

Long Road South Consultation Planning Brief: June 2004
Response Analysis

Respondent and Date	Respondent's Comments	Council's Comments
1 English Nature 25/06/04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thorough ecological survey recommended 2. Support for SUDS and balancing pond 3. Tree and hedge planting welcomed 4. Use native species and native wildflowers 5. Recommends incorporating nature conservation design features in buildings, e.g. bat roosting sites 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Previous surveys have shown that it is unlikely that anything of ecological importance will be found, although the current work on the EIA for the KKBP is discovering a surprising amount of additional ecological value, compared with previous surveys; on balance, it is considered that an ecological survey is required, as set out in the Brief [para 11.5] 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Covered in Section 7 of the Brief 5. This could be included as advisory information
2 NJ Price 28/06/04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Govt guidelines overruled or ignored, e.g. stopping building on greenfield sites 2. Build closer to motorways, as infrastructure can't cope 3. Major environmental objections 4. Keep Waddeton Road open 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Govt guidelines have not been overruled; Torbay Council has met its brownfield target, and only selected Long Road South as a business park site after an extensive search of brownfield sites within Torbay 2. Torbay does not have any motorways; the capacity of the infrastructure is clearly very important, and was debated at the recent Local Plan Inquiry – however, this important aspect will be addressed by a Transport Assessment [TA] to ensure that the traffic impact and means of access are acceptable 3. The Brief takes the environmental agenda very seriously, and this was also debated at the recent Local Plan Inquiry 4. The original Brief has been amended to provide for through vehicular traffic from Waddeton to Long Road, albeit via a slightly changed route through the business park
3 C Bircham 29/06/04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep Waddeton Road open 2. Plant early strategic landscaping 3. Sensitive colours supported 4. Increased traffic problems 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See comment in relation to 2.4 above 2. This important requirement is covered in Section 7 of the Brief 3. This important requirement is covered in paras 8.40 – 8.43 of the Brief 4. See comment in relation to 2.2 above

4 ASD Baker 02/07/04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic impact unacceptable 2. Already have Edginswell plan – don't need two business parks 3. Long Road junction dangerous 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See comment in relation to 2.2 above 2. The Edginswell site is significantly smaller than Long Road South, and in any event, Torbay is in need of both sites in addition to the provision of several other employment sites so as to ensure that sufficient land of acceptable quality is allocated in the right locations to meet Torbay's serious employment needs 3. Transport Assessment [TA] to ensure that the traffic impact and means of access are acceptable
5 Countryside Agency 02/07/04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No comments 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted
6 Environment Agency 09 Jul 04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for Brief 2. Recommends innovative and sustainable building practices 3. Minimise waste 4. Use native planting species 5. Retain and thicken hedgerows 6. Recommends detailed points on pond creation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Recommend: Include a commitment to reduce waste in Section 10 and para 11.5 [matters to be included within the ES] of the Brief 4. Covered in Section 7 of the Brief 5. This is partly covered in Section 7, but it could be made more explicit 6. Noted
7 CPRE 13/07/06	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern over 3 storey buildings 2. Replace 'resisted' with 'forbidden' to strengthen environmental control 3. Phase 2 tree planting and landscaping should be implemented during Phase 1 4. Phase 2 should only be started when the Council is satisfied that the business park is attracting the right type of business 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building heights are covered in paras 8.33 – 8.36 and do not preclude 3 storey development, as long as the height limitations, which are set by the topography, are adhered to 2. It is considered that the word 'resisted' is sufficiently strong to achieve the aims of the Brief 3. See comment in relation to 16.18 below. Para 7.8 does require all the advanced off-site screen planting proposals shown on Plan 3 to be implemented within the first planting season after the planning application is made. However, it is probably unreasonable to require phase 2 on-site landscaping to be planted/implemented at the same time as phase 1 landscaping, although the brief could encourage the developers to do this. 4. Clearly, the Council will be monitoring the progress of the development closely, although this will be limited to planning, transportation and environmental criteria. The Council will grant consent for phase 2 at the appropriate time, in terms of the quality of development, as well as land take, transport and landscaping requirements

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Applicants should be questioned re the number, type and current location of potential employees 6. Mature tree planting needed 7. Too many roundabouts planned for Ring Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. This issue is beyond the remit of planning legislation 6. The Brief does not require mature tree planting over the entire development, but does indicate the need for supplanting with fast growing nurse species and the need to incorporate larger sized trees within a mix of young plants [paras 7.20 & 7.21] 7. There are no new roundabouts planned for the Ring Road
8 Torbay Industrial Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TIS building will still be required by that organisation 2. TIS require whole of site for any expansion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted; the developers will have to acquire the site if they consider it is essential to their detailed scheme designs for Long Road South
9 Torbay Development Agency 14/07/04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential concerns of traffic management and landscaping have been addressed 2. Amenity value of Waddeton Road for cyclists, horse riders and walkers needs to be retained 3. Suggests new section on tourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Recommend: Include a new sub-section on recreation/tourism in Section 8, referring to the recreational element of the footpaths and woodlands 3. See comment on 9.2 above
10 S Devon AONB Unit 14/07/04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledge thorough and robust approach to minimise adverse impacts on adjoining countryside and nearby AONB 2. Welcome lighting strategy 3. Welcome requirement for structural tree planting to implemented at earliest opportunity 4. Welcome requirement for recessive colour scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Noted
11 White Rock Combined Action Group 14/07/04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategy of attracting high quality skilled jobs is noted 2. Concern over extension of Brief to include Waddeton Close 3. Concern that RDL building may become a model for other buildings in the Brief area 4. Assume all ancillary uses and 'gateway activities' will take place in present caravan storage site and grounds of Renwick House 5. Concern over hotel development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The reasons for the extension of the area covered by the Brief are clearly set out and are not considered to compromise the adopted Local Plan in any way 3. The Brief sets out design criteria which would preclude the possibility of a repeat of the RDL building being built within the proposed business park 4. Para 8.19 identifies the area around Waddeton Close as the location for ancillary uses and 'gateway activities'. This area includes the present caravan storage site, and also the other plots and buildings which are situated on Waddeton Close 5. A small hotel, as part of a conference facility, is considered to be an appropriate use for the northern part of the business park

	<p>6. Council should resist any retail facilities – otherwise the concept of a prestige site will be diluted</p> <p>7. Concern re development serving ‘working population’ elsewhere</p> <p>8. Para 8.24 - ‘Avoids adverse visual impact’ is too weak – none of buildings should be seen from afar</p> <p>9. Para 8.34 – Insert ‘not’ before ‘intrude vertically’</p> <p>10. Para 8.36 – Replace ‘large industrial roofs will be resisted’ by ‘will not be allowed’</p> <p>11. Para 8.42 – Accept judicious use of stainless steel, etc</p> <p>12. Concern over existing as well as future light pollution</p> <p>13. Para 8.51 – Support policy line on individual development plots</p> <p>14. Para 9.15 – Question need for secondary access onto Ring Road</p> <p>15. Oppose all the roundabouts on Ring Road</p> <p>16. Para 9.17 – Waddeton Road needs to remain open to through traffic</p> <p>17. Para 10.14 – Important issue of foul drainage is noted</p> <p>18. Evergreens need to be planted to south and west to secure screening 12 months a year</p> <p>19. Archaeology needs to be incorporated into S 106 Agreement</p> <p>20. Environment Statement needs to be incorporated into S 106 Agreement</p>	<p>6. The retail facilities referred to in the brief are to serve the business park, and as such would enhance the quality of the working environment, especially at a location which is so far from Paignton town centre. Para 8.20 makes it clear that retail or other ancillary uses of a scale to serve a wider area than the local business community and the College would be resisted</p> <p>7. The local business community would be Long Road South and Long Road</p> <p>8. The key issue is whether the impact is adverse; clearly the strict height controls in the brief are relevant, together with those sections of the Brief dealing with colour and lighting</p> <p>9. Noted and taken on board</p> <p>10. Para 8.36 as it is written is sufficiently robust to deliver the appropriate result</p> <p>11. Noted</p> <p>12. The off-site tree planting could reduce the existing light impact slightly, although this aspect is outside the remit of this Brief. Paras 8.44 – 8.46 set robust requirements to control light emission from the business park</p> <p>13. Noted</p> <p>14. The issue of a secondary access onto the Ring Road will be determined in the context of the TA</p> <p>15. There are no new roundabouts planned for the Ring Road</p> <p>16. See comment in relation to 2.4 above</p> <p>17. Noted</p> <p>18. Evergreens would introduce a discordant feature into the landscape, which would be counter-productive, and the Brief specifies predominantly native trees, to enhance the existing attractive landscape</p> <p>19. Archaeology is included in the Environment Statement, which will inform the Council of any necessary archaeological work to be carried out by the developers. Recommend: Include reference to archaeology in matters to be included in the S 106 Agreement</p> <p>20. this may necessitate incorporation into The ES may well cover the same issues as the S 106</p>
--	--	---

		Agreement, but the former covers whether the development is acceptable in environmental terms, whilst the latter determines measures that need to be undertaken in order to make it acceptable
12 SW RDA 16/07/04	1. No comments at this stage	1. Noted
13 Stoke Gabriel Parish Council 19 Jul 04	1. Concern over sheer volume and disturbance of traffic 2. Waddeton Road is important for agricultural vehicles, which will go through centre of business park 3. Concern over effects of excess water into River Dart 4. Concern over visual impact onto unspoilt countryside 5. Concern over light pollution	1. See comment in relation to 2.2 above 2. See comment in relation to 2.4 above 3. The drainage aspects have not drawn any objections from the EA 4. In Section 7, the brief stresses the primacy of the environmental setting and sets out clear policy safeguards to minimise visual impact, including control of light pollution 5. See comment in relation to 13.4 above
14 Galmpton Residents Association 20 Jul 04	1. Support for White Rock Action Group's comments 2. Rural setting must be respected 3. Support for concept of high quality prestige site, which must not be watered down 4. Support landscaping provisions in Section 7, including emphasis on fast growing trees, but add evergreen broad leafed trees 5. Para 7.15 – Support involvement of community groups 6. Woodland screening to south and west is critical 7. Para 8.33 – ordnance datum restriction must be absolute	1. Noted 2. See comment in relation to 13.4 above 3. Noted; the Brief intends to achieve this important objective 4. Noted, but see comment in relation to 11.18 above 5. Noted 6. Noted; the Brief sets out requirements for additional woodland screening at Waddeton Lane Plantation to the south and Shopdown Copse to the south west [see Plan 3 for locations and extent of additional tree cover] 7. The Inspector's Report recommends an absolute 81m OD height restriction on the more exposed western part of the Brief [Phase 2]; however, the eastern part [Phase 1] is subject to a recommendation that no building at any point should exceed a height of 8 metres above existing ground level. Recommend: Amend para 8.33 to specify the building height requirements for all parts of the land covered by the Brief. This should include provision to allow for the depth of platforms to be cut up to a maximum of an additional 2 metres, i.e. to permit 10 metre high buildings where the cut platform is at least 2 metres

	<p>8. Para 8.32 – permeable links should be tree-lined</p> <p>9. Para 8.36 – Support policy stance against large roofs</p> <p>10. Para 9.9 – Resolution of existing bottlenecks must precede development</p> <p>11. Concern at proliferation of extra access points on the Ring Road</p> <p>12. Para 9.15 – Oppose secondary access to Ring Road</p> <p>13. Para 9.21 – Support landscaping of car parks</p> <p>14. Para 8.40 – 41 – Policy stance on colour of materials and surfaces is supported</p> <p>15. Para 10.16 – Add undergrounding of telephone and electricity cables</p> <p>16. Para 11.2 – Support requirement for outline planning application to first establish overall parameters for whole site</p> <p>17. Para 11.6 – Support Landscape Management Plan</p> <p>18. Para 11.6 should be less cautious and more assertive</p>	<p>below the present contour level. Para 8.34 of the Brief also refers to sites above 73 metres OD, where height control on the eastern part of the site will be necessary. The overall aim of the Brief is to ensure that the proposed does not impact adversely on the surrounding countryside and in particular the AONB. The determination of the planning applications in accordance with the principles of the Brief will be the critical decision of the Council in terms of protecting the landscape.</p> <p>8. Noted; this could be a suggestion in the Brief</p> <p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. Para 9.9 of the Brief sets out a phasing requirement for development, based on the improvement of the Long Road/Ring Road junction and the improvement of Tweenaway Cross</p> <p>11. There are only 2 new access points proposed on the stretch of the Ring Road between Tweenaway Cross and Windy Corner – at Yannons Farm, to replace an existing sub-standard junction nearby, and a possible secondary access to Long Road South, to enable a permeable layout for emergency vehicles and bus penetration</p> <p>12. See comment in relation to 14.11 above</p> <p>13. Noted</p> <p>14. Noted</p> <p>15. Recommend: Amend the Brief to incorporate the undergrounding of telephone and electricity cables</p> <p>16. Noted</p> <p>17. Noted</p> <p>18. It is considered that the Brief strikes the right balance between policy direction and over prescription, and it is recommended that the Consultation Draft should remain</p>
15 John Britton [Paignton Chamber of Trade and Commerce] 22 Jul 04	<p>1. Supports principle of raising number and quality of jobs in this area of seasonality, low pay and significant pockets of deprivation</p> <p>2. Could a proportion of the site be used for existing local companies looking to expand?</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. There is nothing in the Brief which precludes local companies, subject to the high environmental and</p>

	<p>3. Will inward investment cause inward workforce migration?</p> <p>4. With such a short time table, is the proposal a 'fait accompli'?</p> <p>5. In view of the serious traffic situation, the access provisions of the Brief are supported</p> <p>6. Request for KKBP implementation</p> <p>7. The need for non-B1 jobs is also needed in tandem to Long Road South, in the interests of sustainability</p> <p>8. The area needs additional retail development</p>	<p>design standards which are set out in the Brief</p> <p>3. There will probably be an element of inward migration connected with any existing company that is relocating to Long Road South. However, it is expected that the majority of the new work force, including highly skilled jobs, will be recruited from the local population</p> <p>4. The principle of development at Long Road South has been determined through the Local Plan process. However, the details contained in the Consultation Brief are not a 'fait accompli' until they have been included in a planning application that has been granted planning permission</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. The Council and its partners are in regular contact with Government and a planning application is programmed for submission in the Autumn; however, there are still several steps to go before we are in a position to construct the road, and the latest best estimate is for completion in 2010</p> <p>7. The need for more general industry is addressed in other proposed development along the Ring Road</p> <p>8. The retail demand and capacity situation will be reviewed in a study to be commissioned in the near future</p>
16 Stride Treglown 30 Jul 04	<p>1. These comments are written to 'pave the way' for the delivery of a marketable and deliverable high quality commercial development scheme</p> <p>2. Paras 1.2, 8.2 & 8.3 - Essential that the Council adopt flexible approach to innovative solutions to respond to site restrictions</p> <p>3. Illustrative masterplan [Plans 10 and 11] should not be seen as representing fundamental principles of development to which applications must accord</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. There is a balance which needs to be achieved between securing much needed jobs within an innovative and attractive development [and allowing the developers the freedom to do that] and safeguarding the outstanding natural environment. The Brief therefore sets out a series of development principles, and these will ultimately be tested when the Council considers the planning applications for the Long Road South site.</p> <p>3. Plan 10 of the Brief does set out the principles of development, and it will be up to the developer to persuade the Council that the detailed designs and layouts in a planning application</p>

	<p>adhere to these principles. Alternatively, it will be up to the developer to show, to the satisfaction of the Council that any departures from these principles do not compromise the basic principles of the Brief as set out in sections 2 [para 2.8] and 6. Plan 11 is purely an illustration of what could be achieved at Long Road South.</p> <p>4. Concern that 81metres OD height restriction will impede a high quality scheme</p> <p>5. Suggest text of Brief be described as one possible option, so as to enable the development of innovative schemes which would achieve the 8 main principles of the Brief</p> <p>6. Illustrative material should be clearly defined to prevent third party challenge</p> <p>7. Request EIA Screening Opinion letter to lead developer and attached as Appendix to Brief</p> <p>8. AGLVs deleted from PPG7, and this is therefore a material consideration</p> <p>9. Local Plan Inspector stated there were no significant traffic problems, therefore infrastructure contributions likely to be limited</p> <p>10. Para 4.34 – Replace word 'traffic' by 'trip' to reflect variety of sustainable means</p> <p>11. Para 8.22 – Without an accessibility profile, it is inappropriate to conclude that</p>	<p>4. See comment in relation to 14.7 above</p> <p>5. The Brief is not just seen as a possible option, and the principles are seen as important in guiding an appropriate scheme on what is a sensitive site. Clearly, some flexibility is permitted with a Planning Brief, but it is important that the environmental constraints, which have been a key feature in recent planning inquiries, are respected by the development. Plan 11 makes it clear that it is an illustration</p> <p>6. Noted; this will be prepared in response to this representation</p> <p>7. The AGLV is still an important policy in the adopted Local Plan; however, the impact on the AONB, which has recently been strengthened, and environmental/visual impact issues are still very important</p> <p>8. The Inspector stated that a combination of physical improvements proposed in the Local Plan, together with policy commitments to pursuing Company Travel Plans and other measures aimed at reducing car use and improving transport choices, will together mean that the development will be able to proceed without giving rise to significant traffic problems [Page 170, para 53]. However, the Brief needs to address recent developments since the date of the evidence submitted to the Local Plan, i.e. over the period 2000 – 2004. Transport contributions will be sought in relation to all the measures outlined above, and in the context of the latest information available.</p> <p>9. This is already in place</p> <p>10. The role of the Brief is to set the context for the TA [and accessibility profile] – otherwise there is no</p>
--	---	---

	<p>the site is sufficiently served by [a] choice of modes of transport that would justify more restrictive standards than PPG13</p> <p>12. Para 5.22 – Replace ‘major’ with ‘material’</p> <p>13. Para 6.1 – Redraft to clarify that Long Road South is not a Council development</p> <p>14. Para 6.5 – Delete last sentence, which speaks of the Council resisting unsuitable development at Long Road South</p> <p>15. Para 7.6 – Question usefulness of penultimate point, describing topography and landscape of Dart Valley</p> <p>16. Para 7.8 – Tree planting, per se, does not require planning permission</p> <p>17. Para 7.8 - Nature and form of planting will be for EIA to assess</p> <p>18. Para 7.8 - Off-site planting implementation will be for S 106 to address, but planting is not triggered by first planting season after application made, but within first planting season after detailed planning permissions or reserved matters applications</p> <p>19. Para 6.3 – Supports need to avoid over prescription</p> <p>20. Para 8.2 - Nature of any new or</p>	<p>context for the TA. Clearly, the TA will inform the provision of parking, within the context of PPG13; however, the Brief standard of 1 space per 36.4 sq. m is quite close to the maximum of 1 per 30 sq. m in PPG13.</p> <p>12. The word ‘major’ is considered appropriate with reference to the AONB in the Brief</p> <p>13. The Council’s aim is to see a business park established at Long Road South, and that is what the text is aiming to convey; perhaps the passive tense would clarify this.</p> <p>14. It is considered important for this message to remain in the Brief, given the importance and sensitivity of the site</p> <p>15. The environmental context of Long Road South is considered to be very important, and it is therefore considered to be appropriate to retain this passage</p> <p>16. Noted; however, the tree planting proposals in the Brief are an important part of the mitigation process, and therefore requirements of the Brief</p> <p>17. The EIA will with these aspects in more detail, but is the role of the Brief to give a lead</p> <p>18. Accepted, although the earlier the planting, the better for the development. Recommended: A new section in the Brief, addressing phasing issues, including a section on both Phase 1 and Phase 2 planting. This should include the following extract from the Council’s evidence [PC14/2A], which states: “Development on Phase 2 will only be permitted after the peripheral on-site tree planting and landscaping has been established for at least two planting/growing seasons, and is considered to be satisfactory by the Council”. Para 7.8 requires the off-site planting and landscaping to be implemented within the first planting season after the planning application is made. Recommend: Change para 7.8 to require planting within first planting season after detailed planning permissions or reserved matters applications</p> <p>19. Noted</p> <p>20. The role of the Brief is to set the</p>
--	--	---

	<p>improved junction and trigger point for road improvements will be for TA to address</p> <p>21. Notion of a square should be resisted, and could be serpentine, to afford views</p> <p>22. Brief should acknowledge the role of the college in transforming the economic potential of the Waddeton Close 'gateway' area</p> <p>23. Para 8.2v) - Formal frontage lines onto avenues should not be a pre-requisite of the Brief</p> <p>24. Brief should not require parking areas to be positioned to the rear of development plots</p> <p>25. Para 8.6 – Need for balancing pond is a matter for the EA</p> <p>26. Para 8.19 – Ancillary uses which complement the business park should not be solely limited to the gateway – it is for the developer to promote an appropriate mix which caters for the needs of the local catchment area</p> <p>27. Para 8.27 – Topographical restrictions imposed on site hinder ability to orientate narrower ends of buildings to southern and western boundaries</p> <p>28. Para 8.31 – Balancing pond, whilst accepted, is not consistent with para 8.6</p> <p>29. Para 8.34 Design work pointing to difficulties in keeping to 81 m OD height restriction in Brief</p> <p>30. Para 8.39 - General principle of aligning buildings with contours should be omitted</p> <p>31. Para 8.51 – Delete penultimate sentence and amend to refer to outline planning application as appropriate way forward to ensure that EIA, TA and S 106 Obligations are given a 'procedural framework'</p> <p>32. Para 9.4 – Travel Plan can only be referred to in principle at this stage, subject to TA details</p> <p>33. Para 9.4iv) - Cycleway provision is overly prescriptive</p> <p>34. Para 9.5 – Traffic figures</p>	<p>context for the TA; clearly, the results of the TA will be important, although the Council aims to make the layout permeable to facilitate access for emergency vehicles and to secure bus penetration</p> <p>21. Recommend: Rephrase to include the concept of a serpentine feature</p> <p>22. Recommend: Rephrase para 1.15 to refer to the enhanced economic potential of the 'gateway' area</p> <p>23. See comment in relation to 16.3 above</p> <p>24. See comment in relation to 16.3 above</p> <p>25. EA's response is supportive of a pond, and guidance on pond creation [see 6.6 above]</p> <p>26. The Council sees the northern, gateway part of the site as the principal area for ancillary activities. Recommend: Amend the text to allow for uses ancillary to B1 uses to be located outside the gateway area, although the predominant use within the 'greenfield' part of the site will be for B1 uses.</p> <p>27. It is an essential requirement of the Brief that buildings are integrated into the landscape, and the advice given, whilst being illustrative, will only be overruled if the alternative designs are considered to achieve the principles of the Brief, as set out in Sections 2[para 2.8] and 6.</p> <p>28. Noted; the support from EA will be incorporated into the final Brief</p> <p>29. See comments in relation to 14.7 above</p> <p>30. As a general principle, this is considered important enough to merit inclusion within the Brief</p> <p>31. Recommend: Delete penultimate sentence and amend to refer to outline planning application as appropriate way forward to ensure that EIA, TA and S 106 Obligations are given a 'procedural framework'</p> <p>32. The text relating to the content of a Travel Plan is considered to be general in nature, and it is not compromising to the TA</p> <p>33. This authority takes the Government's cycling targets seriously, and the Brief reflects this</p> <p>34. The Inspector does not refer to</p>
--	---	---

	<p>inconsistent with Inspector, who concluded that GTP plus Tweenaway Cross improvements will mean that proposed developments along Ring Road will be able to proceed without giving rise to significant traffic problems</p> <p>35. Para 9.7 - Delete findings of Western Corridor Transport Study and refer to need for new TA, as circumstances may have changed</p> <p>36. Para 9.9 – Development phasing generally accepted, although the TA will inform the precise milestones</p> <p>37. Paras 9.12 & 9.13 – Long Road/Ring Road Junction improvement is for TA to address</p> <p>38. Paras 9.19 & 9.20 – Proposed modal split is Council aspiration only, but accept that GTP is required to accompany outline planning application</p> <p>39. Para 10.2 – The findings of the EIA and technical studies will inform the type and size of drainage facility</p> <p>40. Para 10.2 - Co-operation will be required with Highways Authority and Water Company to secure adoption of drainage</p> <p>41. Para 10.17 – Wider network improvements need not be provided by Long Road South developers</p> <p>42. Para 11.2 – Accept principle of outline planning application, but full drainage details will follow EIA measures</p> <p>43. Para 11.4 – Submission of S 106 Heads of Terms is not usual, and will be discussed further</p> <p>44. Para 11.5 – Wildlife issues should not be on the list of matters to be included in EIA</p> <p>45. Para 11.6 On-site works can be covered by condition, not S106</p>	<p>actual or projected traffic figures in his report to the Council. The traffic figures in the Brief are based on recent information from the Council's transport consultants; however, it will be updated as part of the TA preparation. Also, see comments in relation to 16.9 above.</p> <p>35. The Western Corridor Transport Study is the basis for the Local Plan, which in turn is the basis for the Brief. It forms a useful context for the updated TA. The Council accepts the circumstances have changed in recent years, and that we have to plan for Long Road South on the basis of the most recent assessment of the traffic situation.</p> <p>36. Noted</p> <p>37. See comments in relation to 16.20 above</p> <p>38. Noted</p> <p>39. Noted</p> <p>40. Noted; although the brief should form the basis of the co-operation</p> <p>41. The infrastructure provision for Long Road South has to be considered in the context of the bigger picture, which is what the brief states</p> <p>42. Noted</p> <p>43. The role of the Brief is to set out strategic guidance for planning applications, and these needs to include aspects which may require a S 106 Agreement. Torbay regularly includes S 106 heads of Terms within Briefs</p> <p>44. See comment in relation to 1.1 above</p> <p>45. Recommend: change para 11.6 to mention that on-site works can be covered by condition</p>
17. Glenn Simmons 03	1. Inspector's Report and Council's	1. The primary document for the Brief

<p>Aug 04</p>	<p>Evidence at Inquiry [PCI 4/2A] primary documents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. No height restrictions should apply to Waddeton Close area, which has been included following Inspector's Report and PCI 4/2A 3. Phase 1 greenfield area is free from the 81 metre OD contour constraint 4. Phase 2 is the only area which is subject to the 81 metre OD contour constraint 5. Inspector acknowledged that some ancillary uses within the greenfield part of the site would be appropriate, and a cluster of all these uses in the gateway area may undermine the prestige nature of the entrance to the business park 	<p>is the adopted Local Plan, although clearly the Council considered carefully the Inspector's Report before adopting the Local Plan and preparing this Consultation Brief</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Clearly, the Inspector's report and the adopted Local Plan are silent on all aspects of planning for the Waddeton Close area, including height restrictions. However, it is important that buildings constructed in this area do not impact adversely on the AONB, in the way that RDL [9.9 metres] does – this was a key fact in the 1996 White Rock Inquiry decision. 3. Phase 1 is subject to adopted Local Plan Policy E1[D], which refers to strict height controls, based on the Planning Brief; the Inspector's Report is clearly a useful basis, but the sensitivity of the site demands that the local planning authority needs to be satisfied that the proposed development will not adversely affect the outstanding quality of the Dart valley 4. Phase 2 is the only area that is subject to a specific height reference in the Inspector's Report. This is not the same as stating whether it is subject to any constraint in the Local Plan, and the adopted Local Plan states that the whole site is subject to strict height controls. However, the Inspector also states that "any building which tops 75 m ASL is likely to be visible from parts of the Dart Valley", and that "across the whole site [i.e. the Local Plan site, excluding the Waddeton Close area], no building at any point should exceed a height of 8 metres." [Page 167, para 36]. 5. See comment in relation to 16.26 above, which is in line with the Inspector's Report