntings then consultation with RSPB for our recommendation for any specific cirl bunting survey.</p>  |                  |                        |
| <p>Historic England notes the proximity of the proposed allocation to the grade II registered Stover Park and the individually designated heritage assets associated with it. We further note the recommendation for a setting assessment in the HELAA heritage and archaeology comments and in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need to conserve and enhance the settings and significance of Stover Park and any other affected heritage assets and require a setting assessment to inform the design and mitigation of development proposals.</p> <p>Historic England notes that the heritage and archaeological comments in the HELAA and the draft Local Plan recommend archaeological assessment and evaluation given the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential of the site. We consider that the site requirements should also address these archaeological matters.</p> <p>For further information and advice, please see The Historic Environment in Local Plans Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 1 (2015), The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (2015), and Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017).</p> <p>Without the use of such site-specific policy criteria for this proposed allocation as part of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, we remain concerned about the soundness of the emerging Local Plan in light of paragraphs 31,189, 190 and 192 of the NPPF 2021. In its current form, Historic England objects to the inclusion of this proposed allocation.</p> |                  |                        |
| <p>EA - There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and a contribution may be required to address this. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development of the site may also be an opportunity to remediate any contamination from previous uses.</p>   |                  |                        |
| <p>NHS Comment - The GP surgeries that serve this potential site have a capacity problem as of August 2021.</p> <p>To mitigate this capacity issue, it is likely that a developer contribution for Primary Care will be requested for the potential site in and around the Heathfield area.</p>   |                  |                        |

Bovey Tracey: Land off Moretonhampstead Road

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Natural England – All of the site options for Bovey Tracey are located within the setting of the Dartmoor National Park (which is recognised in the site description notes). The allocation should be supported by an assessment of landscape evidence to demonstrate whether development of this site can protect and enhance the character and natural beauty of the Protected Landscape.</p> <p>1. This site is within 500m of the Dartmoor National Park boundary. The site yield is expected to be more than 5 homes (approx. 19 in total) but isn't within a built-up area. Landscape impacts will need to be assessed.</p> <p>2. Moderate likelihood of BMV</p>   | <p>Land off Moretonhampstead Road is not being taken forward as a site allocation – please see Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for further details when published.</p> | <p>FS-Case-394898954<br/>                     FS-Case-394577478<br/>                     FS-Case-393579223<br/>                     FS-Case-393444598<br/>                     FS-Case-392848283<br/>                     FS-Case-391945432<br/>                     FS-Case-391220798<br/>                     FS-Case-389110006<br/>                     FS-Case-388424371<br/>                     FS-Case-379177919<br/>                     FS-Case-395432656</p> |
| <p>RSPB – Support:<br/>                     1. Supports the requirements to consider especially potential impacts on bats and to safeguard vegetated commuting/foraging corridors and protect from lighting on this site.</p>   |  | <p>The comments include 8, submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p>  |
| <p>Concern over the impact on biodiversity and ecology</p>  |  |  |
| <p>Concern over the proximity of the site to Lustleigh.</p>   |  |  |
| <p>Would detrimentally impact an attractive gateway to the town.</p>  |  |  |
| <p>Historic England – Object / Comment<br/>                     1. Historic England notes the HELAA identifies the site as having the potential for heritage assets of archaeological interest to be affected by the proposed allocation and the presence of listed buildings nearby.<br/>                     2. Assuming that the Site Requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need to conserve and enhance the significance and settings of affected heritage assets as well as any requirements for archaeological assessment and evaluation (as appropriate) and for local character and distinctiveness, given the site would be a gateway to Bovey Tracey.<br/>                     3. For further information and advice, please see GPA1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans (2015), HEAN 3: Site Allocations (2015) and GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017).<br/>                     4. Without the use of such site-specific policy criteria for this proposed allocation as part of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, we remain concerned about the soundness of the emerging Local Plan in light of paragraphs 31,189, 190 and 192 of the NPPF 2021. In its current form, Historic England objects to the inclusion of this proposed allocation.</p> |  |  |
| <p>Ancient Tor and Whitstone Quarry in the vicinity</p>   |  |  |
| <p>Development on this side of the road may set a precedent and encourage urban sprawl</p>  |  |  |
| <p>The Town Council do not see the need to include this site in the Local Plan refresh as available data shows that the town and its environs has already achieved its required quota of housing covered within the timeframe of the plan.</p>  |  |  |
| <p>The site under consideration if developed would break into an undeveloped area of countryside. If the site were developed it would create a desire to infill to the town causing a further negative visual impact on this area of countryside and additional stress on town services.</p>  |  |  |
| <p>There are already brownfield sites in the area. These should be used first to clean up Bovey.</p>  |  |  |
| <p>Concern that the site lies outside the settlement limit.</p>   |  |  |



| Summary of comment  | Council Response | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|------------------|------------------------|
| Bovey Tracey housing has not been aimed at the younger local population. The price range of new houses put them completely out of reach.  |                  |                        |
| Too far from town centre and amenities.   |                  |                        |
| The site will not provide affordable or rented housing which is the key requirement for the area.   |                  |                        |
| If all the sites currently put forward in both part 2 and part 3 (both larger and smaller residential housing) were to subsequently come to fruition, the parish of Bovey Tracey and Heathfield would be 420 houses over its TDC-defined quota – that's 50% greater than our required allocation.               |                  |                        |
| DCC Comment - DCC transport are exploring opportunities to improve connection from Bovey Tracey to National Cycle Network Route 28.   |                  |                        |
| Concern over traffic and lack of a footpath in this section of the road.  |                  |                        |
| Bus travel is non existent and i understand there are no future plans for this to change. The bus company has informed me that they are unable to drive through Mary Street in order to access the town. At present local residents need to walk almost a mile to the nearest bus stop.                         |                  |                        |
| Residents are unlikely to work in Bovey but would travel to neighbouring towns so there is no local employment benefit.   |                  |                        |
| NHS Comment - GP has capacity problem as of January 2022. To mitigate a primary care developer contribution will be required.   |                  |                        |
| The Infrastructure Delivery Plan schedules the construction of a new primary school for 2025 - 2029. The present school has been full for a number of years and so family-sized homes should not be built on this site unless the construction of a new school is brought forward.                              |                  |                        |
| Finish the properties at Challabrook, Dean Parke, Bonds Meadow and Bradley Road before more destruction of green fields are agreed upon.  |                  |                        |
| Solar panels should be mandatory on new builds to limit the amount of agricultural land/natural habitat required for solar energy panel fields.   |                  |                        |
| EA – Object:<br>1. Large portion of the site within the functional floodplain.<br>2. If still considered but with a smaller developable area it is recommended that the Site Requirement should state no development within the functional floodplain will be supported.<br>3. A detailed FRA will be required. |                  |                        |

#### Bovey Tracey: Land South of Le Molay Littry

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Natural England –</p> <p>1. This site is within 2km of the Dartmoor National Park boundary. The site yield is expected to be more than 5 homes (approx. 26 in total) but is on the outside edge of a built-up area. Landscape impacts will need to be assessed.</p> <p>2. Within the 1km IRZ for Bovey Heath SSSI (below trigger threshold).</p> <p>3. Within the 1km IRZ for Chudleigh Knighton Heath SSSI (rural residential trigger - any residential development of 10 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas).</p> <p>4. Within 250m of Bradley Ponds nature reserve.</p> | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EN10-EN16 and RT1: Bradley Bends, which contains the following criterion: Design and layout solutions to conserve or enhance the landscape setting of the Dartmoor National Park, informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> | <p>FS-Case-394898954<br/>FS-Case-391171771<br/>FS-Case-393576524<br/>FS-Case-389148593<br/>FS-Case-393442618<br/>FS-Case-389110006<br/>FS-Case-391945432<br/>FS-Case-395596590</p> |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|---|--|---|
| <p>RSPB – Support -</p> <p>1. Supports the requirements to consider especially potential impacts on bats and to safeguard vegetated commuting/foraging corridors and protect from lighting on this site.</p> <p>2. Note the intention not to build on the floodplain grazing marsh but not clear how this habitat will be protected from indirect impacts.</p>  | <p>This has been considered and is reflected in Policies RT1 and EN10-EN16.</p>  | <p>The comments include 8, submitted by email, in post, or in person.</p> |
| <p>Concern over the impact on ecology and biodiversity.</p>   | <p>This has been considered and is reflected in Policies RT1 and EN10-EN16.</p>  |   |
| <p>The river meadows should remain untouched.</p>   | <p>This has been considered and is reflected in Policies RT1 and EN10-EN16.</p>  |   |
| <p>Development should not be south of Le Molay Littry Way.</p>  | <p>This has been considered but no change has been made to the policy/plan as the site presents a good opportunity for a small, custom build development that is designed to avoid impact on the adjacent flood zones.</p>   |   |
| <p>Given the position of this site on low level flat site with good functional access to the town. This site could be considered suitable to older care or affordable housing. The area is understood to be of low agricultural value.</p>  | <p>This has been considered but no change has been made to the policy/plan as the site has been considered a suitable location for custom build homes, which will include a proportion of affordable homes. Based on the advice of the County Council, a new care facility for older people was not considered to be required in the area and was therefore not identified as a potential use.</p>   |   |
| <p>Land should be used for farming to bring local produce to the town or for walking and wildlife.</p>  | <p>This has been considered but no change has been made to the policy/plan as the site has been considered a suitable location for custom build homes.</p>   |   |
| <p>Concern that the site lies outside the settlement limit.</p>   | <p>The settlement limit automatically extends to cover new development allocations once a Local Plan is formally adopted.</p>  |   |
| <p>Available data shows that the town and its environs has already achieved its required quota of housing covered within the timeframe of the Teignbridge Local Plan.</p> <p>However, within the town there is a significant lack of affordable housing that allows people native to the area to stay and grow within the community in which they were born. The age of residents of the town is above the national average and increasingly so as the area is a popular retirement area. Yet the volume of housing stock available to older people who wish to downsize and stay within their community is low. This is an important driver within our community as the ability to downsize would in turn release family size properties on to the market.</p> <p>It is the view of the Town Council that this site should not be released for development unless guarantees can be provided that its release would help address these defined housing needs within our community.</p> | <p>This has been considered but no change has been made to the policy/plan as the site has been considered a suitable location for custom build homes (including affordable) as this will meet local demand for custom build plots according to the custom build register.</p> <p>Teignbridge District is required by Government to provide 763 additional homes each year the majority of which will be located in or adjacent to the main towns where local facilities and services already exist. The level of development will be proportionate to its current size the level of local services and facilities.</p> <p>As the draft Local Plan cover the period until 2040, additional housing growth targets will be set proportionate to the size and services / facilities available in each settlement.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan 2040 requires that any new development in Bovey Tracey should provide 25% affordable housing (comprising social rented, affordable purchase and 'first home')</p> <p>The mix of affordable housing provided as part of new development will respond to the need for specific sizes of home(s) as identified on the local housing register. Further to this. the Bovey Neighbourhood Plan requires that these homes should be prioritised for people with a local connection.</p> |   |
| <p>DCC Comments -</p> <p>1. DCC transport are exploring opportunities to improve connection from Bovey Tracey to National Cycle Network Route 28.</p> <p>2. Site is within Mineral Safeguarding Area (ball clay) and within Mineral Consultation Area.</p>  | <p>This has been considered but no change has been made to the policy/plan as the site presents a good opportunity for a small, custom build development in a location that is considered unlikely to impact on the adjacent flood zones and mineral deposits. The objection is noted.</p>   |   |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|--|------------------------|
| <p>3. Residential development has the potential to sterilise and constrain a mineral resource of international importance, contrary to Policy M2 of the Devon Minerals Plan.</p> <p>4. Strongly object to the site.</p>   |  |                        |
| <p>The site would need to include a safe crossing place to enable residents to get onto the shared use path, and/or a cycle lane on the left-hand side as you go from Bradley Bends to the town.</p>  | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy RT1. Improvements to highways and any potential traffic impact from development will be advised by the Highways Authority.</p>  |                        |
| <p>Concern over the additional traffic congestion arising from development.</p>   | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy RT1. Improvements to highways and any potential traffic impact from development will be advised by the Highways Authority.</p>  |                        |
| <p>As development stretches further from the town centre there should be more frequent bus services.</p>  | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies RT1, CC4 and the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>   |                        |
| <p>The proposed site is not expected to provide an increase in employment opportunities. Increased footfall in the town centre could add to the economic sustainability of our local traders.</p>   | <p>This has been considered and it is hoped that improvements and connection with sustainable travel links will encourage use of the Town Centre. See Policies RT1, CC4 and the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>   |                        |
| <p>NHS Comment - GP has capacity problem as of January 2022. To mitigate a primary care developer contribution will be required.</p>  | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, RT1 and the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>  |                        |
| <p>EA Comment - Object -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Large portion of the site within the functional floodplain.</li> <li>2. If still considered but with a smaller developable area it is recommended that the Site Requirement should state no development within the functional floodplain will be supported.</li> <li>3. A detailed FRA will be required.</li> </ol>                                  | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. The area allocated for development lies outside the flood zone with an additional 20m buffer to allow for climate change mitigation. The remainder of the site within the flood zone will be used for biodiversity net gain and flood gain. See Policies CC1, RT1, EN6 and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p> |                        |
| <p>Currently, when all of the agreed development in the town is complete our healthcare and education infrastructure will come under significant pressure to meet the expected demand. The Town's GP practice has just been given permission to extend their premises to meet current demand, but there is limited space on the site to accommodate further expansion.</p>  | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, RT2, the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>   |                        |
| <p>Our primary School is currently catering for significantly more children than the site was intended for. There is limited capacity to meet the demand of the town's population in surrounding schools and transport will need to be provided if the local school hits capacity. The Town Council's view as set out in the NDP is that any further development in the town would require a new school to be provided.</p> | <p>This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, RT1, the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>   |                        |
| <p>All new housing should have maximum solar panels installed by developer as currently large swathes of agricultural land/natural habitat are being earmarked for solar panels instead.</p>  | <p>This has been considered and Policies CC2, CC5 seeks to encourage this. Also see the Bovey Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>   |                        |

## Chapter 7: Edge of Exeter

### Edge of Exeter: Peamore and West Exe

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|--|--|---|
| GHB roost at Peamore House. Expect to see a substantial network of corridors (north-south and east-west) across this site given over to a double hedged dark corridor with species-rich grassland between to support GHB.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN1-EN16 and the Habitats Regulations Assessment.   | 12877552206<br>12877813075<br>12877654366   |
| Varied wildlife. RSPB / Cirl Bunting site in vicinity. Newts and Owls. Number of unconfirmed Wildlife sites. Small lake - Step back development far enough from any water to enable wildlife corridor and natural processes.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN1-EN16 and the Habitats Regulations Assessment.   | 12877691295<br>12877542128<br>12877801090<br>12877753139<br>12877651624   |
| Sensitive landscape. AGLV. A30 is natural boundary of city. Site integral to Exeter's countryside feel. Views from Exeter city.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN4, the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and the Landscape Character Assessment.   | 12875620551<br>12877782262<br>12877767045   |
| Important trees and ancient woodland.  | This has been considered and is addressed in Policy EN16.  | 12877648844   |
| Impact on Exe SPA and SAC. Light pollution impacts. SANGS required probably both on and off site   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN1-EN16 and the Habitats Regulations Assessment.   | 12875204809<br>12877791561<br>12877753534   |
| Site potentially contains priority habitat (deciduous woodlands) and is adjacent to an area of ancient woodland.   | This has been considered and is addressed in Policy EN16.  | 12877664407<br>12875194107  |
| EA – WFD status of Matford Brook is moderate (Phosphate issues). SWW Countess Wear at risk of overload and requires investment from SWW. Need to add SUDS requirement and protect soil quality in policy.<br><br>Site in FZ1 so sequentially preferable. Opportunities to provide benefits to the catchment by incorporating natural flood management measures.<br><br>There are concerns related to SWW infrastructure and a contribution may be required to address this. However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 so sequentially preferable to sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3. There is also an opportunity to provide benefits to the catchment by incorporating Natural Flood Management measures. | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2 and EN1-EN16. All development is required to financially contribute towards SWW infrastructure, and it is for SWW to then implement improvement works in accordance with their strategies.<br><br>The requirement for the use of SUDS is contained within Policy DW3: Design Standards and protection of soils included within Policy GP1: Sustainable Development. | 12877784666<br>12877745268<br>12877633975<br>12875184518<br>12877796678<br>12877625931<br>12877653215<br>12875165103<br>12877802157<br>12877734847<br>12877667126 |
| Parkland and setting of Peamore house (Grade II) is an important gateway building. Peamore House was originally designed to sit within and overlook its peaceful and serene surrounding parkland. This important historical aspect of the Peamore site needs to be protected and preserved. Adjacent Listed buildings / cross.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN17 and the Heritage Impact Assessment.  | 12874834357<br>12877795885<br>12877727871<br>12877638433  |
| Scheduled Ancient Monument on the site. Roman archaeology.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN17 and the Heritage Impact Assessment.  | 12871141307<br>12877789756  |
| Poor quality living environment between large roads isolated between M5, A379, A30.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2 and EN17.   | 12877733381<br>12877650168  |
| Build on brownfield or city centre retail / office buildings that are no longer needed.  | The Local Plan Development Strategy requires that brownfield sites are identified and built on as a priority. However, there is insufficient capacity on these sites to meet the housing need as determined by   | 12870560944<br>12877775481  |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID   |
|---|---|--|
|   | Government. Therefore, the Council must also identify the most suitable greenfield land for development.  | 12877746612<br>12877640669   |
| Loss of valuable grazing / agricultural land. Impact on land used by Orange Elephant dairy farm.  | The Local Plan Development Strategy requires that brownfield sites are identified and built on as a priority. However, there is insufficient capacity on these sites to meet the housing need as determined by Government. Therefore, the Council must also identify the most suitable greenfield land for development. | 12858866173<br>12877784978<br>12877748681<br>12877619468                               |
| Impact of Exeter growth on nearby villages.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy EN1.  | 12850440089<br>12877792328   |
| South westerly part of this site option falls within the Waste Consultation Zone for Kenbury Wood inert landfill site and waste transfer station. However, due to the distance from the site and the impact of the A379 and the A38 which lies between the two areas, it is unlikely residential development in this location would constrain waste operations at Kenbury Wood and therefore as the Waste Planning Authority there is no objection to this site option. | The support for this policy is acknowledged   | 12877710846<br>12877646324<br>12848742221<br>12877781408<br>12877711007<br>12877614434 |
| Concern about impact on existing residents at Little Silver.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, EN17 and the Heritage Impact Assessment.   | 12824608715<br>12877789085   |
| New housing areas need large green spaces and parks.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, DW2, DW3, the District Design Code (Appendix 4) and the Green Infrastructure Strategy.   | 12877737358<br>12877645254<br>12798081187  |
| Development should be attractive affordable flats for first time buyers. Only need affordable homes for local people from local villages / local residents.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, H2 and H3.   | 12877788815<br>12877539205<br>12877620826  |
| New homes at Matford already being built. No need for further homes.  | The Local Plan will allocate housing sites for the period to 2040, in line with Government housing targets. See Policy GP2 and H1.  | 12772688676<br>12877769891   |
| Build on brownfield in town / city centre.  | The Local Plan Development Strategy requires that brownfield sites are identified and built on as a priority. However, there is insufficient capacity on these sites to meet the housing need as determined by Government. Therefore, the Council must also identify the most suitable greenfield land for development. | 12877695256<br>12877614517<br>12759388698<br>12877777497                               |
| Concern that homes will be second homes.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies H1.   | 12877672238<br>12877602419<br>12866914812  |
| Don't need more homes. House prices will reduce in the current area as the area becomes less desirable with increased population. Should reduce population growth   | The Local Plan will allocate housing sites for the period to 2040, in line with Government housing targets. See Policy GP2 and H1.  | 12877781768<br>12877701351   |
| Loss of green areas. Impact on footpaths and permissive / formal rights of way through countryside used by local people. Currently quiet countryside. Impact on mental health.  | This has been considered and Policies GP6, DW1-DW3, EN4 and EN10-EN16 reflect the importance of green spaces and access to them. See also the Green Infrastructure Strategy.  | 12877612147<br>12877846878<br>12877763649  |
| Significant impact of large developments on health services. Insufficient dentist and doctor capacity.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been informed by the NHS and amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, RT2 and the Sustainability Appraisal.  | 12877681374<br>12877601813<br>12877820734  |
| Increased traffic and air pollution. Construction impacts make living in the area intolerable.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policy GP1.  | 12877761212<br>12877701295   |
| Area needs more sports and leisure facilities. Deepway is a real asset to the village but it's no longer big enough for the population. The children's areas added in the new builds are pretty basic and not maintained. There is not much for older children to do.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2, EE3 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy   | 12877556215<br>12877824781   |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|--|
| We have a lot of people travel from Exeter to use our skate park which makes it very busy.   |  | 12877774942<br>12877685051   |
| Concern over impact of development isolated from infrastructure and services.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2, EE3 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy for details of required infrastructure, facilities and services on-site and connections to Exeter and adjacent areas.  | 12877564619<br>12877822121<br>12877769981  |
| Most residents will need to travel into city. Impact on A379 / Bridge Road / Matford congestion.<br>We travelled from the centre of Exminster to north Alphington (less than 3 miles) and left home at 7.55am and arrived at our destination in Alphington at 8.58, this is totally unacceptable.<br>Congestion so bad it is preferable to WfH.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2, EE3 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy for details of required infrastructure, connections to Exeter and adjacent areas. Maximising sustainable and active travel options will be important, as well as excellent internet connections and provision of local facilities to minimise the need to travel.  | 12877678903<br>12877587734<br>12877584220<br>12877582723<br>12877579353<br>12877569654 |
| Lack of public transport infrastructure. Need affordable green public transport provision to support residents, including those without cars. Add bus lanes.<br>None of the bus services passing through the area go directly to any of the areas where schools and doctors are situated.<br>TDC / DCC are impotent in securing public transport for new developments so it is not at all clear how improved transport would be secured. | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2, EE3 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy for details of required infrastructure, connections to Exeter and adjacent areas. This is recognised as an important issue. We will work with DCC and developers to secure public transport links servicing the development.   | 12877576964<br>12877577102<br>12877564140<br>12877541239<br>12877561711<br>12877569034 |
| Need new Train station in Exminster.   | This has been considered but the plan has not been amended because a new station at Marsh Barton is currently under construction.  | 12877567941<br>12877552793   |
| Estate roads in new housing developments are too narrow and cause passing / parking problems.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies DW2, DW3 and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4).  | 12877511783<br>12877537945   |
| A379 will need safe pedestrian and cycle crossing points and improvements. More bus stops needed.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2, DW2, DW3 and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4).   | 12877535661<br>12877539183   |
| Need a northbound access onto M5 to relieve some pressure on city roads.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2 that requires that land required for a northbound sliproad connecting the A379 and A38 is safeguarded  | 12877544618<br>12877545775   |
| Concern over traffic on Days Pottles Lane and Deepway, particularly for school access. Decrease speed limits on lanes. Pedestrian safety on lanes.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies EE2 that proposes improvements to Day Pottles Lane, new roads on the development will be required to conform with Policies DW2, DW3 and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4) and will be approved by the highways Authority.  | The comments also includes 43, submitted by email, in post, or in person.              |
| Support SWE2 Employment allocation only (not wider residential development).   | The support for this policy is acknowledged  |  |
| Exminster would greatly benefit from some more commercial places, especially cafes, takeaways, a bigger supermarket  | This has been considered but the plan has not been amended as it not directly related to the proposed allocation.  |  |
| People will need to travel into Exeter to find work. Most residents would travel to work in the science park or Sowton and other places not easily accessible by public transport from Peamore.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2, EE3 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy for details of required infrastructure, connections to Exeter and adjacent areas. Maximising sustainable and active travel options will be important, as well as excellent internet connections and provision of local facilities to minimise the need to travel. We will work with DCC and developers to secure public transport links servicing the development. |  |
| Are there sufficient jobs to accommodate this population?  | This has been considered and the plan / policy also promotes numerous sites for employment growth within Teignbridge, in addition to job growth in and around Exeter City. See Policy  |  |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|--|------------------------|
| Marsh Barton park and ride already at full capacity. New park and ride at Peamore.   | This has been considered but the plan has not been amended as park and ride provision it not directly related to the proposed allocation.  |                        |
| Insufficient healthcare resources such as GP services and RD&E hospital capacity in the area to cope with further development.   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been informed by the NHS and amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, RT2 and the Sustainability Appraisal.   |                        |
| No early years / primary school places available. Limited secondary school places. Secondary school pupils from Exminster having to travel very far (Dawlish).   | This has been considered and the policy has been amended in liaison with the Education Authority to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5 and EE2.  |                        |
| The SWE expansion does not even include any shops or public transport.   | This has been considered and the policy includes requirements for on-site community facilities and services to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5 and EE2.   |                        |
| Sport England supports use of planning obligations as a way of securing the provision of new or enhanced places for sport and a contribution towards their future maintenance, to meet the needs arising from new development.   | The support for this policy is acknowledged  |                        |
| What consideration has been given to provision of sewage, water, power and communications?   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5. All development is required to financially contribute towards SWW infrastructure, and it is for SWW to then implement improvement works in accordance with their strategies.  |                        |
| Need shared e-bikes in the vicinity - Communal covered cycle parking - Suitable bus services - Suitable segregated cycle infrastructure and a separate footpath linking this estate to Kennford, Exminster, Ide and Alphington - Visitor bike racks (Sheffield stands)   | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies GP5, EE2, DW2, DW3 and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4). The development is required to provide active travel and sustainable travel connections to Exeter and adjacent areas. We will work with DCC and developers to secure public transport links servicing the development.   |                        |
| Concern about cumulative impact on Exminster. Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan.  | This has been considered but the plan has not been amended because as the proposed development is detached from Exminster and located at the edge of the Parish near Exeter, and will contain its own community services and facilities, that it will have only minor impact.  |                        |
| Some of the Peamore site is in Shillingford, not just Exminster Parish.  | Correct and noted.   |                        |
| Contrary to Exminster Neighbourhood Plan development boundary. Parish Council not sufficiently consulted.  | This has been considered but the plan has not been amended because the Local Plan, being the more recent Development Plan Document can amend settlement boundaries as required in order to meet development requirements.  |                        |
| Historic England notes the presence of a Scheduled Monument within the proposed allocation site, the archaeological potential of the site and the related comments in the HELAA and draft Local Plan. There also appear to be also three grade II listed buildings in or immediately adjoining the proposed allocation (No 1-4 inc Peamore House, Peamore War Memorial and Peamore Cottage), as well as a Scheduled Monument to the south-east (Earthwork enclosure south of Blackall's Copse). Given the presence and close proximity of these heritage assets to the proposed allocation and the archaeological potential, we consider that the suitability and the capacity of this site should be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). The HIA should seek to understand the impacts of the proposed allocation, in combination with existing nearby allocations, on the significance and settings of all affected heritage assets. The HIA work should include archaeological assessment and evaluation as maybe required. It should make recommendations for ways in which negative impacts on the significance of affected heritage assets can be avoided, minimised and/or mitigated and opportunities for enhancements maximised. In our view, the HIA should then be used to inform the preparation of a masterplan for the site. Assuming that the | <p>An HIA is currently being undertaken for this site. In advance of the outcome of the HIA, the following is the Council's response:</p> <p>Policy EE2: Peamore and West Exe of the Proposed Submission Local Plan responds to the comments made by Historic England and requires the following:</p> <p><b>Design and layout solutions which conserve or enhance the significance of onsite and nearby heritage assets and their settings, including: Peamore House, Peamore War Memorial, Peamore Cottage, Enclosures NE of Peamore Cottage and Lawrence Castle (Haldon Belvedere), informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment. Development will avoid the immediate surroundings of Peamore House and Enclosures NE of Peamore Cottage; and</b></p> <p><b>A layout informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation, which shall inform the layout of the site.</b></p> |                        |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|---|------------------------|
| site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that these should also include the need to conserve and enhance the significance and settings of the Scheduled Monuments, grade II listed buildings and any other affected heritage assets, as well as any other design or other mitigation measures as maybe identified in the HIA. | This is in addition to Policy EN17: Heritage Assets, which sets out the approach to avoiding harmful impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their settings in line with the NPPF. This policy would relate to any development affecting a heritage asset or its setting, including all allocated development sites.<br><br>Initial concept planning work acknowledges that the scheduled monument and its setting cannot be built upon. |                        |
| New home garages are too small for modern cars – causes parking problems.  | This has been considered and the plan / policy has been amended to reflect this issue. See Policies DW2, DW3 and the Teignbridge District Design Code (Appendix 4).   |                        |

#### Edge of Exeter: Markham's Farm

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|--|--|--|
| Hillside facing the city. Detrimental landscape impact - views of green fields & hedgerows from the City and to lesser extent Haldon. AGLV. Development near the ridgeline should be avoided.  | Policy EE1: Markham Village requires:<br>"Specific landscaping measures to minimise potential landscape impacts to retain and reinforce the setting of Exeter, as informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and shall avoid development of the upper slopes and ridges of the site; and<br>HRA mitigations for the Exe Estuary SPA including at least 17 hectares of SANGS to be provided within the area allocated as EE4: West Exe Countryside Park."<br><br>In addition, all development is subject to the provisions of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy EN10: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</li> <li>• Policy EN11: Important Habitats and Features</li> <li>• Policy EN12: Legally Protected and Priority Species</li> <li>• EN13: European Wildlife Sites</li> <li>• EN14: Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren and</li> <li>• EN15: South Hams SAC</li> </ul>  | 12877720432<br>12875176252<br>12877782799<br>12877773424<br>12876893763<br>12870365271<br>12877790956<br>12877767908<br>12875616398<br>12859137494<br>12877785082<br>12877759195<br>12875613299<br>12856180778<br>1287779064 |
| Impact on various wildlife and trees.  | The development would be subject to Policy EN16: Trees, Hedges and Woodlands as well as the suite of ecology policies set out above.   | 12877729229<br>12875610657   |
| Historic England notes the high potential for archaeology on the site as set out in the heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA. We further note the recommendation that core archaeological sites may need to be preserved in-situ in open space. Given this recommendation, we consider that the archaeological assessment and evaluation (if necessary) should be undertaken to prepare a master plan to help inform decisions about the suitability and capacity of this site for allocation. Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that these should also include the need to conserve and enhance any other affected heritage assets, as well as any other design or other mitigation measures as maybe identified through archaeological assessment and evaluation so as to avoid and minimise negative impacts and maximise enhancements. | Policy EE1: Markham Village of the Proposed Submission Local Plan responds to the comments made by Historic England and requires the following:<br>"Design and layout solutions which conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings, including Lawrence Castle (Haldon Belvedere) and Exeter Cathedral, and the Conservation Areas of Ide, Alphin Brook, Princes Square, Southernhay, and Pennsylvania and listed buildings within them; and A layout informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation."<br><br>This policy requirement is as a result of the HIAs submitted for the site by the site promoters.<br><br>This is in addition to Policy EN17: Heritage Assets, which sets out the approach to avoiding harmful impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their settings in line with the NPPF. This policy would relate to any development affecting a heritage asset or its setting, including all allocated development sites. | 12841914852<br>12877765394<br>12877670340<br>12875606178<br>12812278040<br>12877777731<br>12877694646<br>12875216621<br>12877796638<br>12877761860<br>12877751635<br>12875203091<br>12877790037                              |



| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Within setting of Haldon Belvedere.   | Noted, see above box.  | 12877779923            |
| Known Roman and other archaeological sites nearby. A comprehensive programme of archaeological work should be undertaken to enable the significance of the heritage assets to be understood as well as the impact of any development upon any such assets. Core sites may need to be preserved in open space.             | The Devon County Council Historic Environment team have provided initial advice on the site on the potential for prehistoric and Roman archaeology and the policy requires:<br>"A layout informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation"   | 12877730223            |
| Impact on Ide conservation area and listed buildings.   | This is taken into account in policy, which requires:<br>"Design and layout solutions which conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings, including Lawrence Castle (Haldon Belvedere) and Exeter Cathedral, and the Conservation Areas of Ide, Alphin Brook, Princes Square, Southernhay, and Pennsylvania and listed buildings within them; and A layout informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation."<br><br>This is in addition to Policy EN17: Heritage Assets, which sets out the approach to avoiding harmful impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their settings in line with the NPPF. This policy would relate to any development affecting a heritage asset or its setting, including all allocated development sites. | 12875190880            |
| Site is County Farm owned by DCC. The land in this proposal is Crediton series, 30% clay. The organic matter in the fields I farm organically are between 5% and 6% organic matter. The fields in the proposal are classified as 'very good' according to Agricultural Land Classification Map South-West Region (ALC006) | The farmhouse and buildings will not be developed and will remain to be operational using land outside the site.   | 12877786510            |
| The site is of sufficient size to allow for the provision of local public open spaces to support wildlife and provide landscaping, tree planting and on-site play areas.  | The development will provide large areas of green infrastructure and SANGS, amounting to 29 hectares. It will also provide opportunities for play and a multi-use games area.  | 12877762048            |
| Grasslands are a very useful carbon sink. If we grow less locally there will be more carbon miles importing food from elsewhere.  | Noted.   | 12877722202            |
| Already have 10 homes from Pynes Farm site in Ide. Also SWE1 being built nearby.  | Noted.   | 12877679894            |
| Insufficient affordable housing for local people.   | The development will provide 25% affordable homes, amounting to 225 affordable homes.  | 12877692955            |
| There is a need for housing and for ways of future proofing housing development.  | Noted. Policy H5: of the plan requires development to provide accessible homes and housing to meet local needs.  | 12877680786            |
| Too many houses being built then let out as holiday rentals.  | Policy H1 of the Plan requires new development to be occupied as primary residences, to prevent use as holiday accommodation.  | 12877676029            |
| Is demand for housing from local people or from people moving into the area?  | The main demand for housing is from local people.  | 12877591442            |
| Homes close to main road pollution and noise.   | A buffer would be provided along the A30 to reduce impacts of noise from the A30. Air pollution normally occurs when traffic is stationary or accelerating. Therefore, the presence of the A30 is unlikely to cause air pollution to residents.  | 12877588969            |
| Site used for walking and cycling in open countryside. Important for physical and mental health.  | The site does not benefit from public access, with the exception of a public footpath. The development will provide large areas of green infrastructure and SANGS, amounting to 29 hectares, improved pedestrian and cycle links and opportunities for play including a multi-use games area.  |                        |
| Not enough GP places or hospital beds.  | The development would need to provide financial contributions towards healthcare, as required by Policy GP7: Infrastructure and Transport Networks.  |                        |
| Would need to enhance ped/ cycle provision on A30 overbridge.   | The policy requires:<br>New and/or improved safe and attractive pedestrian/cycle links with safe road crossing points through the site and to:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ide;</li> <li>• Shillingford Abbot;</li> <li>• Shillingford Road;</li> <li>• Crabb Lane and Sustainable Travel Route E17, as identified in the Exeter Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan;</li> </ul>   |                        |

The comments also includes 38, submitted by email, in post, or in person.

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|--|------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A377 to east of A30 roundabout;</li> <li>• Waybrook Lane and Sustainable Travel Route E15, as identified in the Exeter Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan; and</li> <li>• West Exe Countryside Park.</li> </ul>  |                        |
| <p>Traffic and congestion concerns on A30, Chudleigh Road, through Shillingford and Alphington. Increased noise and traffic during construction and occupation. Markham Lane / Polehouse Lane itself is wholly unsuited to traffic. In addition, Ide High Street &amp; Fore St are very congested with frequent disruption caused if large agricultural vehicles or trucks enter the village.</p> <p>If it does connect to the C50 (via an upgraded Polehouse lane, or at the Alphington roundabout through Steven's farm, this may reduce the detrimental effect on the lanes and Ide high street, but will have an adverse effect on Alphington road, which is already a problem point. Park and ride traffic analysis revealed that as well as the familiar queues affecting traffic from the A30 accessing Alphington road, there is a large volume of traffic crossing that queue from the C50 to the A30. Currently this traffic passes largely unimpeded, but any change in conditions that could "link the streams" so that C50-&gt;A30 traffic queued along with A30-&gt;Exeter traffic would have a catastrophic effect on the C50 traffic with queues rapidly building back to Ide and Pocombe bridge. If a significant traffic stream from the new development joined the C50 to go to Exeter, it would then have to merge with the queue from the A30 on the roundabout and could trigger large queues on the C50.</p> | <p>The policy requires development to be designed around low traffic neighbourhood principles and to be fully permeable by foot and bicycle. Supporting text explains that edge of Exeter development sites aspire to result in 50% movement by sustainable travel modes.</p> <p>In addition, Devon County Council Highway Authority has been involved with the writing of the policy, to ensure that highway issues have been addressed. Two separate access from Markham lane and from Ide Road, which do not create opportunities for through traffic with the exception of buses and emergency vehicles, is supported.</p> |                        |
| <p>The site is relatively isolated from shops / services in Shillingford, Alphington, Ide. Wrong side of A30 for most services.</p> <p>Main vehicle access to the site would be via Shillingford road and therefore out of Ide Parish into Alphington. It is likely new residents will identify with Alphington rather than Ide. This will make the new community totally separate from Ide Village, from the community shop, and the green space projects currently underway (Weir meadow and Victorian orchard) It will leave a community 2/3 cut off from it's heart.</p>  | <p>The policy requires the provision of a basic level of services including a shop, community centre, community focal point and mobility hub. Other services in Alphington, Ide and Shillingford Abbot will be accessible via improved walking and cycling routes.</p>   |                        |
| <p>No foot / cycle paths along Shillingford Road. Alphington Road has insufficient capacity. Roads already congested and no alternatives. Dangerous for children. No direct buses or sustainable transport.</p> <p>The access to local footpaths and cycle routes connecting to neighbouring settlements and Exeter can be extended through the new development to enhance connectivity.</p>  | <p>The policy requires the creation of new and/or improved safe and attractive pedestrian/cycle links with safe road crossing points through the site and to other areas including Ide, Shillingford Abbot, Shillingford Road, Crabb Lane, A377 to east of A30 roundabout, and Waybrook Lane.</p>  |                        |
| <p>Any vehicle access to west to Alphington A30 junction unlikely to be acceptable (but not required to unlock site).</p> <p>Not feasible to access Ide A30 Junction, as already congested. The c50 is already busy and the Alphington roundabout a choke point already, with traffic exiting the A30 often queuing on the slip road or roundabout to access the Marsh barton estate or the Alphington Road entrance to Exeter.</p>   | <p>The policy requires development to be designed around low traffic neighbourhood principles and to be fully permeable by foot and bicycle. Supporting text explains that edge of Exeter development sites aspire to result in 50% movement by sustainable travel modes.</p> <p>In addition, Devon County Council Highway Authority has been involved with the writing of the policy, to ensure that highway issues have been addressed. Two separate access from Markham lane and from Ide Road, which do not create opportunities for through traffic with the exception of buses and emergency vehicles, is supported.</p> |                        |
| <p>Construct an access from the site onto the A30 north west bound off ramp, to provide access from the site to Exeter without impacting the C50 traffic. Making Polehouse Lane one way south bound would make a viable route both ways between the site and Exeter without some of the adverse effects.</p>  | <p>Access from the A30 into the site would not be supported.</p>   |                        |
| <p>Ide Parking is a major issue, especially for school drop off and collection. Very dangerous parking on the junction to the C50.</p>  | <p>Noted.</p>  |                        |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|---|------------------------|
| A comprehensive transport strategy is required to maximise the use of active travel and public transport including park and ride. This should take into account the likelihood of long-term development and potential transport improvements at Marsh Barton. Joint work with DCC will be vital here taking account of the existing Exeter transport strategy and emerging Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.  | The policy requires development to be designed around low traffic neighbourhood principles and to be fully permeable by foot and bicycle. Supporting text explains that edge of Exeter development sites aspire to result in 50% movement by sustainable travel modes. This is in response to DCC.  |                        |
| food production where fruit and vegetables and shortened supply chains are critical for a resilient food supply  | Allotments will be included on site.  |                        |
| Not enough employment to sustain the amount of proposed housing.   | The site lies close to a wide range of employment opportunities, which could be accessed on foot, by bicycle or by public transport.  |                        |
| Lack of local facilities within 1K a concern.<br>Would want to see any site provide some form of local retail / amenity.   | The policy requires the provision of a basic level of services including a shop, community centre, community focal point and mobility hub.  |                        |
| Exeter City will be a less attractive place for people to work and locate.   | The comment does not qualify why it would be a less attractive place to work or live.   |                        |
| Insufficient Primary school places. Working with DCC, a comprehensive education strategy is required to consider development proposals in the wider area. If off-site education was provided, this would need to be funded from the development.   | The development will be required to pay financial contributions to primary and secondary education including school transport and to safeguard land for a new 2 form entry primary school including early years, on a 2.3 hectare site with the potential to expand to 4 form entry in the future, closely related to the neighbourhood hub;  |                        |
| Nearest recreational facilities, public space, leisure facilities, are considerable distance away. Site is large enough to accommodate new local public open space. Existing ECC play areas in the vicinity of the site have limited capacity for additional use or expansion to cater for additional demand and would be too far to be reasonably accessible for residents of these sites. Given this context and the scale of development proposed, on site provision is supported. This should include full play provision for all age groups (i.e. LAPs, LEAPS, NEAPs and MUGAs) following as a minimum standard the recommendations of the Fields in Trust guidance 'Beyond the Six Acre Standard'. Looking more widely, provision of skate facilities should be considered on site; the nearest facilities within Exeter are located at Flowerpots more than 3 km away and there are no plans by ECC to provide skate facilities any closer to the proposed sites. Further consideration will need to be given to the potential for on-site playing pitch provision at Markham's Farm. Additional provision in Exeter within close proximity to the site is not currently planned and therefore a lack of more local provision would lead to a greater need to travel. | The policy requires the site to provide At least 12 hectares of public open space across the site to include a combination of young people and children's play areas and other play facility opportunities integrated throughout the development, including a MUGA;<br><br>It will also be subject to Policy DW3, which requires:<br>"New formal and informal green infrastructure including playing pitches, play areas, street sports, parks and gardens, amenity green space and natural/semi natural green space, excluding allotments, should be provided at a ratio of 120 square metres per dwelling; and<br>The Fields in Trust Standards publication 'Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard' (2015 and subsequent revisions) should be used as the starting point for recreational and play space provisions detailed in (b). Capacity and accessibility, and opportunities for improvements to existing nearby provision should also be taken into consideration." |                        |
| Site would require SANGS, and Cirl Bunting survey.   | The site will provide SANGS and will be subject to Policy EN12: Legally Protected and Priority Species.   |                        |
| Contrary to Ide Neighbourhood Plan. Very unpopular with local residents. Ide Parish Council would expect speed restrictions on Ide Village Road to 40mph; a new and serious cycle lane linking Ide with Exeter, and Markham's Farm with Exeter; excellent public transport into Exeter from Markham's Farm; excellent and safe pedestrian access to Ide and to the new development.<br><br>Any new community at this location should definitely offer walking and cycling connections to the Alphington roundabout. The route along the C50 to Ide is expected to be upgraded to a cycle track soon if the retail development in Ide goes ahead. The new community should be joined up too. This is an opportunity to rectify the very dangerous walking and cycling crossing on the A30 south east bound on ramp. The crossing over Alphington road is much safer with good visibility and a traffic island, but it does not connect with the West side of the roundabout. This connection could be made by linking around the roundabout the other way to avoid the exceptionally dangerous crossing from Alphington over the A30 south east bound on ramp. Alternatively this crossing could be made much safer by closing the left lane, making                          | The development would result in additional open space and sustainable travel links towards Exeter for local residents, along with an extended bus route and mobility hub, which could include e-bike/scooter hire or a car club car.<br><br>The policy requires:<br>New and/or improved safe and attractive pedestrian/cycle links with safe road crossing points through the site and to:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ide;</li> <li>• Shillingford Abbot;</li> <li>• Shillingford Road;</li> <li>• Crabb Lane and Sustainable Travel Route E17, as identified in the Exeter Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan;</li> <li>• A377 to east of A30 roundabout;</li> </ul>   |                        |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|--|------------------------|
| <p>the slipway single lane at this point. The geometry of the junction means that there are never 2 vehicles in these two lanes, It was closed in this way for an extended period with roadworks having no effect on traffic and making the crossing massively easier, improving visibility and reducing crossing time, and drawing drivers attention forward as they negotiate the narrower carriageway.</p> <p>Would the development of the site be accompanied by upgrading active travel routes? For example the path from Twisted Oak to Alphington junction could be made a cycle track offering an off road link and a much safer option for crossing Alphington road. Crabbe lane including the ford and the underpass could be made a cycle track offering the new community and Ide, good routes to Exeter and Marsh barton without crossing the Alphington Junction, except by the much safer Alphington road crossing with good visibility and a traffic island.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waybrook Lane and Sustainable Travel Route E15, as identified in the Exeter Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan; and</li> <li>West Exe Countryside Park.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, existing residents' concerns have been raised by one of the Local Ward Members in meetings with Devon County Highways Authority and National Highways and taken on board in suggested design solutions.</p> |                        |
| Breaches A30 to impact Ide and Shillingford Abbot. Development is very large in comparison to population of the villages.  | Noted.   |                        |
| County Farm helps young people into farming and would be loss to industry. Area has been farmed organically. Development will kill the soil.   | The farmhouse and buildings will not be developed and will remain to be operational using land outside the site.   |                        |
| lack of information regarding development of road, river crossing and rail infrastructure.   | This level of detail would be provided at planning application stage.  |                        |
| There is no information addressing the needs and requirements of an ageing population  | All development is subject to Policy H5, which requires a housing mix to reflect local need.   |                        |
| Stop the second home problem.  | Policy H1 ensures that new development is occupied as a primary residence to prevent holiday homes.  |                        |
| EA - It is likely that the site will be suitable for residential development (if the requirements can be met). There is also an opportunity to provide benefits to the catchment by incorporating Natural Flood Management measures.   | The allocation policy, Policy EE1, requires:<br>A detailed flood risk mitigation and drainage plan, including any new connections to existing foul drainage required;  |                        |
| Additional land at Stevens Farm and south of Shillingford Road could be added to Markhams Farm development.  | Noted. This has been added to the development site.  |                        |

#### Edge of Exeter: Atwell's Farm

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID   |
|---|--|--|
| DWT would expect to see a substantial network of corridors (north-south and east-west) across this site to support GHB with other species and habitats.   | <p>Policy EE4: Attwells Farm requires:<br/>"HRA mitigations for Exe Estuary SPA including at least 6 hectares of SANGS to be provided on site including linked green spaces and corridors through the site to connect with Whitycombe Way Valley Park and Kinnerton Way County Wildlife Site."</p> <p>In addition, all development is subject to the provisions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy EN10: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</li> <li>Policy EN11: Important Habitats and Features</li> <li>Policy EN12: Legally Protected and Priority Species</li> <li>EN13: European Wildlife Sites</li> <li>EN14: Exe Estuary and Dawlish Warren and</li> <li>EN15: South Hams SAC</li> </ul> | <p>12877658656<br/>12793337761<br/>12790396203<br/>12877796442<br/>12877555617<br/>12877476781<br/>12793327169<br/>12877619874<br/>12877771285<br/>12877661280<br/>12876558415<br/>12793257861<br/>12877857219</p> |
| Historic England notes from the heritage and archaeology comments in the HELAA and draft Local Plan that the site has archaeological potential and that little archaeological investigation has been undertaken locally. We further note the associated recommendation for sufficient archaeological information to accompany future planning applications. | <p>Policy EE4: Attwells Farm of the Proposed Submission Local Plan responds to the comments made by Historic England and requires the following:<br/>"Conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings, including Cleve House, with development focussed on the lower parts of the site; and<br/>A layout informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation; and</p>  | <p>12877744945<br/>12877626273<br/>12875601650<br/>12791871089<br/>12877852501</p>   |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID   |
|---|---|--|
| Assuming that the site requirements are intended to form the basis for criteria in a site-specific allocation policy, we consider that they should include the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation (if necessary). However, we welcome the inclusion of other site requirements concerning the retention of existing vegetation, landscaping, and design to reflect local vernacular and conserve the setting of Exeter, especially given the proximity of the site to the grade II* listed Cleve House. This listed building was not recognised in the HELAA and draft Local Plan and given this, we have to query if consideration has been given to potential setting impacts on heritage assets located outside of Teignbridge District. We also consider that the need to conserve and enhance the setting and significance of nearby listed buildings should also be included in the site requirements. | <p>Specific landscaping measures to minimise potential landscape impacts that retain and reinforce the setting of Exeter, as informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and shall avoid development of the upper slopes and ridges of the site.”</p> <p>This is in addition to Policy EN17: Heritage Assets, which sets out the approach to avoiding harmful impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their settings in line with the NPPF. This policy would relate to any development affecting a heritage asset or its setting, including all allocated development sites.</p> <p>Initial concept planning work acknowledges that development will be limited to the lower slopes of the site to protect the setting of Exeter.</p> | <p>12877742596<br/>12877619306<br/>12875593137<br/>12790176185<br/>12877819328<br/>12877719245<br/>12877619663<br/>12875211591<br/>12778502291<br/>12877846347<br/>12877732451<br/>12877617650<br/>12875207384<br/>12765632557<br/>12877835154<br/>12877493050<br/>12877621543<br/>12875200640<br/>12762994373<br/>12877822941<br/>12877708593<br/>12877596881<br/>12870736773<br/>12759687519<br/>12877831294<br/>12877723651<br/>12876257435<br/>12870595464<br/>12757096476<br/>12877784766<br/>12877717395<br/>12877622176<br/>12870412839<br/>12756293284<br/>12877800245<br/>12877711049<br/>12877613536<br/>12870341079<br/>12756229103<br/>12877739254<br/>12877625112<br/>12877614437<br/>12867617435<br/>12756216904<br/>12877794913<br/>12877684599<br/>12877567577</p> |
| Seek opportunities for enhancement of Kinnerton Way CWS and Withycombe Valley Park. Whitycombe Valley Park is immediately adjacent to the proposed allocation. If this site is developed, the northern edge should all be enhanced for biodiversity, to link into the existing valley park and adjacent woodland 'Guywood'. In addition, a substantial area along the stream should be protected as green space, also to protect what appear to be mature trees and hedgerows in this stream valley.  | <p>The policy requires:<br/>“HRA mitigations for Exe Estuary SPA including at least 6 hectares of SANGS to be provided on site including linked green spaces and corridors through the site to connect with Whitycombe Way Valley Park and Kinnerton Way County Wildlife Site; and<br/>Specific ecological mitigations, including retention or addition of trees/hedgerows, provision of buffers from woodland and improvements to naturalise the watercourse.”</p>   |  |
| Make space for water – Step back development far enough from water to enable wildlife corridor and natural processes.   | Initial concept planning work shows the area along the watercourse to be used to create SUDs and green space.   |  |
| Harm to AGLV landscape and Exeter’s landscape setting. Visual prominence. Impact on Exeter Green Circle.<br>A defining character of Exwick is the valley, through which Kinnerton Way runs. These fields not only resemble the final unurbanized areas of the valley they also reside at the head of the valley which extends to the same contour as that of redhills. In context of local views and those more distant views from Cowley, St Davids and part of Pennsylvania the area encapsulated by the red line provides a pleasant green buffer below the horizon line, which gives Exeter, a sense of scale and charm.  | <p>The AGLV designation no longer applies.</p> <p>The concern about impact on the landscape setting of Exeter is acknowledged. The site has been subject to Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and the policy includes a criterion to minimise any harm to landscape character:<br/>“Specific landscaping measures to minimise potential landscape impacts that retain and reinforce the setting of Exeter, as informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and shall avoid development of the upper slopes and ridges of the site”</p>  |  |
| Concern over flooding from storm water run off. Significant excavation required, with mud wash off during construction.   | <p>The policy requires:<br/>“Appropriate flood risk mitigation informed by a flood risk assessment and sustainable drainage strategy.”<br/>And Policy EN6: Flood Risk and Water Quality would ensure that development would not result in flooding on site or elsewhere.</p> <p>In addition, it is likely that development would be subject to a Construction Management Plan as required by planning condition at planning application stage. This would prevent mud run-off from the site.</p>  |  |
| Harm to wildlife, ecology and pollution. Loss of greenfields, trees, hedges.  | <p>The policy requires:<br/>“Specific ecological mitigations, including retention or addition of trees/hedgerows, provision of buffers from woodland and improvements to naturalise the watercourse”.</p> <p>In addition, development would be subject to the suite of wildlife policies in the Plan, along with those preventing pollution of air, water or land.</p>  |  |
| Need for SANGS and Cirl Bunting compensation. Dormouse, bats, owls, sparrow hawks, house martins.   | At least 6 hectares of SANGS is required to be provided. Protection of wildlife is afforded through Policy EN12: Legally Protected and Priority Species.  |  |
| The area between Exwick lane and Kinnerton way, and the whitycombe way valley park should be linked west of Cornflower hill to create a wildlife corridor between the two zones. Against  | Large areas of green infrastructure will be provided as part of the development, which will link to Exwick Lane, Kinnerton Way CWS and Whitycombe Valley Park.  |  |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response   | Respondents' unique ID  |
|---|--|---|
| further houses being placed in that basin - not only is it a very steep north facing hillside terrible for houses, the area could very easily benefit the local populace by planting trees and extending walking paths between the two separate parks. If a strip of land can be isolated west of Cornflower hill 50m wide or so to link up the two recreational areas.   |  | 12863953262<br>12755098092<br>12877725796<br>12877717759  |
| Site in a landscape where prehistoric activity is recorded in the wider area and where little in the way of formal archaeological investigation has been undertaken. There may be localised potential for remains of undesignated assets where topography is not too steep, this is unlikely to affect principle or quantum of development, though it may influence layout.   | The policy requires:<br>"A layout informed by details of archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation".<br><br>Quantum of development has been based on developable areas and would not extend up the higher slopes of the site.  | 12877614148<br>12863868350<br>12754979809<br>12877795768<br>12877698910   |
| Historic landscape setting of the city. Old farm buildings. Old lanes and bridleways. Old trees.  | The policy seeks to protect the setting of the city, requiring:<br>"Specific landscaping measures to minimise potential landscape impacts that retain and reinforce the setting of Exeter, as informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and shall avoid development of the upper slopes and ridges of the site"                        | 12877594430<br>12862380263<br>12754924653<br>12877807257  |
| No historic buildings within sight of this area.  | Noted.   | 12877719674   |
| Too steep and wet to build on. Agricultural land. Will substantially alter the character and rural feel of the area.  | Quantum of development has been based on developable areas and would not extend up the higher steeper slopes of the site.<br>There is insufficient brownfield land that is available and developable, so greenfield development is required to meet the district's development needs.<br>The policy seeks to minimise harm to landscape character. | 12877550911<br>12860157559<br>12754851850<br>12877802410<br>12877710623   |
| Land in Teignbridge and Exeter could take some limited development if considered strategically, and that thinking helps provide wider benefits for residents of Exwick, including green space and better transport options.   | The development would provide large areas of green space and include improved sustainable travel links and a mobility hub.   | 12877591033<br>12850899200<br>12754775829   |
| Would support nature reserve / rewilding or mixed agriculture with public access.   | Large areas of open space will be delivered alongside the development.   | 12877808504   |
| There is insufficient pressure for developers to build on brownfield sites as it is obviously more economically viable for them to build on open land. The council should ensure brownfield sites are developed before digging up more countryside.   | There is insufficient brownfield land that is available and developable, so greenfield development is required to meet the district's development needs.   | 12877702047<br>12877570871<br>12850090517<br>12754761728  |
| Could support this plan if the amount of homes was halved (so 125) and at least half were affordable housing.   | Noted.   | 12877805615   |
| Keep development well below the ridgeline. Lower number of lower density development with large gardens. Rural edge feeling with country park.  | The policy requires development to avoid the upper slopes and ridges of the site.  | 12877709208<br>12877525749  |
| The following specific language should be used:<br>1. Net Zero Regulated Operational Energy, with reductions in regulated energy consumption limited to 35kWh/m2/yr. (prior to renewable generation).<br>2. Embodied carbon to be limited to whatever the current LETI guidance suggests at the time of the development, or 350kgCO2/m2 whichever is lower.<br>3. Any short fall in the developments whole life carbon to be paid to the council at a price no lower than £50/metric ton, but should be around £75/metric ton.<br>4. Local created ecological carbon sinks should be allowed (i.e., planting trees in the basin to offset wider emissions). | The development will be subject to the policies contained within the climate change chapter of the Plan.   | 12849724385<br>12752596284<br>12877800542<br>12875259814<br>12877568223<br>12847575201<br>12752443388<br>12877807101<br>12877688058 |
| 5% of the site as custom build, seems low. Usually, the developer will plot the most difficult and expensive places to build as the custom build plots. Not that this is wrong necessarily but if more of the plots were custom build it would also create for a more varied and interesting neighbourhood.   | There is no evidence to support increasing the percentage of custom build plots required by development, as set out In Policy H6.  | 12877551532<br>12846328749<br>12750562676<br>12877807106  |
| Significant loss of amenity to existing Exwick residents if new housing built, due to loss of green space, walking routes and wildlife. This large site would need to provide particularly good GI including 'pocket parks', wildlife corridors and new and improved walking routes through green space to maintain countryside feel.   | The development would include large areas of public open space, improved sustainable travel links, new play areas and SANGS.   | 12877686002<br>12877556352<br>12844571732<br>12744319484  |

| Summary of comment  | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID  |
|---|---|---|
| Too many houses / don't need more homes. Build on brownfield first.   | The Plan's development Strategy has prioritised brownfield redevelopment, but there is insufficient brownfield land that is available and developable, so greenfield development is required to meet the district's development needs.  | 12877803808<br>12877661677<br>12877551546                                 |
| Housing crises, especially a need for smaller homes and social rented homes.  | Noted. The Plan includes a requirement for social rented properties and a mix of homes that reflect local needs under Policies H2 and H5.   | 12841952128<br>12744044281  |
| Green open spaces for walking / running important for mental and physical health. Exwick lane and Rowhorne Road provide important tranquil rural escapes for all non motorised users.   | Noted. The development will include large areas of public open space, improved sustainable travel links, new play areas and SANGS.  | 12877801496<br>12877672105  |
| Leisure and recreation facilities in the local area are not sufficient to have additional houses  | Noted. The development will include large areas of public open space, new play areas and SANGS.   | 12877543553<br>12834482843  |
| Air and noise Pollution. Hundreds of additional cars on Kinnerton Way and/or Redhills. Increase of traffic passing on Moorland Way.   | The policy requires development to result in the:<br>"Creation of a low traffic neighbourhood built with full site permeability by foot and bicycle."   | 12743978382<br>12877794870  |
| Disruption during construction process.   | The temporary disturbance caused by construction of development can be controlled through a Construction Management Plan.   | 12877511212<br>12877537120  |
| Social services over subscribed. Lack of GP capacity.   | The policy requires development to provide:<br>"Financial contributions to health care infrastructure, as required by the IDP."   | 12793340890<br>12742289233  |
| The reliance on car usage in such an outlying, unconnected development will increase obesity and limit physical activity having a negative impact on public health.   | The policy requires development to be designed around low traffic neighbourhood principles and to be fully permeable by foot and bicycle. Supporting text explains that edge of Exeter development sites aspire to result in 50% movement by sustainable travel modes.  | 12877740880<br>12877659201<br>12877533226                                 |
| Site lies within 500m of a frequent bus stop to Exeter. Should be scope to divert a service into site. 1.5km to Exeter St Davids. Good Proximity - but standard of routes needs enhancement.<br>No one takes buses as they are stuck in the congestion. Bus journeys to the center of town, a 5min drive, can take over 30min. Bus service in the area has actually reduced, and now only 1 line services the area not 2.   | The policy requires:<br>"Extension of existing bus services and provision of new bus stops to serve the new development."   | 12793339796<br>12741225498<br>12877793442<br>12877659505<br>12877536262   |
| The most likely transport access point will be from Kinnerton Way. An additional road access south west towards Redhills would alleviate concerns about vehicle access.<br>Kinnerton way should, given its dimensions, be the main road in and out of this corner of Exwick but is grossly underutilised due to poor highway arrangement between the mini-roundabout and the Village Inn. Resultingly the steep and narrow Moorland Way, Knowle Drive , Fairhazel and Gloucester Road are put under excessive pressure and are noisy and dangerous, to the detriment of children gaining access to Exwick Heights. Access would need to be from Redhills to prevent the current Exwick network from being rendered inoperational. | Noted. Devon County Council Highway Authority has been involved with the writing of the policy, to ensure that highway issues have been addressed. Access from Kinnerton way is supported.  | The comments also includes 45, submitted by email, in post, or in person. |
| Access to the site is constrained due to the lack of crossings over the river/railway line. The level crossing is closed numerous times every hour for trains to pass. Additional vehicle access to west could help alleviate issues at level crossing.   | Noted. Devon County Council Highway Authority has been involved with the writing of the policy, to ensure that highway issues have been addressed. Access from Kinnerton way is supported.  |   |
| Close to public footpaths and cycle paths that connect to neighbouring settlements and Exeter. Comprehensive footpath and cycle access connecting to existing routes are required. (Ideally upgrade of route along Kinnerton Way). Scope to help fund upgrade to Kinnerton way to provide higher quality cycle link from Exwick to Riverside paths.   | The policy requires development to result in the:<br>"Creation of a low traffic neighbourhood built with full site permeability by foot and bicycle."   |   |
| Topography increases car use. Concern over lack of nearby public transport would increase car use, roads towards city centre are already congested.   | The policy requires:<br>"Extension of existing bus services and provision of new bus stops to serve the new development."<br>This is in addition to being fully permeable on foot and by bicycle.   |   |
| Narrow lanes – conflict with walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Exwick lane and Barley Lane totally inappropriate for more traffic. Congestion and parking problems at school drop off / pick up times.  | The access to the site is via Kinnerton Way and should not increase traffic on Exwick Lane to a significant degree.<br>The policy requires an area of land adjacent to Exwick Heights school to be safeguarded for school use. this could include measures to help reduce congestion at drop-off/pick-up times. |   |

| Summary of comment   | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID |
|--|---|------------------------|
| Exwick is completely cut off and the only way through the area is to cut through st Thomas all the way down to the junction at the A377. Only in favor of development if an A30 access were created near Pocombe bridge, or further up Tedburn rd.   | Noted. The Highway Authority has not suggested this as a solution, which would only seek to increase car use.   |                        |
| The road to Whitestone is not fully double track, and already carries a large amount of traffic. The unsustainability of increasing traffic on this road has been a factor in other cases such as the small industrial site at Devon View which was refused.   | The access to the site is via Kinnerton Way and should not increase traffic on Rowhorne Lane to a significant degree. The only vehicular access permitted onto Rowhorne Lane would be for use by emergency vehicles only.   |                        |
| Development would need adequate parking, visitor car park and road widths.   | Noted.  |                        |
| I might support this development if I could see that active travel, a world-class public transport provision and no increase in cars were a certainty.   | The development cannot promise to not increase car use. However, it will be designed around low traffic neighbourhood principles and to be fully permeable by foot and bicycle. Supporting text explains that edge of Exeter development sites aspire to result in 50% movement by sustainable travel modes.                |                        |
| The junctions at the bottom of Exwick at Station Road and Okehampton Street are really busy and difficult for large transport to navigate and dangerous for cyclists. Traffic regularly backs up Redhills from about 7.45am to 9.15am.   | Noted.  |                        |
| The website chapter included a superfluous comment 'Potential road access from the site from Markham's Lane and from the A30 Alphington Road junction' which was not relevant to this site proposal.   | Error is noted and has been corrected.  |                        |
| Concern about lack of nursery and school capacity, including in Exwick Heights Primary. Subject to new link route, the site would be close to Exwick Heights Primary School.   | The policy requires safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle links, having regard to the gradients on the site, with safe crossing links through the site and to Exwick Heights Primary School.   |                        |
| Concern about lack of Secondary school capacity and distance.  | The policy requires:<br>"financial contributions to primary and secondary education including school transport."  |                        |
| Concern about lack of capacity and waiting times in GP surgeries in Exwick and St Thomas.  | The development would need to provide financial contributions towards healthcare, as required by Policy GP7: Infrastructure and Transport Networks.   |                        |
| Concern about lack of capacity in NHS Dentists. 2 year waiting list.   | The development would need to provide financial contributions towards healthcare, as required by Policy GP7: Infrastructure and Transport Networks.   |                        |
| Concern about lack of capacity in RD&E Hospital.   | The development would need to provide financial contributions towards healthcare, as required by Policy GP7: Infrastructure and Transport Networks.   |                        |
| Questions over sewerage capacity.  | Development would be subject to Policy EN6: Flood Risk and Water Quality, which would ensure adequate foul drainage provision.  |                        |
| 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line - it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed.   | Noted. The illustrative concept plan of the site shows the overhead transmission line, which crosses only a small part of the westernmost are of the site. There are no houses shown within this areas, which is shown as new woodland.   |                        |
| SW of site used for offloading bombs in WW2.   | Noted.  |                        |
| This area actually has very poor access to the countryside except via the lanes. Informal 'permissive' access into this land is important for local people.  | Large areas of publicly accessible open space will be provided on site as a result of the development.  |                        |
| Whilst we are all trying to reduce carbon emissions, this development will be hugely counter productive.   | The development will be designed around low traffic neighbourhood principles and to be fully permeable by foot and bicycle. Supporting text explains that edge of Exeter development sites aspire to result in 50% movement by sustainable travel modes.  |                        |
| The Previous TDC Local Plan Inspector raised concerns relating to this site. These remain 'The site forms part of an area of attractive rolling farmland, rightly designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), carried over from the Devon Structure Plan. Exeter CC supports the Council's view that development on the edge of Exeter at this point will have an unacceptably harmful impact on the attractive rural landscape, which contains some steep changes of level. I agree that there would be an adverse impact on the setting of Exeter at this location' | The policy seeks to protect the setting of the city, requiring:<br>"Specific landscaping measures to minimise potential landscape impacts that retain and reinforce the setting of Exeter, as informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and shall avoid development of the upper slopes and ridges of the site" |                        |
| Unfair that Teignbridge are proposing houses in Exeter.  | Noted.  |                        |



| Summary of comment  | Council Response  | Respondents' unique ID |
|---|---|------------------------|
| <p>EA - The site has a watercourse running through the middle (shown on the flood risk for surface water maps). There is also a historical problem associated with poorly constructed culverts downstream that may need improvement (at Medley Court).</p> <p>We assume additional flows will be pumped to Cowley Bridge STW? We have no specific concerns around sewage works or hydraulic capacity of the system here. If flows are to be pumped to Countess Wear STW then additional requirements may be needed.</p> <p>Ditches and watercourses (together with wetland habitat) within the site should be kept as open water habitat and suitable buffer strips should be maintained alongside them. European eel (protected species) likely to be present and will need to be considered in any designs.</p> <p>It is likely that the site will be suitable for residential development (if the requirements can be met). The development of this site may result in enhancement of floodplain and watercourses. There is also an opportunity to provide benefits to the catchment by incorporating Natural Flood Management measures.</p> | <p>All development pays financial contributions towards SWW infrastructure, and it is for SWW to then implement improvement works in accordance with their strategies.</p> <p>The allocation policy, Policy EE4, requires:<br/> “Specific ecological mitigations, including retention or addition of trees/hedgerows, provision of buffers from woodland and improvements to naturalise the watercourse.”</p> |                        |
| <p>Topography is simply too steep for a satisfactory outcome. Keep for country park and nature reserve.</p>   | <p>Large areas of the site will remain undeveloped and will be used to create public open space.</p>  |                        |