

Response to comments made by Parish Councils & Local Residents

Our ref 31297/SSL/JMi
Date July 2017

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 We appreciate the time that residents and the Parish Councils' have taken to review the submitted documentation and provide comments to the submitted planning application.
- 1.2 We have reviewed the responses received from Broadclyst Parish Council (BPC), Clyst Honiton Parish Council (CHPC), Cranbrook Town Council (CTC), Rockbeare Parish Council (RPC) (referred to collectively as the PC's below) and comments made by individual residents.
- 1.3 This note aims to respond to the key issues raised and highlights where amendments to the scheme have now been made to respond to these comments. The responses have a number of common themes and we therefore seek to respond to the comments raised on a topic by topic basis below.

2.0 The Key Issues

The Railhead

- 2.1 Parties have raised the fact that the railhead that was proposed on land partly within and partly outside the application red line to the west of the site boundary is no longer being proposed.
- 2.2 It is appreciated that there is a long history to this site and the local community were expecting a Railhead to be provided as part of the wider 'Exeter Gateway' scheme.
- 2.3 However, following evidence provided at the Local Plan Examination the independently appointed Inspector concluded that *"there seems to be no realistic prospect of a railhead being established at the site allocated in the Plan and safeguarding land for a railhead could blight the prospects of the remainder of the land allocated under Strategy 15 for warehouse and distribution uses"*.
- 2.4 Given that goods would need to be transported to and from a railhead facility, in terms of HGV movements in the locality it has been assessed that the traffic movements will not be considerably different. Indeed, the floorspace now proposed was modelled within the Phase 1 evidence and, while the Transport Assessment submitted with Phase 2 recognises an increase in floorspace, this has been found to be acceptable by both the Highways Agency and Devon County Council.
- 2.5 RPC in particular express concern that the original plan for the railhead had provided for a sum of money to be payable to the four adjoining Parishes. We are unsure what payment is being referred to. CIL is not payable on employment development in East Devon and, therefore, while the community may have benefited through CIL payment on other schemes, this is not applicable on this site.
- 2.6 In terms of benefits to the community, the Church Commissioners are working with the Council to prepare a S106 agreement which will include appropriate mitigation for the proposed

development. However, any contributions paid must be in line with the CIL Regulation tests i.e. a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- 1 necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- 2 directly related to the development; and
- 3 fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Transport and Highways

- 2.7 The PC's and local residents have raised concern regarding the increased levels of traffic that the proposed development will have on the local road network.
- 2.8 When the Exeter Gateway Phase 1 land (now being developed by Lidl) was granted planning permission for B8 development (65,757 sq. m) the Transport Assessment at the time made an assumption of an additional 86,000 sq. m of B8 development on the Phase 2 site and the bypass was designed on this basis. In affect, therefore, the only additional impact to be considered is the additional B8 floorspace (up to a maximum additional 24,000 sq. m).
- 2.9 The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application concludes that the development is acceptable from a traffic and transport perspective and this has been scrutinised by both Highways England and Devon County Council and found to be acceptable.
- 2.10 Other points raised:
- 1 **Driverless cars:** the TA does not refer to driverless cars. Whilst it is accepted that this is an emerging technology the wider impacts are unknown at the current time and for the purposes of the TA it is considered more robust to base assumptions on the present day situation.
 - 2 **Bus stop / shelters:** The existing bus stop provision has recently been improved with an additional bus stop between the proposed site entrance and the Lidl entrance. In addition, bus frequency between Cranbrook and Exeter is expected to shorten as Cranbrook is further developed. The site is within walking distance of Cranbrook Rail Station and it is hoped that the provision of future foot and cycle way links will improve and shorten this distance even further, making it a viable transport option.
 - 3 **Pedestrian bridge to Skypark:** a toucan crossing is proposed which is considered to be an acceptable arrangement. A pedestrian bridge is not proposed.
 - 4 **Travel Plans:** A travel plan has been prepared and submitted with the application. In addition, subject to further discussion with the Council, the S106 agreement may include a requirement for a Travel Plan Coordinator.

Access

- 2.11 Access to the site will be taken from London Road via a signalised junction. The infrastructure for the signalised junction is already in place having been implemented as part of the highway works to introduce the Clyst Honiton Bypass. To complete the junction signal heads, poles and associated connections need to be made and once done the access will operate as part of a four arm staggered arrangement with the southern arm providing access to Skypark. A toucan crossing will be introduced across the site access as part of the scheme proposals.

- 2.12 Whilst the planning application for the scheme is in outline, a series of sustainable highway design principles have been applied and will be introduced as part of the scheme development, these are:
- A development spine road incorporating a 3m wide shared foot / cycleway on either side of the carriageway.
 - A 10m strip of land left clear running east / west along the northern boundary to enable Devon County Council to introduce a future cycle link.
 - Continuous foot / cycle link between London Road and buffer to be provided along the northern boundary.

- 2.13 It is understood that the Council are in discussion with Stagecoach to assess opportunities for increasing bus travel to this employment area. Contributions towards sustainable transport measures may be captured through the S106 agreement if justified.

Flooding / Drainage

- 2.14 The PC's have queried the site's flood risk status. To confirm, the north of the site is within flood risk zones 2 and 3 and therefore has a 1 in100 year risk of flooding. See below plan from the EA:



- 2.15 However, as stated within the Planning Statement, all proposed development will be located in Flood Zone 1 defined by the EA as having less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding.
- 2.16 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment prepared by WYG (as amended July 2017) calculates that between 3,366m³ and 9,972 m³ of attenuation is required for the 100 year event (plus 40% allowance for climate change) under scenario 1 and between 3,613 m³ and 11,061m³ of attenuation under scenario 2. As such, the storage devices proposed will be sized for the worst case scenario under each development option.
- 2.17 In addition, as surface water discharge to the site will be achieved through infiltration rather than greenfield run-off, betterment on the current situation is expected. As such, the proposals will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

2.18 South West Water has not objected to the proposals in terms of foul discharges.

Environmental Matters

2.19 The key points raised and our response are:

- 1 **Requirement for Green Roofs:** The Airport has objected to the use of green roofs at the site due to the fact that they can be bird attractants. However, discussion is ongoing with the Council and it might be that there is scope for some of the smaller buildings on the site (bike stores, gatehouse etc.) to include green roofs. This will be considered at the Reserved Matters stage and through the preparation of a Design Code for the site.
- 2 **Bee Hives:** While bee hives are not proposed, both bat and bird boxes will be provided in appropriate locations across the site.
- 3 **More Green Planting:** A Green Infrastructure Plan has been prepared in support of the application which provides additional information on the proposed landscaping. This has been agreed in conjunction with the Council's Landscape Officer.
- 4 **Provision of Wildlife Corridors:** Landscape buffer planting is proposed to all boundaries. Buffer planting is to be a minimum of 10 metres width to the western boundary and 20 metres width around the wider site area. These buffer areas (excluding the western boundary) will also maintain dark flight corridors for bats.
- 5 **Building materials:** The PC's request that the colour of the building materials should be sympathetic and in keeping with the surrounding area. In response, it has been agreed with the Council that a design code for the site will be prepared prior to the submission of the first Reserved Matters application. The PC's will have further opportunity to comment as and when detailed applications are submitted.
- 6 **Presence of Bats:** Bat surveys have been undertaken and appropriate mitigation (including bat boxes and dark flight corridors) is proposed. This is detailed within ES Chapter I (Ecology).
- 7 **Mature Planting:** The Council has requested the retention and enhancement of advanced mitigation landscaping within the site (undertaken as part of Exeter Gateway Phase 1) to offset visual impact, particularly during construction. Details are provided on the revised landscaping plans.
- 8 **Water contamination:** Mitigation measures will be put in place to ensure no contamination of the water environment.

Noise and Light Pollution

2.20 The PC's and local residents are concerned that there will be noise disturbance, particularly to properties located to the east both during construction and operation.

2.21 When assessed individually, operational noise levels at nearby residential dwellings (the closest being at Station Road and Waterslade Lane); from all proposed noise sources associated with the development would be within the World Health Organisation / British Standards (WHO/BS) 8233 criteria with windows open.

2.22 When all proposed noise sources are assessed together, operational noise levels within nearby residential dwellings are also within the appropriate WHO/BS standards criteria with windows open. All residential receptors are predicted to meet the external target level of 50 – 55 dB for gardens and private external spaces which is acceptable.

- 2.23 A noise change assessment has also been undertaken which shows that the change in ambient LAeq noise levels as a result of the scheme are considered to be within the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level at surrounding residences. The change in ambient LAeq noise levels as a result of the proposed development are considered not to be significant at any representative receptors during the both the daytime and night-time. In addition, the proposed plant rating noise levels are predicted to be at least 5-10 dB below existing daytime and night time background noise level.
- 2.24 However, the noise assessment demonstrates that, although absolute noise levels from the proposed scheme are expected to be within the relevant criteria, when a worst case scenario is adopted, noise from the adjacent Lidl scheme could mean that there is potential for some night time noise disturbance to properties located to the east of the site (Station Road) if Scenario 1 were delivered.
- 2.25 Thus, in order to reduce the noise levels at or within the WHO/BS noise intrusion criteria at all receptors at night, under this worst case scenario a 4.0m high barrier would need to be included. If such a barrier were required, it would likely run along the north-eastern extent of the service yard area (see plan ref 6005-047) of the largest unit on Scenario 1. However, to establish the need, a condition will be attached to the outline permission requiring additional noise modelling to be undertaken at the detailed planning stage.
- 2.26 The same process was also undertaken for Scenario 2. However, the multi-unit scheme does not experience the same problems as the vehicle movements are focused towards the centre of the site, and there is greater screening provided by the units themselves with respect to the proposed scheme and the Lidl scheme.
- 2.27 As such, under this scenario, no acoustic barrier is likely to be required subject to further assessment at the reserved matters stage.
- 2.28 In reality, it is likely that noise from the Lidl scheme and across the development site will be less than allowed for in the noise assessment for both scenarios tested. As such, additional noise modelling and assessment will need to be undertaken at the reserved matters stage when details of the scheme and occupiers are known in order to determine the nature and scale of mitigation required. This requirement will be conditioned on the outline consent.
- 2.29 Overall it is considered that appropriate mitigation can be delivered, and required by way of conditions, to overcome any impacts from noise at both the construction and operational stages.
- 2.30 Residents have suggested the use of bunds but unfortunately the land take required would not make this a feasible prospect. As such, should noise mitigation be required, this would be achieved through orientation of the units, landscaping and/or an acoustic barrier.
- 2.31 The Environmental Health officer has also recommended a condition for a further noise assessment to be carried out within one month of operation of the site to ensure that the conclusion and recommendations have been met and complied with.
- 2.32 The site is to have 'dark corridors' to the north, south and east boundaries. While this has clear ecological benefits, it will also minimise light spill to neighbouring properties.

Employment

- 2.33 The socio-economic chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter E) demonstrates that the number of jobs that are expected to be created by the development will depend upon the specific

mix of land uses but it is broadly considered that the development could generate between 1,530 and 1,817 jobs.

2.34 In addition, it is estimated that the new jobs at the proposed development could generate an additional 673-799 indirect and induced jobs in the South West, of which 444-527 will be concentrated in East Devon.

2.35 In terms of local employment, EDDC has requested adherence to the Construction Industry Training Board's Client Based Approach for construction projects over £1 million in value. This requirement will be captured through the S106 agreement.

Parking

2.36 It is acknowledged that there are known issues with existing operators in the area who do not allow their 'owner-drivers' to park their vehicles on site over-night. From speaking to these operators, this appears to be related to liability and insurance issues rather than physical space.

2.37 CCE will work closely with the Council to consider how such an issue can be avoided at the site, but would note that the issues are more complicated than simply providing additional parking at the site.

2.38 Based on the two scheme scenarios, in order to be compliant with policy, the parking provision would be between one space per 170sq.m and one space per 200sq.m of floorspace. As part of the site parking provision, a minimum of two spaces will incorporate an electric charging point.

Landscaping

2.39 The PC's consider the proposed 20 metre landscaping strip on the Southern edge to be too narrow. Additional information has been prepared and submitted to support the landscaping proposals and it is considered that the buffers proposed are sufficient.

2.40 The revised plans and Supplementary Environmental Statement Chapter 5 for additional information refers to this.

2.41 Existing trees are to be retained where possible and advanced planting is now proposed to assist with limiting visual impact from day one.

Air Quality

2.42 The PC's have raised concern over air quality. An air quality assessment was prepared in support of the application and this has since been updated within the Supplementary ES (see Chapter 11).

2.43 At the request of the Environmental Health officer, additional modeling for a future year of 2033 was undertaken to see how the changes in traffic flows as a result of the development may affect the air quality levels. The effects of the development on predicted NO₂ and PM₁₀ levels remain negligible. The proposed development will not be detrimental to Human health.