

ADDENDUM TO JSPA BACKGROUND PAPER No. 2

ASSESSMENT OF SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS FOR URBAN EXTENSIONS TO THE EXETER PUA

May 2003

Contents

1. Scope and Content.....	35
2. Background.....	35
3. Analysis of strategic constraints and identification of development Options.....	36
4. General Assessment set out in the JSPA Background Paper	36
5. Assessment of Specific Development Locations	37
A : The Pinhoe area.....	38
B : Sowton / Redhayes area.....	40
C : A30 / Waterloo line corridor area.....	42
6. Assessment against strategic sustainable development criteria	44
7. Overall Strategic Conclusions.....	45
Appendix I : Extent of development constraints affecting the Exeter PUA	46
Appendix II : Summary Matrix.....	47
Appendix III : Indicative assessment criteria	48

ADDENDUM TO JSPA BACKGROUND PAPER No. 2

ASSESSMENT OF SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS FOR URBAN EXTENSIONS TO THE EXETER PUA

1. Scope and Content

1.1 This paper summarises the Joint Structure Plan Authorities' (JSPA) assessment of alternative options for strategic development at the Exeter PUA. In doing so it focuses on a number of key strategic criteria and represents a more detailed comparison of specific development alternatives. The analysis builds on detailed work undertaken in preparing the Background Papers published in July 2002.

Appendix I : illustrates the extent of development constraints affecting the Exeter PUA
Appendix II : sets out a comparative summary of the assessments undertaken
Appendix III : sets out the basis for the indicative assessment

2. Background

2.1 In assessing development options as part of the Alteration the JSPAs were able to draw on a substantial amount of analysis and assessment undertaken for the preparation of the adopted Structure Plan – and the conclusions reached by the Panel following the previous EIP. This analysis has also been supplemented, since 1997, by more detailed work undertaken by both the District Councils and the Strategic Planning Authorities in developing specific proposals as set out in the Local Plans for East Devon and South Hams. This process has involved the assessment of specific options through a Local Plan Issues consultation process and detailed work undertaken in developing First Deposit versions of the Local Plans for the period to 2011.

2.2 Notwithstanding all of this existing and ongoing work, the JSPAs have been keen to undertake further assessment of all suggested development options as part of the Alteration process, so as to ensure that the reasoning behind their conclusions relating to the proposed development distribution in each area are clear. This paper therefore sets out a more focused assessment of broad development locations, undertaken in the context of the specific representations made on the Deposit Structure Plan.

2.3 The analysis of strategic constraints undertaken in preparing the Deposit version of the Structure Plan Alteration identified a number of absolute constraints, such as location within a National Park or AONB, and therefore precluded a limited number of areas close to the existing Exeter PUA boundary from consideration as potential urban extension locations.

2.4 A number of other locations, while not specifically precluded at this first stage, were also rejected on the basis of topography (suitability for development / physical isolation) or inaccessibility.

2.5 Remaining options were identified north east of the existing PUA (Pinhoe area) and to the east of the existing PUA within the A30 / Waterloo rail line corridor. These options broadly correspond to specific alternatives suggested by objectors to the Deposit Plan. A further site (at Redhayes / Sowton) has been proposed for employment development.

2.6 Background Paper No 2 published alongside the Deposit Plan in July 2002 (the Exeter PUA Study) set out the conclusions of the strategic assessment of these options and identified the A30 / Waterloo line corridor area as the most sustainable option. This strategic conclusion was supported through the Deposit version of the East Devon Local Plan following consultation on an Issues document.

2.7 This paper sets out a more focused assessment of three specific locations for potential development, undertaken in the context of the specific representations made on the Deposit Structure Plan. It has confirmed clear strategic advantages for the development of the A30 / Waterloo line corridor area, as shown in Diagram 7 of the 'Pre EIP Changes to the Deposit Structure Plan', in terms of achieving the most sustainable development pattern.

3. Analysis of Strategic Constraints and Identification of Development Options.

3.1 The main constraints affecting the Exeter PUA area are illustrated in Appendix I. It shows the extent of the East Devon AONB, and the extensive areas of land both within and close to the existing PUA subject to flood risk.

3.2 The map also shows the extent of local landscape designations (AGLV) relating to the Haldon area and the extent of the areas of high quality agricultural land to the north and east of the City are also defined.

3.3 The map also indicates the extent of the main areas subject to noise constraints arising from the operation of Exeter Airport (take off / landing noise). There is an additional area of noise constraint resulting from engine ground testing carried out within the Airport site. The location of this testing facility is not a fixed point and the noise thresholds will vary according to location (see separate diagram).

3.4 In the context of the extent of absolute constraints, the map attached as Appendix I illustrates the remaining options for sustainable strategic development close to the PUA :

North East of the City

A : Pinhoe area

East of the PUA

B : Sowton / Redhayes area

C : A30 / Waterloo rail line corridor area

4. General Assessment set out in the JSPA Background Paper

4.1 North and West of the PUA

"There is no scope for major urban extension to the north or west of the PUA..."

4.2 East of the Exeter PUA

"While there is physical potential to accommodate some development it would be difficult to for this to function as a cohesive urban extension and it would therefore have deficiencies in terms of sustainability – in providing local facilities, access to strategic facilities and community development.

A major extension to the north east (Pinhoe area) would necessitate development beyond the natural physical boundaries of the PUA and would represent a major intrusion in to the rural hinterland. This approach must therefore be assessed against the alternatives available further to the east of the PUA..."

4.3 The A30 / Waterloo line corridor area (the EDDC Local Plan new community area)

“Further development at the proposed new community within East Devon District is likely to offer the most sustainable approach for the accommodation of development outside of the PUA ..”

4.4 The overall conclusion arising from the JSPA Exeter PUA Study was that :

“there are no sustainable locations for a major urban extension to the existing PUA.....the further extension of the new community within East Devon offers the greatest scope for sustainable development”.

5. Assessment of Specific Development Locations

5.1 The following sections of this paper set out the strategic conclusions reached by the JSPAs in respect of each of the specific development options identified as a result of the consultation processes undertaken.

Assessment Criteria :

5.2 The following strategic criteria have been used as the basis for assessing alternative locations for major strategic development.

- Landscape and other constraints
 - impact on the landscape – strategic and local
 - physical and other constraints – minerals, agricultural land, topography
- Effective links to the PUA
 - effective links to urban transport networks – pedestrian, cycling, car / bus
 - access to the strategic road and rail network
- Access to employment and other facilities – existing and planned
- Realising the potential for sustainable transport access and modal choice
- Delivering self containment and local facility provision
- Effective implementation and longer term development potential

5.3 These strategic criteria can also be related to policies and proposals as set out in the draft Alteration version of the Structure Plan (as amended by the pre EIP Changes).

Landscape and other constraints

- Policy ST1 : Policy Criterion 2 protecting environmental assets*
Policy ST12 : Policy Criteria 1 and 2: landscape assimilation and agricultural land
Policy CO14 : Conserving agricultural land
Policy CO16 : Development and noise
Policy MN1 : Conserving mineral deposits

Effective links to the PUA and strategic transport networks

- Policy ST1 : Policy Criterion 5 developing sustainable transport systems*
Policy ST4 : Capacity of existing infrastructure
Policy ST12 : Policy Criteria 3,4 and 5 relating to Exeter, early road based public transport and access to the Exeter / Waterloo rail line
Policy TR2 : Reducing the need to travel and interaction with other land uses
Policy TR7 : Walking and cycling networks
Policy TR10 : Strategic Road Network

Accessing employment and other facilities

- Policy ST1* : Policy Criterion 3 meeting employment needs in accessible locations
Proposal ST19 : Access to strategic employment sites
Policy TR2 : Reducing the need to travel and interaction with other land uses

Delivering self containment and local facility provision

- Policy ST1* : Policy Criterion 3 meeting employment needs in accessible locations
Policy ST3 : Providing a range of local facilities

Realising the potential for sustainable transport access and modal choice

- Policy ST1* : Policy Criterion 5 developing sustainable transport systems
Policy TR2 : Reducing the need to travel and interaction with other land uses
Policy TR7 : Pedestrian and cycle networks
Policy TR9 : Major development in locations accessible to public transport

Effective implementation and longer term development potential

- Policy ST5* : Bulk of development at the PUAs
Proposal ST12 : Capability to develop beyond the current plan period

5.3a Appendices II and III set out an indicative framework against which it is possible to measure the characteristics of each potential development location on a comparative basis. In doing so the criteria have been weighted in order to reflect whether they are considered to be critical or essential for the achievement of sustainable development (3), important for its achievement (2) or desirable (1).

A : The Pinhoe area

Impact on the Landscape

5.4 The area is remote from any existing National Park and AONB designations. Similarly there are no AGLVs close to this area. While the major part of the area is low lying, development on the higher land in the south of the site would be prominent from an extensive rural area to the north and north east.

5.5 The Deposit version of the East Devon Local Plan has however indicated that the Pinhoe area falls within a “Green Wedge” area which should be protected from development in order to “*..safeguard the countryside from encroachment and preserve the setting of Exeter.*” Within the City boundary the high ridge land between the existing PUA and the Pinhoe area is identified in the emerging Exeter Local Plan Review as being “*of major landscape significance, providing the largest and most important part of the landscape setting and containment of the City, which is essential to its character.*”

Physical and other constraints

5.6 The area lies immediately to the north east of the existing PUA. To the west of the B3181 the area is separated from the existing built up area by a high, steep ridge, with the eastern boundary of the area defined by the M5 and the floodplain of the Clyst Valley. While there are no major physical barriers to the north of the area, there is a significant secondary ridge of higher land running west from the M5, south of the Poltimore House estate which forms a partial visual boundary from the north.

5.7 A substantial part of the area to the east of the B3181, would be affected by significant levels of traffic / road noise from the more elevated sections of the M5.

5.8 Almost all of the area immediately to the north and north east of the existing Pinhoe part of the PUA is a mix of Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land. There are no mineral deposits within the area.

Effective links to urban transport networks

5.9 That part of the Pinhoe area immediately to the west of the M5 is directly adjacent to the existing PUA, but the high ridge further to the west would restrict the development of effective links into the northern parts of the existing built up area. The area could be accessed from the B3181 from the east of Exeter but, while it would be physically possible to provide a second access from the west this would require major investment and would not directly access the existing PUA networks. The B3181 is therefore the only main route linking the area into the existing PUA. While this route has capacity to accommodate some additional movement, there is very limited physical scope for any capacity improvement within Pinhoe itself and on the highway network serving the City. Any new development of a strategic scale to the north east of the PUA would therefore place major demands on the highway network in the eastern part of Exeter which there are no clear means of accommodating satisfactorily.

5.10 Public transport would also need to use the B3181 corridor into the City and, on parts of this corridor, there is limited scope to achieve any degree of public transport priority in the absence of major investment. The area would however be served by existing bus routes between Exeter and Cullompton / Mid Devon.

Access to Strategic road and rail networks

5.11 The strategic road network is defined in the Deposit version of the Alteration. The Pinhoe area has no direct access to this network and links to it would be either to the north (junction 28 on the M5) via the B3181 or to the south via the B3181 indirectly accessing the A30 and M5 at Junctions 29 and 30, recognising that southbound traffic from within Exeter is not provided for at Junction 29 with consequent additional pressures at Junction 30. There would therefore need to be major investment to provide a new access route from the Pinhoe area into the PUA and to address major consequent road capacity implications for major junctions such as those Moor Lane and Junction 29 on the M5.

5.12 The B3181 access to Junction 28 on the M5 would involve passing through Cullompton where there are already problems of congestion at peak hours, and concerns about levels of through traffic. There are currently no viable proposals to overcome this constraint.

5.13 To the south, access to Junction 29 would require passing through the constraints affecting the existing Pinhoe area and impact on the capacity of the Junction itself and its immediate approach routes. These approach routes will need to be improved, as envisaged in Proposal TR17, in order to accommodate current major development in the east of the City (Met Office and Exeter Business Park), and there will be limited capacity to accommodate substantial additional flows without further enhancement.

5.14 It is not considered possible to provide a practicable link to the west of the M5. The only other possible solution to the constraints on the B3181 to the south of the area appears to involve the construction of a major new route passing under the M5 to the east of area, re-crossing the M5 and linking to the Monkerton area of Exeter. This represents a major level of investment which would need to be funded entirely by any development. The road network in the east of Exeter is already congested at peak times and there is insufficient capacity to accommodate any significant traffic growth, such as that generated by major development feeding into this sector of the City. Although a link road is planned to pass through the Monkerton area (the Monkerton Link Road), the capacity of the improved junction between the southern end of this link road and Moor Lane will be fully taken up by development anticipated within the eastern part of Exeter. There would also need to be some form of highly effective traffic management on the B3181 to prevent additional traffic from using this route, but this would have implications for internal movement within the north eastern sector of the urban area.

5.15 There is no direct rail access from the area although the site lies close to the Exeter / Waterloo rail line. The nearest access point at Pinhoe station is not well used and is unlikely to provide a significant contribution to the accommodation of trips from the area – given its relative proximity to the City Centre and the difficulties associated with modal change on relatively short trip lengths. Service frequency could be improved along this line subject to the provision of an additional passing loop between Exeter and Honiton.

Accessing employment and other facilities

5.16 The Pinhoe area would be relatively remote from City centre employment (4km) and the Exeter Airport / Skypark employment location (3km) but would be reasonably close to the Sowton / Exeter Business Park employment site. Access to this area would however again be via the constrained B3181 corridor and this constraint would need to be overcome to achieve an effective link between the area and these employment opportunities. Other employment centres in the west of the PUA, such as those at Marsh Barton, would be remote from the area and require access via congested sections of the urban road network including the Countess Weir junction.

5.17 The southern part of the area would be relatively close to existing facilities in north eastern Exeter – at the existing Pinhoe area and the retail store further to the west.

Realising the potential for sustainable transport development and modal choice

5.18 It has already been noted that the potential for rail use from the area is extremely limited, and in view of the constraints on the B3181 it is considered that there is little scope for achieving high levels of bus access from this area using the existing highway network. The physical constraints to the B3181 mean that it has no potential for establishing public transport priority in the Pinhoe area. Some increase in existing bus services could be accommodated but in the absence of substantial investment in major new infrastructure, bypassing the constraints within the B3181 corridor, the Pinhoe area would be unable to meet sustainable transport objectives.

Delivering self containment and local facility provision

5.19 The scale of potential development that could be accommodated in the area, setting aside any other constraints, could support a level of local provision for education or other community / social facilities. A degree of self containment would therefore be achievable with scope to make use of existing secondary education facilities (at Broadclyst) to the east of the area.

5.20 The physical characteristics of the area could allow for employment development but in view of the restricted access to the area from the strategic road and rail network, it is considered that the area would not be well placed to accommodate or attract any major employment development. Some small scale employment arising from mixed development would however be achievable.

Effective implementation and longer term development potential

5.21 The physical capacity of the Pinhoe area to accommodate residential / mixed development is considerable – but only if major constraints to accessibility both by car and public transport can be overcome. As the scale of development increases, the inability of the area to accommodate major employment opportunity within the immediate vicinity becomes more significant with consequent increasing need to travel from the area.

5.22 A limited level of development could be accommodated in the area without compromising identified transport and landscape constraints, but larger scale development would be dependent on the prior completion of major infrastructure investment. Such development might be seen as ~~competing~~ completing the existing Pinhoe / Monkerton settlement, recognising the boundaries provided by the M5 and B3181, without imposing upon the landscape on this important northern approach to Exeter.

B : Sowton / Redhayes area

Impact on the Landscape

5.23 The area is remote from any existing National Park and AONB designations. Similarly there are no AGLVs close to this area.

5.24 The Deposit version of the East Devon Local Plan, however, indicated that the Sowton / Redhayes area falls within a Green Wedge area which should be protected from development to “...safeguard the countryside from encroachment and preserve the setting of Exeter..”

Physical and other constraints

5.25 The area includes predominantly Grade 1 agricultural land in the centre / south with some Grade 2 land north of the A30. The extreme eastern margins of the area in the vicinity of the A30 lie within the area where development would be affected by noise from the operation of Exeter Airport.

5.26 The area lies between the M5 and the Clyst Valley floodplain and is crossed by the A30 Trunk Road. In the north the area includes fairly high ground with a ridge running east / west, while the south of the area is prominent from the east except for that part immediately adjacent to Junction 29 on the M5. The northern boundary of the area is defined by floodplain and the Exeter –Waterloo rail line. The southern boundary of the area is also defined by the Clyst Valley floodplain.

5.27 The Sowton / Redhayes area would have limited capacity for sustainable and cohesive residential development – even if all of its theoretical potential was to be taken up both to the north and south of the A30. The potential of the site for residential development would be further reduced if the more prominent high land to the north of the east / west ridge line were to be excluded on landscape grounds.

Effective links to urban transport networks

5.28 The Sowton / Redhayes area would be accessed from the existing and / or former A30 and in the absence of additional investment public transport would need to use this corridor to link into the City and to employment opportunities to the east (Skypark / Airport). Links into existing PUA transport networks would need to use the A30 via junction 29 but in the north of the area there is also a potential link across the M5 into the Monkerton area of Exeter. This could form an effective link into the existing and proposed networks within the eastern part of the PUA.

5.29 There is potential to provide for a new highway link the Redhayes area to the east of Exeter (and the proposed Monkerton Link road) via the existing M5 overbridge. This new link would assist traffic distribution in the area and reduce the impact of development on the network in the vicinity of Junction 29 on the M5.

Access to Strategic road and rail networks

5.30 The strategic road network is defined in the Deposit version of the Alteration. The Sowton / Redhayes area has potential direct access to this network - linking to it would be either to the A30 which crosses the area and to junction 29 on the M5. Additional traffic using the A30 and the M5 junction would add to existing pressures on these parts of the strategic network.

5.31 The A30 dualling was completed in 1999 and there have also been more recent major improvements to Junction 29 on the M5. Despite this recent investment, the highway network in the vicinity of Junction 29 does not have substantial remaining capacity and there has already been major development in the area. There is however scope for further improvement to the approach roads to Junction 29 and the links from the A30 into the Exeter road network.

5.32 There is no direct rail access from the area although the site lies to the south of the Exeter / Waterloo rail line. The nearest access point at Pinhoe station is not well used and is unlikely to provide a significant contribution to the accommodation of trips from the area. There is limited potential for a new station in this location – given its relative proximity to the existing and proposed stations to the west and east respectively.

Accessing employment and other facilities

5.33 The Sowton / Redhayes area would be well related to the main employment centres on the eastern side of the PUA, including Sowton, the Exeter Business Park, the Inter Modal Rail Freight Facility (IMRFT), Exeter Airport and the proposed strategic employment site at Skypark.

5.34 Other employment centres in the west of the PUA, such as those at Marsh Barton, would be more remote from the area and require access via congested sections of the urban road network including the Countess Weir junction or via the M5 / A30.

5.35 The Sowton / Redhayes area would be separated from the existing PUA by the M5 but could have links back into the existing built up area via the A30 and the existing M5 crossing in the north.

Realising the potential for sustainable transport development and modal choice

5.36 While there is limited potential for rail use from the area, there is considerable potential to extend existing public transport, walking and cycling networks from the built up area into the site - with potential on the A30 corridor to introduce additional bus priority measures. Should development also take place further to the east in the A30 / Waterloo line corridor area, this area would increase the viability and effectiveness of this corridor as a primary public transport link between Exeter and Exeter Airport / Skypark / IMRFT (and the new community).

Delivering self containment and local facility provision

5.37 The physical characteristics of the area would allow for significant employment development but parts of the area would be prominent from the rural areas to the north and east. The northern part of the area would have considerable advantages as a strategic employment location, given its proximity to the M5 and A30 and to recent investment at the Met Office and London Electricity, and this conclusion is understood to be confirmed by the study undertaken into the possible location of a Science Park at the Exeter PUA (report due to be finalised in early May).

5.38 The scale of residential development possible within the area would however be limited – particularly given the visual prominence of the southern and northern most parts of the area. This limited scale of residential development potential would make it difficult to provide viable local services and facilities and would be likely to achieve a poor level of self containment.

Effective implementation and longer term development potential

5.39 The characteristics of the area make it difficult to achieve a sustainable level of residential development and even in the longer term the scale of possible development is constrained by definitive constraints related to floodplains.

5.40 Subject to effective access arrangements being secured to the A30 and / or M5 the area could however have significant potential for employment development – this assessment is addressed separately in the Science Park Study.

C : A30 / Waterloo line corridor area

Impact on the Landscape

5.41 The area is remote from any existing National Park and AONB designations. Similarly there are no AGLVs close to this area.

In this context the 1997 Devon EIP Panel report conclude that this area had *‘sufficient scope for new development to be assimilated into a landscape which does not carry national designations and which by Devon standards is unremarkable’*.

Physical and other constraints

5.42 The area lies to the east of the Exeter PUA and the Clyst Valley flood plain to the east of the Sowton / Redhayes area. The corridor is defined by the Airport / A30 to the south and by the Exeter/ Waterloo rail line and further flood plain to the north close to the rail line.

5.43 There are noise constraints related to the Airport to the south of the area – both operational and that related to engine testing. Operational noise impact is however contained within the boundaries of Exeter Airport itself and does not directly affect A30 / Waterloo line corridor.

5.44 The area includes a limited amount of Grade 2 agricultural on the northern and western margins of the area.

Effective links to urban transport networks

5.45 The A30 / Waterloo line corridor area is detached from the existing Exeter PUA and would have no immediate local links into existing urban transport networks – other than via the strategic road and rail network. These strategic networks do however have the potential to provide high quality public transport links from the area into the existing PUA. The completion of the new A30 has resulted in the release of a degree of capacity on the former A30 route which could be used for the provision of road based public transport. There is capacity on the existing Exeter / Waterloo rail line to accommodate an increased frequency of service provision subject to the provision of additional dual track / passing capacity within the Exeter / Honiton section.

Access to Strategic road and rail networks

5.46 The strategic road network is defined in the Deposit version of the Alteration. The A30 / Waterloo line corridor area has potential indirect but close access to this network - linking to the A30 to the south west (Exeter Airport junction) and east via the former A30.

5.47 The A30 dualling was completed in 1999 and there have also been more recent major improvements to Junction 29 on the M5. Despite this recent investment, the new A30 and Junction 29 do not have substantial remaining capacity and there has been major development in the vicinity. There is however scope for further improvement to the approach roads to Junction 29 and the links from the A30 into the Exeter road network.

5.48 There is potential for direct rail access from the area (to the Exeter / Waterloo rail line) and technical studies commissioned by Devon County Council, have indicated that a new station could be constructed in a location that would provide immediate access to the area.

Accessing employment and other facilities

5.49 The A30 / Waterloo line corridor area would be well related to existing employment opportunities at Exeter Airport and its associated employment development, and it would also be adjacent both to the strategic employment proposal at Skypark and the proposed Inter Modal Rail Freight Facility / Freight Distribution Centre to the west of the area. It would also have good accessibility to the major employment opportunities at the Exeter Business Park, the Met Office and the existing Sowton industrial estate. Access to these areas would involve using the A30 and junction 29 on the M5 and capacity / public transport priority issues at this junction would need to be addressed.

5.50 Other employment centres in the west of the PUA, such as those at Marsh Barton, would be more remote from the area and require access via congested sections of the urban road network including the Countess Weir junction or via the M5 / A30.

Realising the potential for sustainable transport development and modal choice

5.51 In view of the potential offered by the Exeter / Waterloo rail line and the capacity along the former A30 route there is considerable potential for modal choice and the development of public transport links between the area and the existing PUA. Studies have confirmed that, in technical terms, a new station can be accommodated on this rail line in this vicinity and that the provision of services would be viable from an operational viewpoint.

5.52 Proximity to the Airport and Skypark employment sites would allow for pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to be provided between the development area and these locations.

5.53 Notwithstanding its detached location relative to the existing PUA, the A30 / Waterloo line corridor area is therefore likely to perform well in terms of meeting sustainable transport objectives. The corridor between the potential development area, the Airport, Skypark, the inter Modal Freight facility, the potential employment development area at Redhayes / Sowton and the major new employment related development at the Met Office / Exeter Business Park offers the potential to develop a viable high quality, high capacity public transport system to the east of the existing PUA which can be linked effectively into the existing and developing public transport networks within Exeter itself. These links would be especially effective to the east of the City where a public transport interchange is proposed at the existing Honiton Road Park and Ride site.

Delivering self containment and local facility provision

5.54 The A30 / Waterloo line corridor area is physically detached from the existing PUA and it would not be close to other existing facilities and services. If it is to achieve a significant degree of self sufficiency it would need to provide local services and facilities as part of any overall development scheme. The scale of potential development in the area would however be sufficient to support a significant level of local provision for education and other community / social facilities.

5.55 The physical characteristics of the area would allow for local employment development but existing proposals for major employment development at Skypark, and to a lesser extent the IMRFT, would provide access to significant additional local employment opportunity. Given a sufficient scale of development, the area could therefore achieve a high level of self containment.

Effective implementation and longer term development potential

5.56 There is physical capacity for the A30 / Waterloo line corridor area to accommodate a significant scale of residential / mixed development, with potential to the east limited by the need to maintain the separate identity and setting of existing communities such as Whimple.

5.57 The characteristics of the area make it possible to achieve a sustainable level of residential development and there is sufficient capacity for a degree of further expansion beyond 2016.

5.58 Subject to effective access arrangements being secured to the A30 and / or M5 the area could however have significant potential for employment development – this assessment is addressed separately in the Science Park Study.

6. Assessment against strategic sustainable development criteria

6.1 The assessment set out in Appendix II considers each development location against a common set of criteria. These criteria are weighted in accordance with the JSPAs assessment of the most important strategic factors to achieve the most sustainable location for growth. The criteria used are considered to reflect Structure Plan policy objectives, Regional Planning Guidance and Government policy as set out in PPG3 and PPG13. Appendix III sets out the basis for the specific assessment against each criteria.

6.2 The summary matrix in Appendix II illustrates that of the three of the locations assessed, Pinhoe, Sowton / Redhayes and the A30 / Waterloo rail corridor area, the A30 / Waterloo rail corridor area performs

significantly better, both in overall terms and against the essential / critical criteria. While the Sowton / Redhayes area is not appropriate as a location for strategic residential development, there is a clear and decisive differentiation between the Pinhoe and A30 / Waterloo corridor areas in terms of their ability to achieve sustainable development, with the A30 / Waterloo rail line corridor area performing better against both the overall and essential criteria.

7. Overall Strategic Conclusions

7.1 On the basis of this assessment it is concluded that the **Redhayes / Sowton** area does not offer scope for achieving sustainable residential development and should not be identified as a potential location for that form of strategic development. Given its characteristics however (its good links to the strategic transport network, to other existing and planned employment development, to the proposed inter modal facility, to Exeter Airport, and to the existing PUA) it is concluded that the area does however have significant potential for employment related development.

7.2 At **Pinhoe**, there is physical scope for a strategic level of development but its potential is severely constrained by its poor accessibility to the rest of the PUA and to the strategic transport networks. Although part of the site is close to the existing built up area, a substantial level of development would have major implications for the highway network within eastern Exeter for which there is no clear remedy. Access to the area would involve major new road construction and even then would severely impact upon the existing and planned road network within the eastern sector of Exeter. This constraint would also limit the potential to achieve high levels of public transport accessibility in the area, and would make it incapable of providing for significant element local employment opportunity. Development in this area would also have a significant impact on the landscape setting of Exeter and on higher quality agricultural land. The JSPAs do however consider that a much more limited scale of residential development could be accommodated in the Pinhoe area without harming the setting of Exeter or compromising the effectiveness of the existing highway network.

7.3 In the **A30 / Waterloo rail line corridor** area there is physical scope for major development which would be accessible from the strategic road network and from the Exeter – Waterloo rail line. There would be highway capacity issues to be addressed at Junction 29 on the M5. It would be well related to existing and proposed employment opportunities at Exeter Airport / Skypark, the proposed Science Park and other employment sites on the eastern side of Exeter. Accessibility to the rail line and the capacity available on the former A30 provide scope for a high level of public transport penetration and usage. Development would not have a detrimental effect on the landscape setting of Exeter and would affect lower quality agricultural land than in the Pinhoe area.

7.4 **The A30 / Waterloo rail line corridor area is therefore considered to offer the most appropriate location for achieving sustainable strategic development at Exeter, outside of the existing PUA, in the period to 2016.**

Appendix II : Summary Matrix

The following matrix summarises the outcome of the assessments set out above. The basis of the matrix is set out in detail in Appendix III.

	Weight (1)	Pinhoe Area (A)	Sowton / Redhayes area (B)	A30 / Waterloo line corridor (C)
Impact on strategic landscape	3	λλλλ	λλλλ	λλλλ
Impact on local landscape	1	λλ	λλ	λλ
Agricultural land	1	λλ	1	λλ
Mineral constraints	2	λλλλ	λλλλ	λλ
Physical constraints	2	λλ	λλ	λλ
Development capacity	3	λλ	λλ	λλλλ
Urban pedestrian / cycle networks	2	λλ	λλ	11
Access to urban road network	3	λλ	λλ	λλ
Access to strategic road network	2	1	λλ	λλ
Access to rail network	2	λλ	λλ	λλλλ
Road based public transport potential / overall travel	3	λλ	λλλλ	λλλλ
Innovative / dedicated public transport potential	1	λ	λλ	λλ
Access to local employment	3	λλ	λλ	λλ
Access to strategic employment	2	λλ	λλ	λλ
Access to existing facilities	1	λλ	λλ	λ
Local facility viability within area	3	λλ	λ	λλλλ
Local employment potential within area	3	λλ	λλλλ	λλ
Early implementation	2	λλ	λλ	λλ
Development potential beyond 2016	1	λλ	λ	λλ
Overall Weighted Assessment (1)		115	132	154
Essential / critical criteria (1)		63	75	87

11111	λλ	λλ	λλ	λλ	λλ	λ
Best placed to meet criteria →	→	→	→	→	→	→ Least well placed

(1) Weighting to achieving the most sustainable locations for growth - 3 : essential / critical, 2 : important, 1 : desirable...

Appendix III : Indicative assessment criteria

Indicative assessment	5 λλλλλ	4 λλλλ	3 λλλ	2 λλ	1 λ	Indicators
Impact on strategic landscape	Whole area remote from national designation	Distant views from national designation	Visible from national designation area	Prominent from NP or AONB	Adjacent to national designation	distance prominence
Impact on “local” landscape	Remote from AGLV and no significant local landscape constraint / impact	Limited impact on nearby AGLV and / or limited conflict with local landscape objective	Adjacent to AGLV or part in conflict with local landscape objective	Part of area within AGLV or potential conflict with important local landscape objective	Major part of area within AGLV or major conflict with important local landscape objective	distance prominence area included impact on settlements
Agricultural land	No Grade 1 or 2	Grade 1 or 2 in places	Significant part Grade 1 or 2	Mostly Grade 1 or 2	All Grade 1 or 2	area included
Minerals constraints	No impact	Part of area close to local consultation area	Part of area close to / within locally significant consultation area	Part of area within or adjacent to significant consultation area of national significance	Major part of area within or adjacent to significant consultation area of national significance	distance area affected significance of mineral
Physical constraints to cohesive developable area	No physical constraints within area	Peripheral part of area detached by physical barrier – not suitable for development	Area sub divided by physical features – difficult to develop as a single area	Area dissected by physical features – would have to be developed in discrete parcels	Area severely affected by internal topographical constraints / flood plain etc	topography floodplains woodland
Development Capacity	>200 ha	150 – 200 ha	100 – 150 ha	50 – 100 ha	< 50 ha	area available for cohesive development
Urban cycle and pedestrian network links	Direct and unconstrained access to existing pedestrian / cycle networks	Direct but partially constrained access to existing pedestrian / cycle networks	Constrained access to existing pedestrian / cycle, networks	Limited access to existing pedestrian / cycle networks	Severely constrained or remote access to existing pedestrian / cycle networks	distance access points choice topography capacity

Indicative assessment	5 λλλλ	4 λλλ	3 λλ	2 λ	1 λ	Indicators
Access to the urban road network	Unconstrained multiple direct access to local network – no major investment necessary	Direct access possible and only minor capacity constraints - remedy likely to be viable	Access possible but some capacity constraint - remedy likely to be viable	Some access possible but capacity constraint - remedy viability questionable	Limited access possible and major capacity constraint - remedy viability prohibitive	distance choice capacity cost of remedy funding possible
Effective access to strategic road network	Unconstrained multiple direct access to strategic network – no major investment necessary	Direct access possible and only minor capacity constraints - remedy likely to be viable	Access possible but some capacity constraint - remedy likely to be viable	Some access possible but capacity constraint - remedy viability questionable	Limited access possible and major capacity constraint - remedy viability prohibitive	distance choice capacity cost of remedy development funding
Access to rail	Immediate rail access with possible station. Line potential and service viability good	Immediate rail access but station location and potential service levels constrained	Close to rail line access - may be constrained and / or potential service levels limited	Fairly remote from rail or access subject to major constraint / potential service levels very limited	Remote from rail network	proximity line capacity access possibility viability
Road based Public transport / overall travel	Multiple routes, circular and corridor potential, high frequency viability	Circular or corridor possible routes, potential, good service viability	Ready extension of existing networks, high service level and viability likely	Some potential links to existing networks but low frequency, marginal viability	Remote from existing networks. Poor frequency, questionable viability	access to existing network choice development viability indirect benefit total travel volume
Innovative / dedicated PT access potential	Within main viable corridor – direct access and no physical barriers	Close to main viable corridor – indirect access but some physical barriers	Accessible to main viable corridor or within secondary	Some distance from main and secondary corridors	Remote from all potential routes / corridors	route viability accessibility corridor definition
Access to strategic employment opportunities	Immediate access to a choice of strategic sites	Close to one or more strategic sites	Accessible to a strategic employment site	Strategic sites at some distance	Remote from all sites	distance job choice accessibility
Access to other employment	Immediate access to a choice of job locations	Close to one or more sites	Accessible to an existing site	Existing sites at some distance	Remote from all sites	distance job choice

Indicative assessment	5 λλλλ	4 λλλ	3 λλ	2 λ	1 λ	Indicators
						accessibility
Access to existing facilities	Direct access to a wide range	Direct access to some existing	Some existing facilities nearby	Limited facilities at some distant	Remote from any existing	distance facility range
Viability of local facilities	Wide range of key facilities likely to be viable eg full range of education / retail centre / community facilities	Good range of viable facilities possible eg primary education/ retail centre / community facilities	Potential for some local facilities eg primary education / some retail provision / basic community facilities	Limited potential for very basic facilities eg local retail	Little or no potential for viable facilities	development scale
Potential for on site employment opportunities	Major site viable with good accessibility	Major site potential but limited accessibility	Local site viable with good accessibility	Local site possibility but limited in scale – poor accessibility	No suitable viable site	flat land accessibility
Potential for early implementation	Immediate substantive start possible – late infrastructure thresholds	Immediate start possible – but some early infrastructure thresholds	Early start possible on initial phase – dependent on some up front infrastructure	Significant up front investment necessary for even initial development – questions re timing and viability	Major up front investment necessary before any initial development – development unlikely to fund	constraints thresholds infrastructure
Potential beyond 2016	Scope for major further development beyond 2016 – assuming substantive contribution pre 2016	Scope for further development – but finite in scale with some thresholds and physical boundaries crossed	Some scope for incremental growth – but partially constrained and limited in scale	Physical scope but constrained by infrastructure / landscape barriers etc	None beyond immediate contribution pre 2016	constraints site capacity topography costs