



www.landuse.co.uk

Cranbrook Development Plan: Issues and Options Report

Sustainability Appraisal Report

Prepared by LUC
May 2016

Project Title: Sustainability Appraisal of the Cranbrook Development Plan

Client: East Devon District Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
1	20/05/16	Draft SA Report for the Cranbrook Development Plan: Issues and Options Report	Kate Nicholls Donald McArthur Kieran Moroney	Taran Livingston	Taran Livingston
2	25/05/16	Final SA Report for the Cranbrook Development Plan: Issues and Options Report	Kate Nicholls Donald McArthur Kieran Moroney	Taran Livingston	Taran Livingston



www.landuse.co.uk

Cranbrook Development Plan: Issues and Options Report

Sustainability Appraisal Report

Prepared by LUC
May 2016

Planning & EIA
Design
Landscape Planning
Landscape Management
Ecology
Mapping & Visualisation

LUC LONDON
43 Chalton Street
London
NW1 1JD
T +44 (0)20 7383 5784
london@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in:
Bristol
Glasgow
Edinburgh



FS 566056 EMS 566057

Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number: 2549296
Registered Office:
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Context for the Cranbrook Development Plan	1
	The Cranbrook Development Plan	1
	Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	2
2	Methodology	6
	Stage A: Scoping	7
	SA Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects	9
	SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report	11
	SA Stage D: Consultation on the Cranbrook Development Plan and this SA Report	11
	SA Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the Cranbrook Development Plan	11
	Appraisal methodology	11
	Difficulties Encountered	12
3	Sustainability Context for Development at Cranbrook	13
	Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes	13
	Baseline Information	14
	Key Sustainability Issues	16
4	SA Findings for the Issues and Options	19
	Vision and Strategic Objectives	19
	SA findings for the Cranbrook Development Plan options	25
	Concept Masterplans	31
5	Monitoring	33
6	Conclusions	35
	Next steps	35
Appendix 1		36
	Scoping Consultation Comments	36
Appendix 2		44
	SA Matrices for the Cranbrook Development Plan Options	44
	SA matrices for the four scenarios presented in Part 5 of the Issues and Options document	45
	SA matrices for the Concept Masterplans 1 and 2 developed during the two day workshop in 2015	55

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared by LUC on behalf of East Devon District Council as part of the integrated Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the emerging Cranbrook Development Plan.
- 1.2 This report relates to the Issues and Options version of the Cranbrook Development Plan (June 2016) and it should be read in conjunction with that document.

Context for the Cranbrook Development Plan

- 1.3 Cranbrook is a rapidly developing new town in East Devon, close to the city of Exeter. By mid-2015, around 1,000 new homes had been built and were occupied. The East Devon Local Plan proposes the expansion of Cranbrook up to 2031 to accommodate nearly 8,000 new homes. This scale of development would make Cranbrook the second biggest town in East Devon, after Exmouth.
- 1.4 On the basis of its current extent, Cranbrook is located approximately 2.5km to the east of Exeter at the nearest point and is approximately 600m to the north of Exeter Airport. The railway line to the east of Exeter runs along the northern boundary of Cranbrook.
- 1.5 Cranbrook is being developed as a new town, to include employment land and services and facilities alongside the new housing.

The Cranbrook Development Plan

- 1.6 East Devon District Council is producing a masterplan for Cranbrook which will form the basis of a Development Plan Document (DPD), a formal planning document that will guide development in the new town during and beyond the development period (known as the 'Cranbrook Development Plan'). While the East Devon Local Plan sets out the broad framework for development at Cranbrook, it covers the period up to 2031 only and therefore the Cranbrook Development Plan needs to set the framework for development over the longer term.
- 1.7 To date work on the preparation of the masterplan for Cranbrook has involved a series of stakeholder workshops and technical meetings which have helped to narrow down the list of priorities for Cranbrook and to identify reasonable options for the Plan. The first stage of preparing the Cranbrook Development Plan has also taken place in June 2015. East Devon District Council consulted organisations and individuals on the Planning Policy database who may have an interest in future Cranbrook development, outlining what the Cranbrook Development Plan may cover and seeking their views on any alternative or additional issues that should be addressed. The June 2015 consultation stated that the Cranbrook Development Plan might do the following:
 - Allocate specific sites and land areas for new development.
 - Designate land for 'protection' or safeguarding which will prevent or limit development.
 - Include policies, cross-referencing where appropriate to specific land areas, in respect of development of:
 - a) new homes;
 - b) Gypsy and Traveller accommodation;
 - c) community facilities;
 - d) education facilities;
 - e) sports and play areas and facilities;

- f) shops;
- g) parks and open space;
- h) places of employment; and
- i) other possible uses not detailed above.

- Establish the supporting infrastructure and means for its delivery required by the above uses.
- Establish forms and principles of development and materials and design standards to promote the highest quality outcomes.
- Define mitigation required to off-set potential adverse impacts that might otherwise arise as a consequence of development.
- Determine mechanisms for monitoring the success and quality of what is happening and being built and set targets.
- Determine whether planning applications submitted to the Council should be granted planning permission and what conditions might apply.

1.8 This SA Report relates to the current stage of the Cranbrook Development Plan (Issues and Options version), which is being published for consultation between June and July 2016. The Issues and Options document sets out an overall Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Plan and outlines the issues that could affect the development of a sustainable new town at Cranbrook. Although the Plan does not present specific options for addressing those issues, it does allude to some high level alternative approaches that could be taken to address some of the issues in the Plan. The Plan also sets out four alternative scenarios which relate to the spatial development of the town, and two alternative concept masterplans that were developed during stakeholder workshops.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.9 Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It is designed to ensure that the plan preparation process maximises the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development and minimises any potential adverse impacts. The SA process involves appraising the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the policies and proposals within a plan from the outset of its development.
- 1.10 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is also a statutory assessment process, required under the SEA Directive¹, transposed in the UK by the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633). The SEA Regulations require the formal assessment of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment and which set the framework for future consent of projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)². The purpose of SEA, as defined in Article 1 of the SEA Directive is *'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans...with a view to promoting sustainable development'*.
- 1.11 SEA and SA are separate processes but have similar aims and objectives. Simply put, SEA focuses on the likely environmental effects of a plan whilst SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts. National Planning Practice Guidance³ shows how it is possible to satisfy both requirements by undertaking a joint SA/SEA process, and to present an SA report that incorporates the requirements of the SEA Regulations. The SA/SEA of the Cranbrook Development Plan is being prepared in line with this integrated approach and throughout this report the abbreviation 'SA' should therefore be taken to refer to 'SA incorporating the requirements of SEA'.

¹ SEA Directive 2001/42/EC

² Under EU Directives 85/337/EEC and 97/11/EC concerning EIA.

³ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>

Structure of this report

- 1.12 This report is the SA report for the Issues and Options version of the Cranbrook Development Plan (June 2016). **Table 1.1** below signposts how the requirements of the SEA Regulations have been met within this SA report.

Table 1.1: Requirements of the SEA Regulations and where these have been addressed in this SA Report

SEA Regulation Requirements	Where covered in this SA report
Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is (Reg. 12 and Schedule 2):	
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	Chapter 3
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Chapter 3
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	Chapter 3
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	Chapter 3
e) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Chapter 3
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects)	Chapter 4 and Appendix 2
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	Chapter 4 and Appendix 2
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Chapter 2
i) a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;	Chapter 5
j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	A separate non-technical summary document will be prepared to accompany the SA report for the Publication version of the Cranbrook Development Plan.

SEA Regulation Requirements	Where covered in this SA report
The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2)	Addressed throughout this SA report.
<p>Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4) 	A Scoping consultation for the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan was undertaken between September and October 2015.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2) 	Consultation is being undertaken in relation to the Cranbrook Development Plan Issues and Options document between June and July 2016 and will continue to be for all future iterations of the Plan. The current consultation document is accompanied by this SA report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Art. 7). 	N/A
Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making (Art. 8)	
<p>Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Art.7 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the plan or programme as adopted a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report of Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Art. 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Art. 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and the measures decided concerning monitoring (Art. 9) 	To be addressed after the Cranbrook Development Plan is adopted.
<p>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Art. 10)</p>	To be addressed after the Cranbrook Development Plan is adopted.
<p>Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive (Art. 12).</p>	This report has been produced in line with current guidance and good practice for SEA/SA and this table demonstrates where the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met.

1.13 This section has introduced the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan. The remainder of the report is structured into the following sections:

- **Chapter 2: Methodology** describes the approach that has been taken to the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan.
- **Chapter 3: Sustainability context for development at Cranbrook** summarises the relationship between the Cranbrook Development Plan and other relevant plans, policies and

programmes; describes the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the area and identifies the key sustainability issues.

- **Chapter 4: SA findings for the Issues and Options** summarises the SA findings for the options in the current version of the Cranbrook Development Plan.
- **Chapter 5: Monitoring** describes the approach that should be taken to monitoring the likely significant effects of the Cranbrook Development Plan and proposes monitoring indicators.
- **Chapter 6: Conclusions** summarises the key findings from the SA and describes the next steps to be undertaken in the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan and the SA.

1.14 The main body of the SA report is supported by the following appendices:

- **Appendix 1** presents the comments that were received in relation to the Scoping consultation between September and October 2015.
- **Appendix 2** presents the detailed SA matrices for the Cranbrook Development Plan options.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 In addition to complying with legal requirements, the approach being taken to the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan is based on current best practice and the guidance on SA/SEA set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which involves carrying out SA as an integral part of the plan-making process. **Table 2.1** below sets out the main stages of the plan-making process and shows how these correspond to the SA process.

Table 2.1: Corresponding stages in plan making and SA

Local Plan Step 1: Evidence Gathering and engagement
SA stages and tasks
<p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives • 2: Collecting baseline information • 3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems • 4: Developing the SA framework • 5: Consulting on the scope of the SA
Local Plan Step 2: Production
SA stages and tasks
<p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: Testing the Plan objectives against the SA framework • 2: Developing the Plan options • 3: Evaluating the effects of the Plan • 4: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects • 5: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Plans
<p>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: Preparing the SA Report
<p>Stage D: Seek representations on the Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: Public participation on Plan and the SA Report • 2(i): Appraising significant changes
Local Plan Step 3: Examination
SA stages and tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations
Local Plan Step 4 & 5: Adoption and Monitoring

SA stages and tasks

- 3: Making decisions and providing information

Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Plan

- 1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring
- 2: Responding to adverse effects

2.2 The methodology set out below describes the approach that has been taken to the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan to date and provides information on the subsequent stages of the process. Where appropriate, the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan is drawing from the SA/SEA work that has been carried out over the last few years in relation to the East Devon Local Plan.

Stage A: Scoping

2.3 The SA process began in September 2015 with the production of a Scoping Letter for the Cranbrook Development Plan. Given the narrow scope of the Cranbrook Development Plan, plus the fact that a detailed SA Scoping consultation had already been undertaken for the East Devon Local Plan, LUC, in agreement with East Devon District Council, prepared a consultation Scoping letter instead of a full Scoping Report. The letter set out the scope of the SA work that would be undertaken for the Cranbrook Development Plan and was sent to the statutory environmental bodies⁴ for comment.

2.4 The Scoping stage of the SA involves understanding the social, economic and environmental baseline for the plan area as well as the sustainability policy context and key sustainability issues. The SA Scoping letter for the Cranbrook Development Plan presented the outputs of the following tasks:

- Policies, plans and programmes of relevance to the Cranbrook Development Plan, and which shape the policy context for its development, were identified and the relationships between them were considered. This included policies from the East Devon Local Plan. This process enables any potential synergies to be exploited and any potential inconsistencies and incompatibilities to be identified and addressed.
- Baseline information was collected on environmental, social and economic issues of relevance to the Cranbrook Development Plan area, drawing on the information that was collated and regularly updated throughout the SA of the East Devon Local Plan. This baseline information provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the likely effects of the Cranbrook Development Plan and helps to identify alternative ways of dealing with any adverse effects identified.
- Key sustainability issues for the Cranbrook area were identified, drawing from those identified in the East Devon Local Plan SA where relevant.
- The Sustainability Appraisal framework that was used in the SA of the East Devon Local Plan was presented, comprising the SA objectives against which options and subsequently policies would be appraised. It was considered appropriate to make use of this SA framework rather than developing a new framework as those objectives have been designed to address the key sustainability issues facing East Devon District, which are also relevant at the local level for Cranbrook. The SA framework provides a way in which the sustainability impacts of implementing a particular plan can be described, analysed and compared. It sets out a series of sustainability objectives that define long-term aspirations for Cranbrook and East Devon with regard to social, economic and environmental considerations. During the SA, the performance of the Cranbrook Development Plan options (and later, policies) are assessed against these SA objectives.

⁴ Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency.

- The SA Scoping letter also included details of the proposed assessment methodology for the Cranbrook Development Plan, drawing on the methodology used previously for the SA of the East Devon Local Plan. Details of the proposed structure of the SA Report and next steps in the SA and Plan-preparation process were also provided.

- 2.5 Public and stakeholder participation is an important element of the SA and wider plan-making processes. It helps to ensure that the SA report is robust and has due regard for all appropriate information that will support the plan in making a contribution to sustainable development. The SA Scoping letter for the Cranbrook Development Plan was published in September 2015 for a five week consultation period with the statutory consultees (Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England) as well as other interested parties.
- 2.6 **Appendix 1** lists the comments that were received during the Scoping consultation and describes how each one has been addressed in the SA work undertaken since then. In light of the comments received a number of amendments have been made to the review of plans, policies and programmes, the baseline information and the key sustainability issues (see **Chapter 3**), and these sections of the SA report will continue to be updated as necessary at each stage of the process to ensure that they reflect the current situation in Cranbrook and take account of the most recent sources of information. A number of consultation comments were also received from consultees in relation to the SA framework and those have been addressed as appropriate, as described in **Appendix 1**.
- 2.7 **Table 2.2** overleaf presents the SA framework for the Cranbrook Development Plan which includes 20 headline SA objectives, as well as showing how all of the 'SEA topics' have been covered by the SA objectives. One small change has been made to the SA framework following the Scoping consultation - this relates to SA objective 8 which now refers to the need to consider effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets (as described in **Appendix 1**).

Table 2.2: SA framework for the Cranbrook Development Plan

SA Objectives	Relevant Topic(s) covered, as set out in the SEA Regulations
1. To ensure everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home.	Population, human health, material assets.
2. To ensure that all groups of the population have access to community services.	Population, human health, material assets.
3. To provide for education, skills and lifelong learning	Population, material assets.
4. To improve the population's health	Population, human health.
5. To reduce crime and fear of crime.	Population, human health.
6. To reduce noise levels and minimise exposure of people to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.	Population, human health.
7. To maintain and improve cultural, social and leisure provision.	Population, material assets.
8. To maintain and enhance built and historic assets and their settings.	Cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage.
9. To promote the conservation and wise use of land and protect and enhance the landscape character of East Devon.	Soil, landscape.
10. To maintain the local amenity, quality and character of the local environment.	Fauna, flora, soil, water, air, landscape.
11. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of East Devon.	Biodiversity, fauna, flora.
12. To promote and encourage non-car based modes of transport and reduce journey lengths.	Human health, air.
13. To maintain and enhance the environment in terms of air, soil and water quality.	Soil, water, air.
14. To contribute towards a reduction in local emissions of greenhouse gases.	Air, climatic factors.
15. To ensure that there is no increase in the risk of flooding.	Water, human health, material assets.
16. To ensure energy consumption is as efficient as possible.	Climatic factors.
17. To promote wise use of waste resources whilst reducing waste production and disposal.	Material assets.
18. To maintain sustainable growth of employment for East Devon, to match levels of jobs with the economically active workforce.	Population, material assets.
19. To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Towns of East Devon.	Population, material assets.
20. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment.	Population, material assets.

SA Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- 2.8 Developing options for a plan is an iterative process, usually involving a number of consultations with public and stakeholders. Consultation responses and the SA can help to identify where there may be other 'reasonable alternatives' to the options being considered for a plan.
- 2.9 Regulation 12 (2) of the SEA Regulations requires that:
- "The (environmental or SA) report must identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of—*
- (a) implementing the plan or programme; and*
- (b) reasonable alternatives, taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme."*
- 2.10 It should be noted that any alternatives considered to the plan need to be 'reasonable'. This implies that alternatives that are not reasonable do not need to be subject to appraisal. Examples of unreasonable alternatives could include policy options that do not meet the objectives of the

plan or national policy (e.g. the National Planning Policy Framework) or development site options that are unavailable or undeliverable.

- 2.11 It also needs to be recognised that the SA/SEA findings are not the only factors taken into account when determining which options to take forward in a plan. Indeed, there will often be an equal number of positive or negative effects identified for each option, such that it is not possible to 'rank' them based on sustainability performance in order to select an option. Factors such as public opinion, deliverability and conformity with national policy will also be taken into account by plan-makers when selecting options for their plan. In the case of the Cranbrook Development Plan, conformity with the East Devon Local Plan is also necessary.
- 2.12 This section provides an overview of how the options for the Cranbrook Development Plan have been identified and appraised. During the next stage of the SA, information will be provided about how the SA findings for the options fed into the selection of Preferred Options for the Plan, once that process has been completed.

Identification and appraisal of options for the Cranbrook Development Plan

Concept masterplans

- 2.13 The Concept Masterplans were developed during the first of two workshops held in July and September 2015, both of which were two days long and were led by the Savills masterplanning team and chaired by the Design Council. During the workshops delegates heard about some of the issues that development at Cranbrook is trying to resolve, issues that may be encountered during development, and the many opportunities that Cranbrook has to be a successful and sustainable new town. The ways in which the design and layout of Cranbrook could capitalise on opportunities and resolve issues were also explained. In groups, delegates explored how this information informs the way Cranbrook expands in the future by placing squares representing hectares of different types of land use onto a scale map of the potential development area.
- 2.14 The Savills team took these designs and when reviewing them found they largely conformed to two different design ideas. The Savills team produced two composite plans as a result that formed the concept masterplans. These were tested to see which was viable, given the development context and the requirements of a sustainable settlement.
- 2.15 The masterplans were provided to LUC to be subject to SA in early 2016, and the SA findings were sent to the Council in February 2016. This work was not made publicly available at the time and is now presented in this SA report (**Appendix 2**), as well as in the appendices to the Cranbrook Development Plan Issues and Options.

Issues

- 2.16 The Issues and Options document sets out an overall Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Plan and outlines the issues that could affect the development of a sustainable new town at Cranbrook. Although the Plan does not present specific policy options for addressing those issues, Part 4 of the Plan does allude to some high level alternative approaches that could be taken to address some of the issues in the Plan, and a commentary identifying possible sustainability effects of these alternative approaches has been presented in **Chapter 4** of this report.

Scenarios

- 2.17 The four scenario diagrams presented in the Issues and Options document have been developed by varying approaches to the main four issues in Cranbrook: density, landscape, noise and neighbourhood plan areas. These scenarios illustrate that maintaining current average housing density (35dph) will make it more than likely that development has to take place in areas that will either affect the visual amenity of existing settlements or in areas where future residents will be affected by noise levels above World Health Organisation recommendations. Increasing average housing density to the level suggested by Savills (45dph) reduces land-take, the likelihood of visual impact and the need to build in areas subject to high noise levels. It also increases the probable viability of businesses by putting more people within easy walking distance.
- 2.18 The four scenarios have been subject to SA and the findings are presented in **Chapter 4** and **Appendix 2** of this report.

SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report

- 2.19 This SA report describes the process that has been undertaken to date in carrying out the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan. It sets out the findings of the appraisal of options, highlighting any likely significant effects (both positive and negative, and taking into account the likely secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term and permanent and temporary effects), making recommendations where possible for ways that Plan policies could be developed to reduce potential negative effects and maximise the benefits of the Plan.

SA Stage D: Consultation on the Cranbrook Development Plan and this SA Report

- 2.20 East Devon District Council is inviting comments on the Cranbrook Development Plan Issues and Options and this SA Report. Both documents are being published on the Council's website for consultation between June and July 2016.

SA Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the Cranbrook Development Plan

- 2.21 Recommendations for monitoring the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the Cranbrook Development Plan are presented in **Chapter 5**.

Appraisal methodology

- 2.22 The reasonable options for the Cranbrook Development Plan set out in the June 2016 Issues and Options document have been appraised against the SA objectives in the SA framework (see **Table 2.2** earlier in this section), with scores being attributed to each option to indicate its likely sustainability effects on each objective as follows:

Figure 2.1 Key to symbols and colour coding used in the SA of the Cranbrook Development Plan

++	The option or policy is likely to have a significant positive effect on the SA objective(s).
++/-	The option or policy is likely to have a mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects on the SA objective(s).
+	The option or policy is likely to have a positive effect on the SA objective(s).
0	The option or policy is likely to have a negligible or no effect on the SA objective(s).
-	The option or policy is likely to have a negative effect on the SA objective(s).
-/+	The option or policy is likely to have a mixture of significant negative and minor positive effects on the SA objective(s).
--	The option or policy is likely to have a significant negative effect on the SA objective(s).
?	It is uncertain what effect the option or policy will have on the SA objective(s), due to a lack of data.
+/- or +/-	The option or policy is likely to have an equal mixture of both minor or both significant positive and negative effects on the SA objective(s).

- 2.23 Where a potential positive or negative effect is uncertain, a question mark is added to the relevant score (e.g. +? or -?) and the score is colour coded as per the potential positive, negligible or negative score (e.g. green, yellow, orange, etc.).

- 2.24 The likely effects of the options need to be determined and their significance assessed, and this inevitably requires a series of judgments to be made. This appraisal has attempted to differentiate between the most significant effects and other more minor effects through the use of the symbols shown above. The dividing line in making a decision about the significance of an effect is often quite small. Where either (++) or (--) has been used to distinguish significant effects from more minor effects (+ or -) this is because the effect of an option on the SA objective in question is considered to be of such magnitude that it will have a noticeable and measurable effect taking into account other factors that may influence the achievement of that objective. However, scores are relative to the scale of proposals under consideration.
- 2.25 The SA findings for the Cranbrook Development Plan options are described in **Chapter 4**.

Difficulties Encountered

- 2.26 It is a requirement of the SEA Regulations that consideration is given to any data limitations or other difficulties that are encountered during the SA process. During the appraisal of the policy options the fact that options had not yet been worked up in detail (comprising only suggested policy approaches) meant that at times it was difficult to assess in detail the likely effects of the options on each SA objective. Once the preferred options have been worked up into more detailed draft policies it should be possible to draw more certain conclusions about the likely effects.
- 2.27 It should be noted that Grade 3 agricultural land comprises both Grade 3a and Grade 3b agricultural land. Only Grade 3a agricultural land, which covers about 21% of England's farmland, falls into the classification of best and most versatile agricultural land. The NPPF advises that planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land for development in preference to that of a high quality. The breakdown between Grade 3a and Grade 3b agricultural land is not available for the Cranbrook area, and therefore under the precautionary principle it is assumed that Grade 3 land has the potential to be best and most versatile agricultural land.

3 Sustainability Context for Development at Cranbrook

- 3.1 This chapter presents the review of relevant plans, policies and programmes and baseline information for Cranbrook, which together provide the sustainability context for the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan. At the end of the chapter the key sustainability issues for Cranbrook are identified.
- 3.2 A number of amendments have been made to the information in this chapter since it was originally presented in the September 2015 SA Scoping letter, in light of consultation comments received during the Scoping consultation and to update the information, drawing on the most recently published evidence sources.

Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes

- 3.3 The Cranbrook Development Plan is not prepared in isolation, being greatly influenced by other plans, policies and programmes and by broader sustainability objectives. It needs to be consistent with international and national guidance and strategic planning policies and should contribute to the goals of a wide range of other programmes and strategies, such as those relating to social policy, culture and heritage. It must also conform to environmental protection legislation and the sustainability objectives established at the international, national and regional levels.
- 3.4 Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires the SA report to include:
 - (1) *"an outline of the...relationship with other relevant plans or programmes"; and*
 - (5) *"the environmental protection objectives established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation"*
- 3.5 It is necessary to identify the relationships between the Cranbrook Development Plan and the relevant plans, policies and programmes so that any potential links can be built upon and any inconsistencies and constraints addressed.
- 3.6 There are a wide range of relevant plans, policies and programmes that shape the policy context in which the Cranbrook Development Plan is being prepared. These have been reviewed in detail as part of the SA of the East Devon Local Plan, and the most relevant for the Cranbrook Development Plan specifically are summarised below.
- 3.7 At the international level, Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (the 'SEA Directive') and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (the 'Habitats Directive') are particularly significant as they require Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be undertaken in relation to the emerging Cranbrook Development Plan. These processes should be undertaken iteratively and integrated into the production of the plan in order to ensure that any potential negative environmental effects (including on European-level nature conservation designations) are identified and can be mitigated.
- 3.8 There are a wide range of other relevant EU Directives, such as the Water Framework Directive 2000, which seeks to protect inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwaters, most of which have been transposed into UK law through national-level policy, and in particular the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 3.9 The Cranbrook Development Plan must be in line with national policy as set out in the NPPF and its accompanying National Planning Practice Guidance, and will also need to be in conformity with the adopted East Devon Local Plan. The Local Plan allocates land for development at Cranbrook through Strategy 9: Major Development at East Devon's West End and Strategy 12: Development at Cranbrook. Any additional development land that is allocated in the Cranbrook Development Plan would need to be within the wider Cranbrook Development Plan area that is allocated in Strategy 12 of the East Devon Local Plan. The Local Plan policies also set out criteria that will apply to all new development at the West End of the District, including at Cranbrook (Strategy 10: Green Infrastructure in East Devon's West End and Strategy 11: Integrated Transport and Infrastructure Provision at East Devon's West End). Proposals within the Cranbrook Development Plan must be in conformity with these and other strategic Local Plan policies, as well as the general development management policies in the Local Plan.
- 3.10 A number of Neighbourhood Plans are being prepared by the communities around Cranbrook and East Devon District Council is working with these communities to ensure that they develop plans for their future that build on the opportunity presented by Cranbrook. Neighbourhood plans are currently being prepared by Rockbeare, Broadclyst, Whimble and Clyst Honiton Parish Councils and the relationship between the neighbourhood plans, the Local Plan and the Cranbrook Development Plan is one of the issues considered by the Issues and Options document.

Baseline Information

- 3.11 Baseline information provides the context for assessing the sustainability effects of proposals in the Cranbrook Development Plan and it provides the basis for identifying trends, predicting the likely effects of the plan and monitoring its outcomes. The requirements for baseline data vary widely, but it must be relevant to environmental, social and economic issues, be sensitive to change and should ideally relate to records which are sufficient to identify trends. Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires data to be gathered on biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors.
- 3.12 Baseline information for the whole of East Devon District has been collated and regularly updated throughout the SA of the East Devon Local Plan and has been consulted on as part of that SA process. Key baseline information about the Cranbrook area specifically is summarised below. Some of the information has been drawn from that gathered for the production of the Cranbrook Development Plan itself, as well as from datasets held by LUC (e.g. information about the proximity of flood zones and designated biodiversity sites).
- 3.13 Cranbrook is a rapidly developing new town in East Devon, close to the City of Exeter and neighbouring Whimble and Rockbeare. The result of over 20 years of planning, it is now coming to fruition with development having started onsite in June 2011 and the first new homes being completed in May 2012. By mid-2015 around 1,000 new homes had been built and were occupied. Planning applications for the development of 4,120 additional new homes, sports and leisure facilities and green infrastructure were also submitted to East Devon County Council in March 2015. The East Devon Local Plan proposes the expansion of Cranbrook up to 2031 to accommodate nearly 8,000 new homes. This scale of development would make Cranbrook the second biggest town in East Devon, after Exmouth.
- 3.14 On the basis of its current extent, Cranbrook is located approximately 2.5km to the east of Exeter at the nearest point and is approximately 600m to the north of the Exeter Airport site. Cranbrook is located near to the A30 and M5 motorway, and has a new railway station which has been built as part of the early stages of the town's development. The train into Exeter takes only nine minutes to the centre compared to around 40 minutes by car, however, it currently only runs hourly. In addition, there is a dedicated cycle route into Exeter from Cranbrook which many people in Cranbrook use on a regular basis. However, private car remains the key mode of transport in the area.
- 3.15 Cranbrook is being developed as a new town to include employment land and services and facilities alongside the new housing, within the context of significant growth within the 'West End' of East Devon. This means that Cranbrook will be in close proximity to the employment

developments of Skypark, Science Park, the Inter-Modal Freight Facility and Exeter Airport as well as being linked to Exeter by rail, good quality cycle routes and bus and to the surrounding countryside and the new Clyst Valley Regional Park through a network of footpaths and cycleways.

- 3.16 A new primary school, St Martin's Primary, opened in September 2012 and a new healthcare facility, Cranbrook Medical Practice, opened in spring 2015. A second primary school and the first secondary school at Cranbrook also opened in September 2015 at the new Cranbrook Education Campus. A respondent to the first consultation on the Cranbrook Development Plan noted that Cranbrook is a very community-spirited town with lots of activities going on.
- 3.17 Cranbrook is served by a Combined Heat and Power System that is already producing heat and electricity. This will make Cranbrook a low carbon development.
- 3.18 There are no designated biodiversity sites within very close proximity of Cranbrook, although the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and East Devon Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) are approximately 3.5 km to the south east and the Exe Estuary SPA and Ramsar site is approximately 6.5 km to the south west. These sites are highly sensitive and the qualifying species and habitats that they are designated for are vulnerable to human pressures including recreation and general disturbance. In partnership with Natural England, East Devon District Council and the neighbouring authorities of Exeter City Council and Teignbridge District Council have determined that housing and tourist accommodation developments in their areas will have a detrimental in-combination impact on the Exe Estuary SPA and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC as a result of the impacts of recreational use. These impacts have been found to be greatest from developments within 10 km of these European sites, and the Cranbrook Development Plan area falls within 10 km of both. The three Councils have prepared the South East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy⁵, which sets out a joint approach to mitigating the potential significant effects on the SAC and SPA including delivery of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) sites to try to encourage dog walking and other recreation away from the sensitive European sites.
- 3.19 In addition, Hellings Park Fen just north of the railway line at Wishford Farm on the Killerton estate is a County Wildlife Site. Further away the park and woods north of Killerton House are designated as a SSSI for their geology. Another County Wildlife Site, Ashclyst Forest, although not designated as a SSSI is also of national importance for its lichens and the number of veteran trees it includes (the forest also supports an important population of pearl-bordered fritillary butterfly, a greatly declined UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Species and is important for bats).
- 3.20 The Cranbrook development area is located some distance from the AONBs in East Devon, being approximately 4km from the East Devon AONB to the south/south east and 10km from the Blackdown Hills AONB to the east. Cranbrook lies in the 'lowland plains' landscape character type, as identified in the East Devon Landscape Character Assessment⁶. This area comprises low lying land adjacent to river valleys. It is flat and in mixed cultivation, with a variety of field size and pattern. Wide hedges, often elm-dominated, and hedgerows are distinctive, often with prominent hedgerow oaks. The landscape around Cranbrook is relatively flat but falls away steeply to the south along an escarpment bordering the airport and Rockbeare. The land rises sharply in the north east corner of the master plan area towards the green wedge east of Whimble.
- 3.21 The East Devon Local Plan Strategy 10: East Devon's West End promotes the Clyst Valley Regional Park (CVRP) as a green infrastructure initiative that will provide high quality natural green space. The CVRP land allocation surrounds Cranbrook and could potentially function as a SANG to mitigate the recreational impact of additional visitors to the European designated East Devon Pebblebed Heaths and the Exe Estuary.
- 3.22 Most of Cranbrook lies outside of high flood risk zones, although there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3 which extend within the area that is allocated in the East Devon Local Plan, across the northern boundary and through the centre of the area. Much of the Cranbrook development area

⁵ South-east Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy. Footprint Ecology. June 2014.

⁶ East Devon and Blackdown Hills Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and East Devon District Landscape Character Assessment and Management Guidelines (2008)

is within Grade 3 agricultural land, although it is not known if this is Grade 3a or 3b. The northern part of the site is within Grade 4 agricultural land.

- 3.23 Rockbears Manor Registered Park and Garden is located approximately 500m to the south east of Cranbrook and there are a number of listed buildings within and around the development area. Approximately 5km to the north west is the National Trust estate at Killerton (a Grade II* listed Park and Garden), and nearby Broadclyst is designated as a Conservation Area. Cranbrook falls within the defined 'Zone of Potential Influence' identified in the Killerton Setting Study⁷ which locates Cranbrook principally within a sub-area of the Lowland Plains landscape character type, character area 6c, which forms the middle to distant setting to the southern part of Killerton Park, featuring in key views from Killerton Garden. The study recognises this area to only be of low significance to the Park and currently subject to the greatest degree of change of all the areas covered by the study. However, whilst the area is of low significance to Killerton Park the potential for impacts on this heritage asset will need to be considered during the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan and through the SA.
- 3.24 There are no Air Quality Management Areas within or near to Cranbrook – the only one that has been declared in East Devon District is within Honiton, further to the east. The proximity of Exeter Airport to the south of Cranbrook means that noise is a concern, as well as other possible impacts associated with airport operation.

Key Sustainability Issues

- 3.25 A set of key sustainability issues for Cranbrook was identified during the Scoping stage of the SA and was presented in the September 2015 Scoping letter. In light of comments received during that consultation, a small number of amendments have been made to the key sustainability issues now presented in this report.
- 3.26 In recognition of the SEA Regulation requirement (Schedule 2) that the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme must be described in the Environmental Report, **Table 3.1** overleaf describes the likely evolution of each key sustainability issue if the Cranbrook Development Plan were not to be adopted.

⁷ LUC, (2013), *Killerton Setting Study*

Table 3.1: Key Sustainability Issues for the Cranbrook Development Plan and likely evolution without the Plan

Key Sustainability Issue	Likely evolution of the issue without implementation of the Cranbrook Development Plan
<p>The need to ensure that large-scale new development is appropriately integrated into the landscape, respecting and enhancing local character where possible.</p>	<p>In the absence of the Cranbrook Development Plan, this issue would still be addressed to some extent through relevant policies in the adopted East Devon Local Plan. The Local Plan Strategy 5: Environment states that new development will incorporate open space and high quality landscaping to provide attractive and desirable natural and built environments for new occupants and wildlife. Strategy 46: Landscape Conservation and Enhancement and AONBs requires development to be undertaken in a manner that is sympathetic to, and helps conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of, the natural and historic landscape character of East Devon. These general East Devon-wide policies will apply to all new development, including large-scale development at Cranbrook. However, if the Cranbrook Development Plan were not to be adopted, the opportunities to include policies relating to the landscape impacts of the town specifically would be lost; therefore this issue would not be as well addressed. Similarly, the lack of a comprehensive masterplan for Cranbrook would mean that the development is less likely to be comprehensively planned and well-integrated into the landscape.</p>
<p>The need to ensure that large scale new development is compatible with the wider transport network.</p>	<p>In the absence of the Cranbrook Development Plan, this issue would still be addressed to some extent through relevant policies in the adopted East Devon Local Plan. Strategy 12: Development at Cranbrook sets the overall context for the development in the Local Plan and states that the Council will produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will set out key requirements recognising the need for improved transport links and road improvements as Cranbrook grows. However, if the Cranbrook Development Plan were not to be adopted, opportunities to consider this issue through the masterplanning process would be lost, as would opportunities to include locally specific policies relating to this issue.</p>
<p>The need to protect biodiversity (in particular the Exe Estuary SPA and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC) from the impacts of large-scale development in the area, in particular increased recreation pressure.</p>	<p>In the absence of the Cranbrook Development Plan, this issue would still be addressed to some extent through relevant policies in the adopted East Devon Local Plan. Strategy 10: Green Infrastructure in East Devon's West End refers to the potential impacts on biodiversity, including from recreation, of the large-scale growth proposed in the West End, including at Cranbrook. The policy refers to the South East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy which has been developed to ensure that impacts on European sites specifically are avoided, and which would still be in place in the absence of the Cranbrook Plan. However, without the masterplanning process associated with the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan, opportunities to consider in more detail at the Cranbrook level the likely impacts of development at the town on biodiversity, and to address them, would be lost.</p>
<p>High flood risk in some parts of the development area, and the need to consider impacts on strategic watercourses.</p>	<p>In the absence of the Cranbrook Development Plan, this issue would still be addressed to some extent through relevant policies in the adopted East Devon Local Plan. Policy EN21: River and Coastal Flooding specifies that a sequential approach will be taken to determining the location of new development, focussing it in Flood Zone 1 where possible before Flood Zones 2 and 3. East Devon-wide policies such as this will also apply within Cranbrook. However, without the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan, opportunities to consider the issue of flooding during the detailed masterplanning process would be lost.</p>
<p>The need to conserve and enhance the setting of listed buildings and other heritage features, such as Killerton Registered Park and Garden.</p>	<p>In the absence of the Cranbrook Development Plan, this issue would still be addressed to some extent through relevant policies in the adopted East Devon Local Plan. Policy EN8: Significance of Heritage Assets and their Setting sets out the requirements for developers to proportionately and systematically assess the significance of any heritage assets and their settings which could be affected by development. Policy EN9: Development Affecting a Designated</p>

Key Sustainability Issue	Likely evolution of the issue without implementation of the Cranbrook Development Plan
	Heritage Asset states that the Council will not grant permission for developments involving substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset unless it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or that various criteria apply. These and other relevant East Devon-wide policies will apply to all development, including that at Cranbrook. However, without the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan, opportunities to consider impacts on the historic environment during the detailed masterplanning process would be lost.
The need to avoid high levels of car use by balancing residential development with an appropriate range of employment opportunities, services and facilities.	In the absence of the Cranbrook Development Plan, this issue would still be addressed to some extent through relevant policies in the adopted East Devon Local Plan. Strategy 12: Development at Cranbrook sets the overall context for the development in the Local Plan and states that jobs, social and community facilities will be provided alongside housing at the town. However, this policy is high level and does not include any detail about the specific location of different types of development within the town. This can be considered in more detail through the masterplanning process associated with the preparation of the Cranbrook Development Plan, and therefore in the absence of the Plan, the issue would not be as comprehensively addressed.

4 SA Findings for the Issues and Options

- 4.1 This section summarises the SA findings for the options set out in the Issues and Options version of the Cranbrook Development Plan (June 2016). The detailed SA matrices for the options can be found in **Appendix 2**.

Vision and Strategic Objectives

- 4.2 **Table 4.1** overleaf presents the SA scores for the Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Cranbrook Development Plan, which are described below.

Summary of likely effects - Vision

- 4.3 The overall Vision for Cranbrook sets a general aim for development to take place in a sustainable way to enable Cranbrook to become a 'Sustainable New Town' and is supported by a number of aspirations, which are mostly social and economic. As it is aspirational, the Vision is likely to have a positive effect on all of the social and economic SA objectives, but the lack of environmental aspirations means that the Vision is likely to have generally negligible effects on the environmental SA objectives.
- 4.4 Social aspirations set out in the Vision include the provision of good homes and jobs, improvements to people's health and safety and the development of community facilities including public transport and green infrastructure. Therefore, the vision is likely to have minor positive effects on SA objectives 1 (**housing**), 2 (**access to services**), 3 (**education**), 4 (**health**), 5 (**crime**), 7 (**leisure and recreation**), 10 (**local amenity**) and 12 (**transport**).
- 4.5 Economic aspirations within the Vision include the stimulation of economic growth and provision of good quality jobs and the Vision is therefore likely to have minor positive effects on SA objectives 18 (**employment**), 19 (**town centre vitality**) and 20 (**economic growth**).
- 4.6 The Vision is unlikely to have any significant effects on the SA objectives as it sets out high level aspirations and the success of the Vision in helping to achieve the SA objectives will depend largely on the more detailed policies included in the Cranbrook Development Plan. The Vision is for the long term development of Cranbrook, therefore the sustainability effects identified are likely to occur over the longer term.

Summary of likely effects – Strategic Objectives

- 4.7 The Cranbrook Development Plan strategic objectives are generally unlikely to have an effect on, or are compatible with, the SA objectives (as shown in **Table 4.1**). They are likely to have a number of minor positive effects, including on SA objectives 1 (**housing**), 2 (**access to services**), 3 (**education**), 4 (**health**), 8 (**historic environment**), 10 (**amenity and local character**), 11 (**biodiversity**), 18 (**employment**), 19 (**town centre vitality**) and 20 (**economy**). As with the Vision, the sustainability effects of the strategic objectives are likely to occur over the longer term.
- 4.8 Some of the Local Plan strategic objectives are likely to lead to significant positive effects, where they directly address SA objectives. This is the case for:
- Design and Housing Objective 2 in relation to **housing** (SA objective 1).
 - Health and Wellbeing Objectives 1-5 in relation to **health** (SA objective 4).
 - Culture, Sport and Community Objective 5 and Economy and Enterprise Objective 4 in relation to **education** (SA objective 3).
 - Design and Housing Objective 5 in relation to **crime** (SA objective 5).
 - Culture, Sport and Community Objectives 3 and 6 in relation to **leisure and recreation** (SA objective 7).

- Design and Housing Objective 1 in relation to **local amenity** (SA objective 10).
- Landscape and Biodiversity Objective 3 in relation to **biodiversity** (SA objective 11).
- Energy and Climate Change Objective 3 and Transport Objectives 1-3 in relation to **sustainable transport** (SA objective 12).
- Energy and Climate Change Objective 1 in relation to **energy efficiency** (SA objective 16).
- Energy and Climate Change Objective 4 in relation to **waste** (SA objective 17).
- Economy and Enterprise Objective 5 and Design and Housing Objectives 1 and 3 in relation to **town centre viability** (SA objective 19).
- Culture, Sport and Community Objective 4 and Economy and Enterprise Objectives 1-3 in relation to **economic growth** (SA objective 20).

Table 4.1: SA scores for the Cranbrook Development Plan Vision and Strategic Objectives

	SA Objectives																			
	1. Housing	2. Community services	3. Education and skills	4. Health	5. Crime	6. Noise	7. Leisure and recreation	8. Historic environment	9. Landscape character	10. Amenity	11. Biodiversity	12. Sustainable transport	13. Air, soil and water	14. Greenhouse gas emissions	15. Flood risk	16. Energy efficiency	17. Waste	18. Employment	19. Vitality and viability of towns	20. Inward investment
Plan Vision	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
Health and Wellbeing Objectives																				
Objective 1: Health and wellbeing is integrated into all parts of the town.	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Objective 2: A balanced, active community with the best health and wellbeing outcomes in the UK.	+?	+?	+?	+	+?	+?	+?	0	0	0	0	+?	+?	+?	+?	0	0	+?	0	0
Objective 3: A town is designed to help prevent long-term health conditions such as obesity and depression from developing.	+?	+?	0	+	0	+?	+?	0	0	0	0	0	+?	+?	+?	0	0	0	0	0
Objective 4: From the start new technology helps health and wellbeing services work together to provide the most effective services.	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Objective 5: The best environment for everyone, including the young and vulnerable.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Culture, Sport and Community Objectives																				
Objective 1: A supportive, balanced, diverse community with community, sport and cultural facilities for everyone.	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	0	+?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
Objective 2: Strong cultural and community activity that brings the community together and brings those from neighbouring communities into the town.	0	+?	+?	+?	0	0	+?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0

	SA Objectives																				
Objective 3: A range of flexible community buildings and spaces that enable the community to interact as and when they wish.	0	+	+	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	
Objective 4: A town that supports and encourages local creative projects.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++
Objective 5: Schools that are the heart of the community.	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Objective 6: Sports activities are accessible to all, part of the fabric and community of Cranbrook.	0	+	0	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Economy and Enterprise Objectives																					
Objective 1: Cranbrook secures its identity as a small enterprise town with a successful business community which is recognised for identifying new business opportunities.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++
Objective 2: Cranbrook residents are encouraged to start their own small businesses within the town and are given help to grow those businesses.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++
Objective 3: External businesses are attracted to Cranbrook because it is a thriving and vibrant town.	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++
Objective 4: All residents can access excellent education to develop the skills they need to fulfil their ambitions.	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Objective 5: Vibrant town and neighbourhood centres which are busy and successful both in the day and evening.	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	+
Energy and Climate Change Objectives																					
Objective 1: Reduce the amount of harmful greenhouse gases Cranbrook sends into the atmosphere by being more energy efficient and making greater use of renewable energy.	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	
Objective 2: Be fully informed and prepared for the effects and impact of climate change.	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	
Objective 3: Encourage residents to minimise their carbon footprint by using public transport, walking and cycling and reducing the energy they use.	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	

	SA Objectives																				
Objective 4: To encourage the purchasing of local goods and materials by residents and the developers and ensure that waste is recycled wherever possible.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+
Transport Objectives																					
Objective 1: An integrated, coordinated transport system enabling people to move easily within Cranbrook and to its neighbours and beyond.	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	
Objective 2: Have as many public transport routes and services as possible and make walking and cycling around the town as easy as possible.	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	
Objective 3: Reduce car use by making public transport, walking and cycling attractive alternatives.	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Objective 4: Be ready for future developments in transport technology.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Landscape and Biodiversity Objectives																					
Objective 1: Cranbrook has high quality accessible natural green spaces.	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	
Objective 2: Green spaces and landscape features within and around Cranbrook are linked and have a variety of functions, making sure that they are as valuable as possible to the community and wildlife.	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	
Objective 3: Buildings and open spaces include nesting boxes and other features to create wildlife habitats that the community can also enjoy.	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Objective 5: Features such as ponds and ditches are used to collect storm water and designed so that they help to create attractive streets and open spaces.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Design and Housing Objectives																					
Objective 1: Buildings and spaces are well designed to make an attractive, thriving town.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	
Objective 2: A wide range of homes are available to rent and buy.	++	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	
Objective 3: Streets are social spaces, connecting people, not just places.	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	

	SA Objectives																				
Objective 4: Spaces and buildings are designed to encourage people to talk to one another, allow people to trade goods and services and can easily be changed to meet the changing needs of the community.	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
Objective 5: Spaces and buildings are designed to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour without the need for CCTV or an excessive police presence.	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delivery and Flexibility Objectives																					
Objective 1: Cranbrook's delivery will be supported by a clear policy framework in the Local Plan, Cranbrook DPD and Neighbourhood Plans that provide clarity and certainty to developers, communities and other stakeholders.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Objective 2: Development at Cranbrook recognises change over time and allows flexibility of use and provides opportunity and space for emerging needs of the community.	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
Objective 3: Cranbrook will develop as a sustainable new town, phased to ensure the community's needs can be met both during development and long into the future.	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+

SA findings for the Cranbrook Development Plan options

Options within Part 4: Issues

- 4.9 Part 4 of the Cranbrook Development Plan sets out the issues that could affect the development of a sustainable new town at Cranbrook. Although this section of the Plan does not present specific policy options for addressing particular issues, the text does allude to alternative ways that certain issues may be approached or addressed. Therefore, the following section provides a high level commentary of the potential sustainability effects of those broad approaches and identifies particular areas where there could be positive or negative effects and issues that might need to be considered if and when more detailed policies are worked up.

Airport noise

- 4.10 Part 4 of the Cranbrook Development Plan notes that one of the key choices for Cranbrook will be whether to restrict development in areas where noise levels are exceeding the World Health Organisation Standard, or to allow development in those areas and accept the impact this may have on residents and mitigate impacts as far as possible. These options affect the spatial location of development and so are considered as part of the appraisal of the four spatial scenarios further ahead in this chapter.

Sports

- 4.11 The Cranbrook Development Plan recognises that sports pitches and associated facilities can take up large areas of land and be expensive to maintain. Two approaches are identified in Part 4 of the Plan, the first being to provide sports pitches over a number of sites comprising only one or two pitches on each and located throughout the town so that they are easily accessible to everyone, although they would only be able to provide limited facilities. The second approach referred to is to provide large sports hubs in a couple of locations which would have the potential to provide more and better pitches and also to provide club houses, changing facilities, social venues that would support sports clubs and enable other social events to take place.
- 4.12 The first approach is likely to have positive effects on the accessibility of sports facilities for the community (SA objective 2) and on levels of walking and cycling (SA objective 12) because more people would live within a short distance of a sports facility. Positive effects on health (SA objective 4) are also likely. However, each individual facility may be less high quality and the lack of associated facilities may deter some people from using them, which could have the opposite effect. The effects of the second approach would be the opposite – while facilities may be less accessible, they would be more comprehensive which may encourage people to make more use of them. These effects are likely to be reasonably quick to achieve and permanent once the facilities are established. The sustainability effects would be most positive if a mix of sports facilities can be provided – some smaller and more dispersed and some larger and more comprehensive.

How to provide facilities

- 4.13 The Cranbrook Development Plan notes that waiting for culture, community and sports facilities to be provided in the town is an option; however it would also be possible to deliver many of these spaces through temporary buildings and spaces at low cost using well-designed temporary facilities.
- 4.14 The second option (providing spaces on which to provide temporary sports, cultural or community facilities until permanent facilities can be provided) would have more positive effects than the first option (not doing so), particularly in the short term, albeit the effects could be temporary. The second option would improve access to leisure and recreation facilities within Cranbrook (SA objective 7), benefitting health (SA objective 4) and avoiding the need for people to travel elsewhere, in turn reducing journey lengths (SA objective 12) and benefitting air quality (SA objective 13) and greenhouse gas emissions (SA objective 14). Not providing temporary facilities would result in negative effects on these issues as levels of access to sports, cultural and community facilities would be less good for residents of Cranbrook, particularly during the time that the town is still developing, however, if permanent facilities were to be developed in the longer term then similar positive effects as above could be achieved, albeit in the longer term but they would be more permanent. The sustainability effects would be most positive if a mixed

approach was taken i.e. temporary facilities provided until more permanent ones can be delivered.

Energy and climate change

- 4.15 The Cranbrook Development Plan notes that more could be done to reduce emissions from buildings by making them more efficient and by increasing the amount of energy they gain from natural sources like the sun. Cranbrook itself could produce significant amounts of energy if more opportunities were taken to install renewable energy systems.
- 4.16 Doing more to benefit from solar gain and renewable energy would have medium-long term positive effects on reducing greenhouse gas emissions (SA objective 14), increasing energy efficiency (SA objective 16) and air quality (SA objective 13). The alternative option of doing nothing would not have the same positive effects, but is not considered in itself to have negative effects on any of the SA objectives. Therefore, it is recommended that the Plan include a policy to ensure that new development includes renewable energy.

Transport

- 4.17 The Cranbrook Development Plan refers to two options for the development of a second railway station at the town – it could be located either near to the town centre or to the east of Cranbrook.
- 4.18 Both options for a new train station would have longer term, permanent positive effects on sustainable transport (SA objective 12) and greenhouse gas emissions (SA objective 14) as improved rail services should help to reduce levels of car use in and around Cranbrook. These positive effects are likely to be more significant if the new station were to be centrally located as it would be more accessible for most people and so levels of usage are likely to be higher. Similarly, the better accessibility of a new station at the town centre would mean that it would have more positive effects in terms of providing access to community services (SA objective 2), leisure and recreation facilities (SA objective 7) and employment opportunities (SA objective 12). As well as providing good access for people in Cranbrook travelling out of the town for these purposes, a town centre railway station would enable more people from outside of Cranbrook to access the town centre offer there. A more central station could, however, have a negative effect on the landscape (SA objective 9) as the new station would be located in a higher quality landscape area. The effects of a station to the east of the town on the landscape are uncertain at this stage. Both options could have negative effects on flood risk (SA objective 15) as both would locate a new station within or close to high flood risk areas although the effects are uncertain until specific proposals come forward.

Natural green space and SANGs

- 4.19 The Cranbrook Development Plan notes that a large area of SANGs is needed for Cranbrook but that there are several factors to be considered when deciding where it should be provided, including the need to ensure that noise levels are acceptable, especially near the Airport, and the year round accessibility of land in flood plain.
- 4.20 If SANGs were to be provided in areas of high noise levels, this could reduce their attractiveness and effectiveness as SANGs, which could result in negative effects on biodiversity (SA objective 11). People may be less likely to use these spaces for outdoor recreation and so negative effects could also occur in relation to health (SA objective 4) and leisure and recreation (SA objective 7). Conversely, if SANGs are provided outside of high noise areas, people would be more likely to use them and positive effects on these same SA objectives would be expected. Similarly, if SANGs are to be provided in areas that are not accessible all year round because of flooding, they would be less accessible and less effective as SANGs (as their primary purpose is to provide alternative recreation areas to draw people away from the sensitive SAC and SPA sites), which would have negative effects on the same SA objectives. Therefore it is recommended that SANGs are provided where they are accessible all year round as they would be more effective and would have positive effects on these objectives. The sustainability effects of SANGs provision are likely to be in the medium to longer term, depending on how quickly the sites are delivered, but should be permanent.

Designing and good mix of homes

- 4.21 The Cranbrook Development Plan refers to options for the mix of housing to be provided at the town. At present Cranbrook provides a high percentage of family homes which have been attractive to the market and have sold successfully. However, to support a cohesive community there needs to be a wider mix of house types to enable a diverse community to develop. A wider mix could include apartments, bungalows, houses and apartments designed for older people, sheltered accommodation and housing with care, as well as the family homes already being provided.
- 4.22 Providing a wider mix of housing types would have long term, permanent positive effects on the vitality and viability of the town (SA objective 19) and could also benefit health (SA objective 4) by ensuring that those with specific housing needs have those needs met, including elderly and disabled people. There may also be positive effects on housing provision (SA objective 1) although this is to some extent uncertain as if housing is provided that does not reflect the demands of the market for largely family homes at Cranbrook, positive effects would not be achieved and there could even be negative effects.

Density

- 4.23 Part 4 of the Cranbrook Development Plan notes that there is a choice to be made about the mix of housing densities within the town and whether there should be greater variety in density than the existing development and also whether average densities should be increased. These options affect the spatial location of development and so are considered as part of the appraisal of the four spatial scenarios further ahead in this chapter.

Designing homes for Gypsies and Travellers

- 4.24 In relation to Gypsy and Traveller pitches, the Cranbrook Development Plan notes that choices can be made about the number, location and size of the sites and whether these include space for employment or not.
- 4.25 The provision of pitches in any location would have positive effects on housing (SA objective 1), provided that enough are developed to meet the identified local need of gypsies and travellers. Effects could occur in the short to medium term as once the sites are provided there would be minimal construction time needed. The location of the sites within Cranbrook will influence the effects on many of the SA objectives as this will determine how accessible sites are to schools, community facilities, jobs and sustainable transport links. Effects on many of the SA objectives will be more positive where pitches are well-connected and levels of car use can be lower. Larger sites may be more visible and therefore more likely to affect landscape character (SA objective 9) and the setting of heritage assets (SA objective 8); however fewer sites overall may be provided overall if they are larger in size which could reduce the likelihood of impacts on those SA objectives. Conversely, smaller sites may be less visible but there would be more sites overall; therefore increasing the likelihood of heritage assets and the landscape being affected, although these impacts could be mitigated through good design of sites.

The future of London Road

- 4.26 Two approaches for the future of London Road are described in the Cranbrook Development Plan. It could continue as at present, acting as a barrier to development to the south and containing Cranbrook. Alternatively, it could become a functional asset and a part of Cranbrook itself rather than a way out or a bypass. It could provide an attractive and functional gateway to the town encouraging people to stop and visit the new town, building awareness of the great potential it offers. Development fronting onto the London Road on its north side and within the existing consented area and allocated expansion areas could help the London Road to start to fulfil this role.
- 4.27 Developing the role of the London Road could have medium to long term, permanent positive effects on the economy (SA objective 20) and employment (SA objective 18) as well as enhancing the vitality and viability of the town (SA objective 19). It could also result in higher levels of use of local services and facilities (SA objective 2), enhancing their viability and stimulating new provision. The alternative approach of not taking these opportunities and continuing with the role of the road as at present would not have negative effects; however the potential positive effects would not be achieved and negligible effects would be likely.

Self and custom built homes

- 4.28 The Cranbrook Development Plan notes that self and custom-built homes increase the diversity of housing, help create greater community stability and a greater sense of place, and that the East Devon Local Plan supports the Government aim to significantly increase the amount of self and custom build in the UK. Cranbrook is well-placed to enable greater levels of self-build by making land available.
- 4.29 Self build housing provides opportunities for people to design custom homes to meet their needs and can be more cost effective; therefore increasing land provision for this would have positive effects on housing (SA objective 1) in the medium-long term depending on how quickly construction is achieved.

Options within Part 5: Next Steps

- 4.30 **Table 4.2** below summarises the SA scores for the four scenarios for the spatial development of Cranbrook that are set out in Part 5 of the Cranbrook Development Plan; the more detailed SA matrices are presented in **Appendix 2**, and the findings are summarised below Table 4.2. The four spatial development options are:

- **Scenario 1:** Current density and development within areas subject to noise levels above recommended limits.
- **Scenario 2:** Current density and development in Neighbourhood Plan areas
- **Scenario 3:** Increased average density to 45dph and development within areas subject to noise levels above recommended limits.
- **Scenario 4:** Increased average density to 45dph and development in landscape sensitive areas and some land within Neighbourhood Plan areas.

Table 4.2: SA scores for the four scenarios

SA objective	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
1. Housing	-	+	-/+	+
2. Community services	-	-	+	+
3. Education and skills	0	0	0	0
4. Health	-	+/-	-/+	+
5. Crime	0	0	0	0
6. Noise	--	+	--	+
7. Leisure and recreation	-	-	+	-
8. Historic environment	-/+?	-/+?	+/-?	+/-?
9. Landscape character	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
10. Amenity	-	+	-	+
11. Biodiversity	-?	-?	+?	+/-?
12. Sustainable transport	-	-	++/-	++/-
13. Air, soil and water	-	-	+/-	+/-
14. Greenhouse gas emissions	-	-	++/-	++/-
15. Flood risk	0	0	0	0
16. Energy efficiency	0	0	0	0
17. Waste	0	0	0	0
18. Employment	0	0	0	0
19. Vitality and viability of towns	-	-	+	+
20. Inward investment	-/+	-/+	+	+

- 4.31 All four scenarios would result in the same amount of **housing** development (SA objective 1) and this is likely to be in the medium-long term and permanent; however Scenarios 1 and 3 would place development in areas that are adversely affected by noise from Exeter Airport, which could compromise the quality of housing developed in those areas. Minor negative effects are therefore likely for those two scenarios, although for Scenario 3 this is mixed with a minor positive effect as the higher density development associated with that scenario may result in opportunities to provide a wider range of homes of different types, sizes and appearance. As it also provides higher density development, Scenario 4 is likely to have a minor positive effect, which is also

reinforced by the fact that it would steer housing development away from high noise areas. Scenario 2 would have a minor positive effect because it would also steer housing development away from high noise areas.

- 4.32 The higher density development associated with Scenarios 3 and 4 would result in the medium-long term in more people living in closer proximity to community **services and facilities** and being able to access them without needing to use a car; therefore positive, permanent effects are likely on SA objective 2 for those scenarios. Conversely, minor negative effects are likely for Scenarios 1 and 2 which would involve lower density and more dispersed development, with people needing to travel longer distances (possibly by car) to access services and facilities day to day. Because of this, Scenarios 1 and 2 are also likely to have minor negative effects on **sustainable transport** (SA objective 12), **air, soil and water** (SA objective 13) and **greenhouse gas emissions** (SA objective 14). Scenarios 3 and 4 would have mixed effects on those three SA objectives; they would enable more people to walk and cycle day to day as journeys would often be shorter, and the higher density development would mean that a second railway station could be located nearer to the town centre, making it potentially more accessible and attractive to users and reducing levels of car use. However, building the station in this location may be more technically challenging as it is in the flood plain and near to the high voltage power lines and it may therefore be less likely to be delivered.
- 4.33 The higher density development associated with Scenarios 3 and 4, and the resulting good opportunities for walking and cycling, is likely to have a positive effect on **health** (SA objective 4) in the medium-long term, with the opposite likely for Scenarios 1 and 2 which could have minor negative effects due to lower levels of active travel. However, Scenarios 2 and 3 are likely to have mixed effects overall as Scenario 3 would involve development in high noise areas which could adversely affect health, while Scenario 2 would steer development away from those areas and reduce noise exposure. For that reason, Scenarios 1 and 3 are likely to have significant negative effects on **noise** (SA objective 6) and **amenity** (SA objective 10). These effects would be intermittent but permanent.
- 4.34 Scenarios 1, 2 and 4 are all likely to have minor negative effects on **leisure and recreation** (SA objective 7) while Scenario 3 would have a minor positive effect. This is because Scenarios 1 and 2 would require larger areas of land for housing development due to the lower density of development, which would reduce the options for delivering SANGs near to Cranbrook. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available which are predominantly within the flood plain. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes. Under Scenario 4, although development would be at higher density, in order to reduce the amount of development within Neighbourhood Plan areas, land would be used for development in the north east corner of Cranbrook that may be better suited for other uses including SANGs. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available within the masterplan study boundary, which are predominantly within the flood plain or in areas subject to high levels of noise. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes. Conversely, under Scenario 3 development would be at higher density, freeing up more land closer to Cranbrook for SANGs outside of the flood plain, meaning that it would be more accessible for leisure and recreation purposes. The positive effects of SANG provision are likely to be experienced in the medium to longer term, depending on how quickly the sites are delivered, but should be permanent.
- 4.35 The effects of the four scenarios on **heritage** (SA objective 8) would depend largely on the specific location and design of built development, which is not yet known. Lower density development under Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean that development is more dispersed, potentially impacting upon the setting of more heritage features; however dispersed development may be able to be designed more sympathetically, for example incorporating more green infrastructure, which could reduce the likelihood of negative effects on heritage assets. Conversely, higher density development under Scenarios 3 and 4 would be more concentrated so may affect the setting of fewer heritage features; however the development may be less sympathetically incorporated into the wider landscape and townscape. Scenarios 1 and 3 could result in development which is visually intrusive from Rockbeare, and so could potentially affect the setting of Rockbeare Registered Park and Garden although this cannot be assessed in detail

until specific development proposals come forward. Potentially mixed (minor positive and minor negative) but uncertain effects are therefore identified for all four scenarios. These effects would be likely to occur in the medium-longer term depending on how quickly development takes place.

- 4.36 The higher density development associated with Scenarios 3 and 4 may mean that it sits less sympathetically in the **landscape** (SA objective 9), as opportunities for incorporating green infrastructure within the development might be more limited. However, it would also mean lower levels of land take overall than Scenarios 1 and 2 which would involve more dispersed, lower density development. Scenario 1 would also require development on ridgelines which would be visually intrusive to existing settlements, particularly Rockbeare. Similarly, in order to avoid development in areas that may be visually intrusive to existing settlements, Scenario 2 would need to use significant areas of land within Neighbourhood Plan boundaries which increases the risk of Cranbrook merging with Rockbeare, significantly affecting the character and identity of the village. Scenarios 3 and 4 would involve higher density development and so would limit the amount of land take and avoid coalescence between Cranbrook and Rockbeare; however both scenarios would involve development in visually intrusive areas. In all cases, the mixed effects identified are likely to be permanent and in the medium to longer term, but uncertain as impacts on the landscape will depend on the specific location and design of development which is not known at this stage.
- 4.37 As with heritage and landscape, impacts on **biodiversity** (SA objective 11) cannot be assessed in detail until specific development proposals come forward. There are no designated biodiversity sites within very close proximity of Cranbrook that would be affected under the four scenarios. However, with any greenfield development there is likely to be some effect on undesignated biodiversity features such as hedgerows, trees and mobile species. Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean that development is lower density and more dispersed, potentially impacting upon more biodiversity features as overall land take would be higher. Minor negative effects are therefore likely for those scenarios. Conversely, higher density development under Scenarios 3 and 4 would be more concentrated so would involve less land take, reducing the likelihood of negative impacts on biodiversity. Minor positive effects are therefore likely for those scenarios. However, in all cases the effects are likely to be temporary (mostly during construction) and uncertain as they will depend on factors such as the design and specific location of development which is not yet known. The scenarios could also affect biodiversity as a result of the implications that they would have for the provision and effectiveness of SANGs. Scenarios 1 and 2 would require larger areas of land for housing development due to the lower density of development, which would reduce the options for delivering SANGs near to Cranbrook. This could reduce their attractiveness and effectiveness in terms of reducing recreation pressure at European sites, reinforcing the minor negative effects already identified for those scenarios. Conversely, under Scenario 3 development would be at higher density, freeing up more land closer to Cranbrook for SANGs, meaning that it would be more accessible for leisure and recreation purposes and therefore more effective in terms of mitigating impacts on European sites. This reinforces the minor positive effect already identified for that scenario. Under Scenario 4, although development would be at higher density, in order to reduce the amount of development within Neighbourhood Plan areas, land would be used for development in the north east corner of Cranbrook that may be better suited for other uses including SANGs. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available within the masterplan study boundary which are predominantly within the flood plain or in areas subject to high levels of noise. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes. This would again reduce the effectiveness of the SANGs and a mixed (minor positive and minor negative effect) is therefore likely overall for Scenario 4.
- 4.38 The lower density development that would result from Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean a continuation of the densities that are currently being achieved within Cranbrook, which are associated with suburban housing estates that tend to attract families, making it less likely that the town will accommodate a balanced community. This could have a negative effect on the overall **vitality and viability of the town** (SA objective 19). Conversely, Scenarios 3 and 4 would involve higher density development which could have the opposite effect, achieving a more balanced and therefore vibrant community. Minor positive effects are therefore likely for those scenarios. These effects are likely to be medium to longer term and permanent.

- 4.39 In terms of the **economy** (SA objective 20), under Scenarios 3 and 4 development would be higher density and so a second railway station could be located nearer to the town centre. This could have positive effects in the medium to long term on the economy of Cranbrook by supporting the development of the town centre and encouraging inward commuting by train. Under Scenarios 1 and 2 a second railway station would be located less centrally as a result of the more dispersed settlement pattern which would reduce the potential economic benefits. Therefore, minor negative effects are likely to result from Scenarios 1 and 2 and minor positive effects are likely to result from Scenarios 3 and 4. However, the minor negative effects from Scenarios 2 and 3 are combined with a minor positive effect, resulting in a mixed effect overall, because these scenarios would involve development being located on both sides of London Road. This could have economic benefits as a result of the road becoming a gateway to the town, supporting commercial activities. The positive effects are considered to be minor rather than significant because the lower density development associated with these scenarios would reduce the potential viability of commercial activity in the area.
- 4.40 All four scenarios are expected to have negligible effects on the remaining SA objectives. In most cases this is because the issue covered by the SA objective would not be directly affected by the spatial location of development; however in relation to **flood risk** (SA objective 15) the reason for the negligible scores is that all of the options direct built development outside of the areas of Flood Zone 2 within Cranbrook.

Summary

- 4.41 In general, the effects of Scenario 4 on the SA objectives are broadly more positive than those of the other three scenarios. Many of the sustainability effects of the scenarios are influenced by the likely density of development, with the higher density development proposed under Scenarios 3 and 4 having generally more positive effects than the more dispersed and lower density development that would result from Scenarios 1 and 2. However, the effects of Scenario 3 are less positive than Scenario 4 because it would steer development to areas of high noise levels which could adversely affect a number of the sustainability objectives.

Concept Masterplans

- 4.42 **Table 4.3** below presents the SA scores for the two alternative concept masterplans that were developed during consultation workshops that took place as part of the evidence gathering process to help inform the Issues and Options document. The detailed SA matrices for these concept masterplans are also presented in **Appendix 2**. As described in **Chapter 2** of this report, these two options were subject to SA by LUC in February 2016 and the SA findings were reported to the Council at that time in order that they could inform the Council's decision making, but the SA work was not published at that time.
- 4.43 Maps illustrating the two concept masterplans can be found in Appendix 3 of the Cranbrook Development Plan document.

Table 4.3 SA scores for the concept masterplan options

SA objective	Concept masterplan 1	Concept masterplan 2
1. Housing	++	++
2. Community services	++	-
3. Education and skills	+	-
4. Health	-/+	--
5. Crime	0	0
6. Noise	-	--
7. Leisure and recreation	++	-/+
8. Historic environment	-?	-?
9. Landscape character	-?	-?
10. Amenity	0	0
11. Biodiversity	-?	-?
12. Sustainable transport	++	--/+
13. Air, soil and water	+	-

SA objective	Concept masterplan 1	Concept masterplan 2
14. Greenhouse gas emissions	++	--/+
15. Flood risk	0	0
16. Energy efficiency	+	-
17. Waste	0	0
18. Employment	++	+
19. Vitality and viability of towns	++	-
20. Inward investment	++	++

- 4.44 **Table 4.3** demonstrates that Concept Masterplan Option 1 scores more positively against the SA objectives than Concept Masterplan Option 2. Both options would provide the same amount of **housing** and **employment** land; therefore both would have significant positive effects on SA objectives 1 and 20. However, under Option 1 most people within Cranbrook would be within a ten minute walk of a neighbourhood or town centre, which would help to improve **access to services** (SA objective 2) and improve **sustainable transport** use (SA objective 12), with the associated benefits for **greenhouse gas emissions** (SA objective 14) and **air quality** (SA objective 13). Under Option 2 there would be a single town centre which for many people would be outside of walking distance and the public transport services associated with that option would also be less efficient.
- 4.45 Option 1 is less vulnerable to noise from Exeter Airport compared to Option 2, which would therefore have significant negative effects on **health** (SA objective 4) and **noise** (SA objective 6). Both options could have potential negative effects on a number of the environmental SA objectives including the **historic environment** (SA objective 8), **landscape** (SA objective 9) and **biodiversity** (SA objective 11) due to the scale of development that would take place; however in both cases the effects are uncertain and cannot be assessed in detail until specific development proposals come forward.

5 Monitoring

- 5.1 The SEA Regulations requires that *"The responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme with the purpose of identifying unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action"* (Regulation 17) and that the environmental report should provide information on *"a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring"* (Schedule 2). Monitoring proposals should be designed to provide information that can be used to highlight specific issues and significant effects, and which could help decision-making.
- 5.2 The Government guidance on SA states that it is not necessary to monitor everything. Instead, monitoring should be focussed on the significant sustainability effects that may give rise to irreversible damage (with a view to identifying trends before such damage is caused) and the significant effects where there is uncertainty in the SA and where monitoring would enable preventative or mitigation measures to be taken. Due to the early stage of the Cranbrook Development Plan preparation process, the monitoring measures proposed in this initial SA Report relate to all of the SA objectives; however later in the SA process it should be possible to focus more specifically on the predicted significant effects only.
- 5.3 As discussed in **Chapter 4**, a number of the Cranbrook Development Plan options could have potential significant effects (both positive and negative) on the SA objectives. Therefore, it is recommended that monitoring is undertaken to determine whether these effects do indeed occur due to implementation of the Cranbrook Development Plan, and in order to seek to remedy or reverse them.
- 5.4 **Table 5.1** presents suggested indicators for monitoring the potential significant sustainability effects of implementing the Cranbrook Development Plan. Note that the indicators proposed are included as suggestions, and are drawn from the indicators proposed in the SA Report for the East Devon Local Plan, reflecting the indicators proposed within the monitoring framework for the Local Plan itself.
- 5.5 In addition, the data used for monitoring in many cases will be provided by outside bodies. Information collected by other organisations (e.g. the Environment Agency) can also be used as a source of indicators. It is therefore recommended that the Council continue the dialogue with statutory environmental consultees and other stakeholders commenced as part of the SA process and plan preparation, and work with them to agree the relevant sustainability effects to be monitored and to obtain information that is appropriate, up to date and reliable.

Table 5.1: Suggested indicators for monitoring the sustainability effects of the Cranbrook Development Plan

SA objectives for which potential significant effects have been identified	Suggested indicators
1. To ensure everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of new homes built annually within the town. • Percentage of all new homes delivered in the town that are affordable.
2. To ensure that all groups of the population have access to community services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of community services delivered within Cranbrook including GP and school places.
3. To provide for education, skills and lifelong learning to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> meet the needs of the local population, and meet local employment needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of new work-based apprenticeships offered in the town annually. • Number of new school places created in the town annually.
4. To improve the population's health.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of walking and cycling for commuting to and from Cranbrook.
5. To reduce crime and fear of crime.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of crimes reported annually in the

SA objectives for which potential significant effects have been identified	Suggested indicators
	town.
6. To reduce noise levels and minimise exposure of people to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of noise pollution incidents reports annually in Cranbrook.
7. To maintain and improve cultural, social and leisure provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.
8. To maintain and enhance built and historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of heritage assets within proximity of Cranbrook on the 'Heritage at Risk Register'.
9. To promote the conservation and wise use of land and protect and enhance the landscape character of East Devon.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of new development taking place on high quality agricultural land.
10. To maintain the local amenity, quality and character of the local environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of complaints made to EDDC regarding noise pollution in Cranbrook.
11. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of East Devon.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including (i) change in priority habitats and species (by type); and (ii) change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional, sub-regional significance (changes arising from development, management and planning agreements, in hectares and numbers of priority species type). • Amount of SANGs delivered.
12. To promote and encourage non-car based modes of transport and reduce journey lengths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of bus services in the town. • Frequency of rail services in the town. • Levels of bus and rail patronage.
13. To maintain and enhance the environment in terms of air, soil and water quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the town.
14. To contribute towards a reduction in local emissions of greenhouse gases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable energy capacity installed by type.
15. To ensure that there is no increase in the risk of flooding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality.
16. To ensure energy consumption is as efficient as possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable energy capacity installed by type.
17. To promote wise use of waste resources whilst reducing waste production and disposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of waste generated in the town annually. • Percentage of waste generated in the town that is recycled.
18. To maintain sustainable growth of employment for East Devon, to match levels of jobs with the economically active workforce.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of land (defined by completed sqm gross floorspace) developed for employment by type.
19. To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Towns of East Devon.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of completed retail development in the town centre.
20. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of land (defined by completed SqM gross floorspace) developed for employment by type.

6 Conclusions

- 6.1 The options for the Cranbrook Development Plan have been subject to a detailed appraisal against the SA objectives which were developed at the Scoping stage of the SA process, and the findings are summarised in **Chapter 4** of this report.
- 6.2 In relation to emerging policies to be included in the Cranbrook Development Plan, the Issues and Options document does not set out specific options for all potential policy approaches; however it alludes to some choices that may need to be made and these have been described in terms of their likely sustainability effects where possible. If and when detailed policies are worked up, these will also be subject to SA and it should be possible to assess their likely effects including any cumulative effects in more detail at that point.
- 6.3 In relation to the four scenarios for the spatial development of Cranbrook, the SA has sought to identify where the alternative approaches would have different sustainability effects, and there is a clearly preferable option in sustainability terms as described in **Chapter 4**. However, the SA findings will not be the only factor to be taken into account by the Council when selecting which options to select and which to reject.

Next steps

- 6.4 The SA Report will be made available alongside the Issues and Options version of the Cranbrook Development Plan during the consultation period (June-July 2016) and the SA findings, along with the outcomes of that consultation, will be taken into account by East Devon District Council as it selects options to be taken forward in the next iteration of the Cranbrook Development Plan. At that time, the SA report will also be updated.

LUC
May 2016

Appendix 1
Scoping Consultation Comments

Table A1.1: Consultation responses received in relation to September 2015 Scoping letter

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
Honiton Town Council	Your letter was reviewed by the Town Council’s Planning Committee on 6th October. The Town Council wishes to thank you for consulting and to advise that it has no comments to make.	Noted, no action required.
Marine Management Organisation	I have reviewed the document sent and have no comment on behalf of the MMO. Predominantly, the MMO are concerned with works carried out below Mean High Water Springs and as such this scoping letter is rather outside of our remit as far as I can see.	Noted, no action required.
National Trust	Paragraph 16 of the SEA Scoping letter states that there are no biodiversity sites within very close proximity of Cranbrook. However, Hellings Park Fen just north of the railway line at Wishford Farm, on the Killerton estate, is a County Wildlife Site as designated by the Devon Wildlife Trust. Further away the park and woods north of Killerton House are designated SSSI for their geology. Ashclyst Forest, although not designated an SSSI, is also of national importance for its lichens and the number of veteran trees it includes (the forest also supports an important population of pearl-bordered fritillary butterfly, a greatly declined UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Species and is important for bats). Ashclyst Forest is also a County Wildlife site.	Noted. The baseline information has been expanded to refer to these locally designated biodiversity sites (see Chapter 3).
National Trust	Paragraph 19 of the SEA Scoping letter identifies the Killerton Registered park and garden. However, the baseline information needs to be corrected in terms of the status of the heritage assets concerned, as identified in the <i>Background</i> section above; specifically that the park and garden is in fact grade II*, not grade II. The Conservation Area at Broadclyst should also be mentioned. Reference should be made to the <i>Killerton Setting Study</i> produced by Land Use Consultants in 2013. The Killerton setting study locates Cranbrook principally within a sub-area of the <i>Lowland Plains</i> landscape character type, <i>character area 6c</i> , which forms the middle to distant setting to the southern part of Killerton Park, featuring in key views from Killerton Garden. The study recognises this area to only be of low significance to the Park and currently subject to the greatest degree of change of all the areas covered by the study. However, whilst the area is of low significance to Killerton Park it should still be noted that the DPD area falls within the defined ‘ <i>Zone of Potential Influence</i> ’, and the setting study should form part of the evidence base of the DPD and a proportionate assessment of impact be made in relation to potential development. National policy in relation to ‘plan-making’ is clear that “Local planning authorities should have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the	Noted. The reference to Killerton in the baseline information has been corrected and reference to the Conservation Area at Broadclyst has been added. The need to consider the findings of the Killerton Setting Study is also referred to in the updated baseline information (see Chapter 3).

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
<p>National Trust</p>	<p>environment.” (NPPF; para 169)</p> <p>Key Environmental and Sustainability Issues Specific mention should be made of the Clyst Valley Regional Park proposal. The Trust strongly supports Green Infrastructure (GI) forming an integral part of the vision for sustainable growth in the Exeter and East Devon Growth Point area. The <i>Killerton Estate and Ashclyst Forest</i> ‘Strategic Project’ identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy Phase 2 for the Exeter Area and East Devon New Growth Point (2009; Pages 12 and 15), plans for the “<i>enhancement of Killerton Estate and Ashclyst Forest as a key recreation and leisure asset and valuable wildlife habitat</i>” with the new community at Cranbrook being encouraged to “<i>make full use of the enhanced leisure and recreational facilities at the Forest</i>” (page 22).</p> <p>The New East Devon Local Plan Strategy 10 for East Devon’s West End promotes the Clyst Valley Regional Park (CVRP) as a Green Infrastructure initiative that will provide high quality natural green space, and makes clear that developer contributions will be used to help deliver this ‘landscape’ scale strategic project (Strategy 10 – Green Infrastructure in East Devon’s West End). At the Examination of the East Devon Local Plan the Council indicated that the CVRP could potentially function as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) to mitigate the recreational impact of additional visitors on the protected European wildlife sites of the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths and the Exe Estuary. The Trust has recently produced <i>A Prospectus for Action; Opportunities arising from the Exeter and East Devon Growth Point</i>, prepared by Land Use Consultants (August 2015), which has already been submitted to the Council to form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and specifically the Cranbrook DPD (copy attached). This highlights the need for a <i>Growth Point Green Infrastructure Masterplan</i>. The Cranbrook DPD should tie in with such a Green Infrastructure Masterplan, and specifically the planning for, and delivery of, the Clyst Valley Regional Park. The Trust has also commissioned a SANGs assessment for Killerton from Footprint Ecology, which is forthcoming.</p>	<p>Noted. Information has been added to the baseline information in relation to Clyst Valley Regional Park (see Chapter 3).</p>
<p>National Trust</p>	<p>Under the first bullet, of paragraph 21 of the letter, the impact of the development of Cranbrook on the wider road network, particularly north of the rail line, needs to be considered as an issue. Already we are seeing an increase in traffic along narrow Devon lanes and inevitably 18-20,000 new residents with their cars is going to bring about significant change, impacting the character of the current rural landscape. Would this increased movement activity be deemed to “<i>respect and enhance</i>” local character? And if not, consideration needs to be given to the steps necessary to mitigate this impact.</p>	<p>Noted. An additional key sustainability issue has been added (see Table 3.1) in relation to the need to consider the impacts of development on the transport network.</p> <p>The key sustainability issue relating to flood risk has been amended to make reference to the need to consider the impacts of development at</p>

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
	<p>The third bullet should also cover any likely impact, from the expansion of Cranbrook, on the flood plain of the strategic watercourses within the study area, particularly in relation to Trust land.</p> <p>The fourth bullet should specifically mention parks and gardens, given the Killerton setting study mentioned above.</p> <p>Finally, there is the issue of the new railway station only currently being proposed to have access from one side of the track, with no pedestrian or cycle crossing currently proposed at Cranbrook station. This would not be taking the opportunity to maximise its potential contribution to SA objectives, specifically SA objective 12, by not helping encouraging use of non-car based modes of transport by local communities north of the rail line. This needs to be considered as an issue.</p>	<p>Cranbrook on strategic watercourses (see Table 3.1).</p> <p>The key sustainability issue relating to conservation and enhancement of heritage assets has been amended to make reference to the need to consider the impacts of development at Cranbrook on Killerton Park and Garden (see Table 3.1).</p> <p>As noted earlier in this table, an additional key sustainability issue has been added in relation to the potential for development at Cranbrook to impact upon the local transport network (see Table 3.1). The impacts of proposals in the Cranbrook Development Plan on levels of sustainable transport use will be considered through the appraisal of options against SA objective 12: To promote and encourage non-car based modes of transport and reduce journey lengths.</p>
National Trust	<p>SA Objectives</p> <p>A Sustainability Appraisal objective should specifically relate to Cranbrook being developed within the context of 'landscape scale' strategic infrastructure projects, and directly contributing to their delivery.</p> <p>SA objective 8 should make reference to heritage assets <i>and their setting</i>.</p>	<p>Noted. SA objective 8 has been amended to refer to impacts on the setting of heritage assets.</p>
Natural England	<p>Our comments relate to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the Cranbrook Plan SA/SEA • The HRA of the Cranbrook Plan <p>Scope of the Cranbrook Plan SA/SEA</p> <p>Your scoping letter refers to the relatively narrow scope of the Cranbrook Plan within the context of the East Devon Local Plan. We acknowledge that the Cranbrook Plan does not allocate development in excess of the Local Plan allocation at Cranbrook and that the SA/SEA of the Cranbrook Plan can draw on the SA/SEA of the overarching Local Plan. The proposed approach to the Cranbrook Plan's SA/SEA, as set out in the Scoping Letter, will meet the SA/SEA requirements in terms of methodology, relevant policy context, baseline information, key environmental and sustainability issues and SA Framework.</p>	<p>Noted, no action required.</p>

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
	<p>The HRA of the Cranbrook Plan We agree with your assertion that, as the Cranbrook Plan allocations remain within the Local Plan allocations, the conclusions of the Local Plan’s HRA can apply to the Cranbrook Plan. We acknowledge that additional work was undertaken on the HRA and the wording of the Local Plan, to address our concerns as set out in our earlier HRA consultation response dated 11 June 2015. We also acknowledge that the revised versions of the Local Plan and the HRA were submitted for Examination as shown on the EDDC website. We are satisfied that the Local Plan as it currently stands accords with the Habitats Regulations, and that a separate HRA of the Cranbrook Plan is not necessary. If any significant changes to the Local Plan are made however, this position will need to be reviewed.</p>	
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>We are satisfied with the proposed scope of the SEA. The contents of the scoping letter and the SEA framework recognise most of the key environmental issues of relevance to us like ensuring no increase in flood risk, the maintenance and enhancement of water quality, the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and the waste management. Nonetheless we would recommend that the SEA makes specific reference to the objectives of the Water Framework Directive and includes priority habitats and species when considering biodiversity impacts.</p>	<p>Noted. The Water Framework Directive is now referred to in the review of plans, policies and programmes (see review in Chapter 3).</p> <p>Options for the Cranbrook Development Plan will be appraised against SA objective 11 which considers impacts on biodiversity, including priority habitats and species.</p>
<p>David Lock Associates</p>	<p>SA Scoping It is agreed that the Cranbrook Plan DPD, and the SA process related to it, has a narrow scope. This arises in part as the DPD and its SA is prepared in the context of an overarching Sustainability Appraisal for the East Devon New Local Plan. Equally, in the formulation of options, the scope is narrowly defined by the East Devon Local Plan which is now at an advanced stage and which explicitly provides for the further expansion/intensification of Cranbrook to accommodate the additional houses and other related facilities proposed in the Cranbrook Plan Area, outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Areas of Rockbeare, Broadclyst and Clyst Honiton.</p> <p>Baseline Information Your Scoping letter sets out some of the sources of such information and summarises some of that information. The baseline information should also make reference and draw from the application material that supports the present applications for the expansion of Cranbrook (15/00045-47/OUT).</p> <p>Key Environmental and Sustainability Issues It is agreed that many of the key sustainability issues will be the same as the rest of the District. As to those issues set out in your letter I would make the following comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the reference to the need to ensure that large scale new development being 	<p>Noted. The baseline information has been amended to include details of the proposed expansion of Cranbrook (see Chapter 3). It is recognised that options in the Cranbrook Development Plan may offer opportunities for landscape enhancement as well as the mitigation of negative impacts and this will be addressed in the SA as appropriate. The SA framework includes objectives relating to housing, employment and services and facilities, against which options for the Cranbrook Development Plan are being assessed, and consideration is being given to the need to achieve a balance between the provision of housing and supporting infrastructure.</p>

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
	<p>appropriate and integrated into the landscape and respecting character should be expanded to include consideration of the opportunities for landscape enhancements – including significant new planting. It should also recognise that landscape impacts of development can be positive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the reference to biodiversity appears to be inconsistent with that in paragraph 10 of the Scoping letter. It is agreed that para 10 is the appropriate approach. • considerable care is needed in considering the issue of the conservation of the setting of the listed buildings at such a high level. The design of Cranbrook to date has shown that the setting of listed buildings has been appropriately and satisfactorily addressed through the detailed design process. <p>Considerable care also needs to be exercised in considering an issue of balancing residential opportunities with employment and services and facilities. As was set out in our representations on the scope of the DPD, such issues must be considered on the basis of the fundamental planning philosophy of Cranbrook - in particular the close synergistic relationships between Cranbrook, Skypark, the Airport and other developments - and not as a standalone development. NB: Nick sent additional email containing previous scoping comments</p>	
<p>David Lock Associates</p>	<p>Assessment methodology for the Cranbrook Plan</p> <p>There are, however, a number of important points that the SA/SEA must take into account in assessing options against the environmental and sustainability objectives set out in the methodology.</p> <p>First the assessment can only be at a high level. Hence the conclusions drawn at that level must not prejudge the opportunity to draw conclusions based on more detailed designs at a later stage of the master plan process or more detailed technical work being conducted as part of the DPD and/or application process. For instance drawing conclusions on the setting of listed buildings is likely to be inappropriate given the level of assessment and information available to the SA. Such judgements can only be formed with more certainty on the basis of more detailed assessments and design.</p> <p>Second recognition should be given to the opportunity through further design development to deliver substantial positive outcomes and/or to mitigate the impacts of development. Outcomes at this SA stage should not prejudge that more detailed design process. For instance there is substantial potential through design to deliver landscape enhancements. The positive opportunities arising from development (including at later design stages) should be fully reflected in the assessment an also the positive opportunities for mitigation.</p> <p>With regard to the consideration of options, the SA for the Plan should not seek to</p>	<p>Noted. It is inevitable that some of the impacts of development cannot be determined at this level of assessment and where appropriate the SA will refer to effects being uncertain depending on factors such as the detailed design of development that eventually comes forward. It will also be recognised that high quality design can have positive effects on the landscape and built environment, as well as mitigating potential negative effects.</p>

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
	<p>prejudge outcomes or options being considered through other means. One such example would be the consideration in relation to gypsy and traveller provision that are to be considered in the District Wide Gypsy and Traveller DPD.</p>	
<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>In relation to the issues contained in your letter, NR's is primarily concerned with the provision of an effective and sustainable public transport system. This is compatible with the objective of avoiding high levels of car use by promoting and encouraging non-car based modes of transport. NR therefore welcome the inclusion of this objective.</p> <p>In relation to the "Key Environment and Sustainable Issues" listed in the scoping letter, NR are of the view that in addition to ensuring that new large-scale development is appropriately integrated into the landscape and, where possible, respecting and enhancing local character, the scoping of the EA should also ensure that new development is integrated in such way that it does not compromise or disrupt the provision of existing sustainable services. For example NR have already made a representation to the Draft Cranbrook DPD that any new development that may increase traffic at a nearby level crossing sited to the east of the settlement would not only have implications for safety at the level crossing but, as a result of increased patronage, may force NR to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using the crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. Clearly, such a negative impact on rail services resulting from new development that is poorly integrated would be contrary to other key environmental and sustainable issues listed in the scoping letter such as the need to avoid high levels of car use. It would also be contrary to "SA Objective 12" which seeks to promote and encourage non-car based modes of transport.</p>	<p>Noted. As already described in this table above, an additional key sustainability issue relating to the need to consider the impacts of new development on the transport network has been included (see Table 3.1 of this report).</p>
<p>Paul Smith</p>	<p>The protection of environment and habitat, is clearly one of the central issues surrounding the ongoing development of Cranbrook, and subject to both UK and EU directive. However it will be necessary for the exercise of a fine balance of conflicting interest to ensure a sustainability of development incorporating adequate infrastructure to maximise the well - being and healthy life style of all residents.</p> <p>In addition to Town based recreational facilities, Cranbrook must be considered in the context of its connectivity to surrounding parishes, and policies adopted which encourage a healthy life style. Amongst other infrastructure this will entail provision of safe cycle/walking routes throughout, usable by all communities, providing improved access to countryside facility but also communication.</p>	<p>Noted. The likely effects of proposals in the Cranbrook Development Plan on health and sustainable transport are being assessed through the appraisal of options against SA objectives 4: health and 12: sustainable transport.</p>

Consultee	Response	LUCs response
	<p>Whilst faced with an ever diminishing budget, I note that since 2013 Local Authorities have been made responsible for public health issues as part of health and social care reforms. I note that Cranbrook has the potential to be selected as a 'healthy lifestyle Town' following comments made by Simon Stephens head of NHS England. I am unclear as to the potential for funding benefits, but It will be imperative that EDDC works closely with all partners if this proposal is to be realised to optimum benefit.</p> <p>Finally, whilst the arrival of a rail service and improving bus services will ensure swifter and more flexible travel, it is clear that whilst daily usage maybe reduced, rural residents will not part with their vehicular transport because of the complete freedom of movement it enables. Many residents of Cranbrook and surrounding area travel to employment considerably further afield than Exeter. It is therefore essential that this reality continues to be acknowledged by planners and informs decisions re parking provision both on and off road. Inadequate parking and road widths were acknowledged at phase 1 of Cranbrook, however these issues have to a larger extent been addressed during the building of phase 2. This ongoing consideration should prevail during further build out of the Town.</p>	
Equality and Human Rights Commission	<p>Please be advised that the Commission receives many notices and requests to comment on planning issues. We do not have the resources to respond to all, and it is not our practice to respond to consultations on local planning projects. As you may be aware, Local Planning Authorities and other public authorities, in the planning process are subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and are usually better placed than the Commission is to understand the context of planning projects. Therefore, we would request you do not send us further information on this project, unless there is a clear and specific equality and human rights concern you wish to raise (for example, impact on minority communities such as BME groups, or on accessibility for disabled people) where we may be able to add value or if you are uncertain about how the PSED may apply in the decision-making process. As the regulator for the PSED, we may be able to assist.</p>	Noted, no action required.
South West Water	<p>Kate regarding Cranbrook South West Water has no concerns with regard to the phases currently under construction/with the benefit of planning permission. We have already been consulted by East Devon District Council regarding the 3 further expansion areas and again have no concerns in respect of our interests.</p>	Noted, no action required.

Appendix 2

SA Matrices for the Cranbrook Development Plan Options

SA matrices for the four scenarios presented in Part 5 of the Issues and Options document

- **Scenario 1:** Current density and development within areas subject to noise levels above recommended limits.
- **Scenario 2:** Current density and development in Neighbourhood Plan areas.
- **Scenario 3:** Increased average density to 45dph and development within areas subject to noise levels above recommended limits.
- **Scenario 4:** Increased average density to 45dph and development in landscape sensitive areas and some land within Neighbourhood Plan areas.

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
1. To ensure everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home.	-	+	-/+	+	<p>The same number of homes would be provided under all four scenarios. The differences between the scenarios in terms of their effects on this objective therefore depend on how the housing to be provided would be distributed.</p> <p>Under Scenarios 1 and 3, development would take place in areas of subject to noise levels above recommended limits; therefore homes in those areas may not be classed as of 'decent' quality as they could be affected by noise unless feasible mitigation measures are implemented to keep new homes and external amenity areas within acceptable noise limits . Scenarios 2 and 4 would avoid development in areas of high noise levels so homes would be considered to be of better quality.</p> <p>Under Scenarios 3 and 4 there may be opportunities to provide a wider range of homes of different types, sizes and appearance, as a result of the higher density. The same opportunities would not exist under Scenarios 1 and 2 which would involve lower density development.</p> <p>Therefore, Scenarios 2 and 4 are likely to have minor positive effects on this objective while Scenario 1 would have a minor negative effect. Scenario 3 would have a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect.</p>
2. To ensure that all groups of the population have access to community services.	-	-	+	+	<p>Under Scenarios 1 and 2, development would be of lower density which would mean that fewer people would live within easy walking distance of shops and services. This could reduce their viability and a minor negative effect is identified for those scenarios.</p> <p>Under Scenarios 3 and 4 development would take place at a higher density which would mean that more people would be within walking distance of a town or neighbourhood centre, making shops, cafes and other services more viable and more easily accessible. Minor positive effects are therefore likely</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
					for those scenarios.
3. To provide for education, skills and lifelong learning	0	0	0	0	None of the scenarios would have a direct effect on this SA objective.
4. To improve the population's health	-	+/-	-/+	+	<p>Under Scenarios 1 and 3 development would take place in areas of subject to noise levels above recommended limits which could adversely affect people's health. Scenarios 2 and 4 would avoid development in areas of high noise levels so adverse impacts on health would be avoided.</p> <p>However, Scenarios 3 and 4 5 would offer better opportunities for people to walk day to day, benefitting health, as higher density development would mean that more people live within walking distance of shops, services and facilities. Conversely, development under Scenarios 1 and 2 would be lower density so levels of walking day to day may be lower.</p> <p>Therefore, Scenario 1 is likely to have a minor negative effect, while Scenario 4 would have minor positive effects. Scenarios 2 and 3 would have mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effects on health overall.</p>
5. To reduce crime and fear of crime.	0	0	0	0	None of the scenarios would have a direct effect on crime and fear of crime which would instead be influenced by factors such as the design of development.
6. To reduce noise levels and minimise exposure of people to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.	--	+	--	+	<p>Under Scenarios 1 and 3, development would take place in areas of subject to noise levels above recommended limits which would expose more people to noise pollution day to day. Significant negative effects are therefore likely for those two scenarios.</p> <p>Scenarios 2 and 4 would avoid development in areas of high noise levels which would reduce the number of people exposed to noise pollution day to day and a minor positive effect is likely for those scenarios.</p>
7. To maintain and improve cultural, social and leisure provision.	-	-	+	-	Scenarios 1 and 2 would require larger areas of land for housing development due to the lower density of development, which would reduce the options for delivering SANGs near to Cranbrook. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available within the masterplan study boundary which are predominantly within the flood plain. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes.

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
					<p>Minor negative effects on this SA objective are therefore identified for Scenarios 1 and 2.</p> <p>Conversely, under Scenario 3 development would be at higher density, freeing up more land closer to Cranbrook for SANGs, meaning that it would be more accessible for leisure and recreation purposes. Minor positive effects are therefore likely for that scenario.</p> <p>Under Scenario 4, although development would be at higher density, in order to reduce the amount of development within Neighbourhood Plan areas, land would be used for development in the north east corner of Cranbrook that may be better suited for other uses including SANGs. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available within the masterplan study boundary which are predominantly within the flood plain or in areas subject to high levels of noise. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes. Minor negative effects are therefore identified for Scenario 4.</p>
8. To maintain and enhance built and historic assets and their settings.	-/+?	-/+?	+/-?	+/-?	<p>The effects of the four scenarios on this SA objective would depend largely on the specific location and design of built development, which is not yet known. Because all development under any of the scenarios would be within the identified Cranbrook area, there would be no differences between them in terms of their potential impacts on heritage features outside of Cranbrook, such as Killerton Registered Park and Garden. Lower density development under Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean that development is more dispersed, potentially impacting upon the setting of more heritage features. However, it may be able to be designed more sympathetically, for example incorporating green infrastructure, which could reduce the likelihood of negative effects on heritage assets. Conversely, higher density development under Scenarios 3 and 4 would be more concentrated so may affect the setting of fewer heritage features; however the development may be less sympathetically incorporated into the wider landscape and townscape (e.g. through Green Infrastructure being incorporated) which could increase the chances of adverse effects on the setting of heritage features. Scenarios 1 and 3 could result in development which is visually intrusive from Rockbeare, and so could potentially affect the setting of Rockbeare Registered Park and Garden although this cannot be assessed in detail until specific development proposals come forward. Potentially mixed (minor positive and minor negative) but</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
<p>9. To promote the conservation and wise use of land and protect and enhance the landscape character of East Devon.</p>	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	<p>uncertain effects are therefore identified for all four scenarios.</p> <p>Scenarios 3 and 4 would involve higher density development which may mean that it sits less sympathetically in the landscape, as opportunities for incorporating green infrastructure within the development might be more limited. However, it would also mean lower levels of land take overall than Scenarios 1 and 2 which would involve more dispersed, lower density development.</p> <p>Scenario 1 would involve lower density development; therefore higher levels of land take, and it would require development on ridgelines which would be visually intrusive to existing settlements, particularly Rockbeare. However, opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure within the lower density development may be good. Mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effects are therefore likely overall for that scenario.</p> <p>Scenario 2 would also involve higher levels of land take as a result of lower density development, but would not require development in visually intrusive areas. However, in order to avoid development in areas that may be visually intrusive to existing settlements this scenario would need to use significant areas of land within Neighbourhood Plan boundaries which increases the risk of Cranbrook merging with Rockbeare, significantly affecting the character and identity of the village. Overall, mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effects are therefore likely for that scenario.</p> <p>Scenarios 3 and 4 would involve higher density development and so would limit the amount of land take and avoid coalescence between Cranbrook and Rockbeare; however both scenarios would involve development in visually intrusive areas. In the case of Scenario 3, this is a result of the need to use land on or beyond ridgelines in order to avoid using Neighbourhood Plan areas. This development would therefore be visually intrusive to surrounding areas, particularly the village of Rockbeare. Overall, mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effects are therefore likely for both scenarios.</p> <p>In all cases, the effects identified are uncertain as impacts on the landscape will depend on the specific location and design of development which is not known at this stage.</p>
<p>10. To maintain the local amenity, quality and character of the</p>	-	+	-	+	<p>The effects of new development under any of the four scenarios on local amenity will depend largely on the design of the development and its visual</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
local environment.					<p>appearance, which cannot be assessed at this stage and will not be determined by its spatial location. However, amenity can also be impacted upon by the extent to which people are exposed to high noise levels.</p> <p>Under Scenarios 1 and 3, development would take place in areas of subject to noise levels above recommended limits; therefore amenity could be adversely affected. Scenarios 2 and 4 would avoid development in areas of high noise levels so amenity would not be affected in this way.</p> <p>Therefore, Scenarios 1 and 3 are likely to have minor negative effects on this objective while Scenarios 2 and 4 would have a minor positive effect.</p>
11. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of East Devon.	-?	-?	+?	+/-?	<p>There are no designated biodiversity sites within very close proximity of Cranbrook that would be affected differently under the four scenarios. Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean that development is lower density and more dispersed, potentially impacting upon more biodiversity features as overall land take would be higher. Minor negative effects are therefore likely for those scenarios. Conversely, higher density development under Scenarios 3 and 4 would be more concentrated so would involve less land take, reducing the likelihood of negative impacts on biodiversity. Minor positive effects are therefore likely for those scenarios. However, in all cases the effects are uncertain as they will depend on factors such as the design and specific location of development which is not yet known.</p> <p>The scenarios could also affect biodiversity as a result of the implications that they would have for the provision of SANGs. Scenarios 1 and 2 would require larger areas of land for housing development due to the lower density of development, which would reduce the options for delivering SANGs near to Cranbrook. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available within the masterplan study boundary which are predominantly within the flood plain. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes. This could therefore reduce the effectiveness of SANGs in terms of reducing recreation pressure at European sites, reinforcing the minor negative effects already identified for those scenarios. Conversely, under Scenario 3 development would be at higher density, freeing up more land closer to Cranbrook for SANGs, meaning that it would be more accessible for leisure and recreation purposes and therefore more effective in terms of mitigating impacts on European sites. This reinforces the minor positive effect already identified for that scenario.</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
					<p>Under Scenario 4, although development would be at higher density, in order to reduce the amount of development within Neighbourhood Plan areas, land would be used for development in the north east corner of Cranbrook that may be better suited for other uses including SANGs. This is likely to reduce year round access to SANGs for leisure purposes as they are more likely to be delivered on the remaining areas available within the masterplan study boundary which are predominantly within the flood plain or in areas subject to high levels of noise. Year-round provision could only be made further away from Cranbrook, reducing access for leisure purposes. This would again reduce the effectiveness of the SANGs and a mixed (minor positive and minor negative effect) is therefore likely overall for Scenario 4.</p>
<p>12. To promote and encourage non-car based modes of transport and reduce journey lengths.</p>	-	-	++/-	++/-	<p>Lower density development under Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean that it would be more likely that a second station at Cranbrook would be located further to the east, away from the town centre, as a result of lower density development taking up more land. This may make a second station less conveniently accessible and therefore mean lower levels of use. In addition, the lower density development under those scenarios could mean that people are more likely to use cars day to day as fewer people would live within walking distance of shops, services and facilities in the town centre. Network Rail has noted that any new development that may increase traffic at a nearby level crossing sited to the east of Cranbrook may force Network Rail to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using the crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements, so may impede modal shift. Minor negative effects are therefore likely for Scenarios 1 and 2.</p> <p>Conversely, under Scenarios 3 and 4 development would be higher density and more people would be within walking distance of a town or neighbourhood centre, improving access to public transport links and making non-car based transport more viable. In addition, the higher density development would mean that a second station could be located nearer to the town centre. This may mean that it would be more accessible and therefore more people would use rail travel in place of cars. However, building the station in this location may be more technically challenging as it is in the flood plain and near to the high voltage power lines and it may therefore be less likely to be delivered. Overall a mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is likely in</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
					relation to Scenarios 3 and 4.
13. To maintain and enhance the environment in terms of air, soil and water quality.	-	-	+/-	+/-	<p>It is assumed that all new development at Cranbrook under any of the four scenarios would be high quality in terms of its design in order to minimise its environmental impacts, in line with relevant policies in the East Devon Local Plan. Therefore, the effects of the scenarios on this SA objective will be largely determined by the extent to which they could result in air pollution from high levels of car use, and the extent to which they could result in the loss of high quality soils.</p> <p>Much of the Cranbrook development area is within Grade 3 agricultural land, although it is not known if this is Grade 3a or 3b; therefore all four options could potentially result in the loss of high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>In terms of air pollution from transport, lower density development under Scenarios 1 and 2 could mean that people are more likely to use cars day to day as fewer people would live within walking distance of shops, services and facilities in the town centre. It would also mean that it would be more likely that a second railway station at Cranbrook would be located further to the east, away from the town centre, as a result of lower density development taking up more land. This may make a second station less conveniently accessible and therefore result in ongoing car use with the associated air pollution. Overall minor negative effects are therefore likely for Scenarios 1 and 2.</p> <p>Conversely, under Scenarios 3 and 4 development would be higher density and more people would be within walking distance of a town or neighbourhood centre, improving access to public transport links and making non-car based transport more viable, reducing the associated air pollution. In addition, the higher density development would mean that a second railway station could be located nearer to the town centre. This may mean that it would be more accessible and therefore more people would use rail travel in place of cars. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely in relation to Scenarios 3 and 4.</p>
14. To contribute towards a reduction in local emissions of greenhouse gases.	-	-	++/-	++/-	<p>Levels of emissions from built development will depend on its design and the behaviour of residents, which cannot be determined at this stage. Therefore, the effects of the four scenarios on this objective will depend largely on what each scenario would mean in terms of levels of car use.</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
					<p>Lower density development under Scenarios 1 and 2 would mean that it would be more likely that a second railway station at Cranbrook would be located further to the east, away from the town centre, as a result of lower density development taking up more land. This may make a second station less conveniently accessible and therefore result in ongoing car use with the associated greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the lower density development under those scenarios could mean that people are more likely to use cars day to day as fewer people would live within walking distance of shops, services and facilities in the town centre. Minor negative effects are therefore likely for Scenarios 1 and 2.</p> <p>Conversely, under Scenarios 3 and 4 development would be higher density and more people would be within walking distance of a town or neighbourhood centre, improving access to public transport links and making non-car based transport more viable, reducing the associated emissions. In addition, the higher density development would mean that a second railway station could be located nearer to the town centre. This may mean that it would be more accessible and therefore more people would use rail travel in place of cars. However, building the station in this location may be more technically challenging as it is in the flood plain and near to the high voltage power lines and it may therefore be less likely to be delivered. Overall a mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is likely in relation to Scenarios 3 and 4.</p>
15. To ensure that there is no increase in the risk of flooding.	0	0	0	0	<p>Most of Cranbrook lies outside of high flood risk zones, although there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3 which extend within the area that is allocated in the emerging East Devon Local Plan, across the northern boundary and through the centre of the area. None of the scenarios would involve more development within the floodplain in comparison to the others – under all four scenarios, development would be focussed outside of flood zones and some of the flood plain is to be occupied by green space. Therefore, all four scenarios are likely to have negligible effects on this SA objective, with effects being determined largely by factors such as the design of the development and the incorporation of SuDS, which cannot be determined at this stage.</p>
16. To ensure energy consumption is as efficient as possible.	0	0	0	0	<p>None of the scenarios would have a direct effect on energy efficiency which would instead be influenced by the design of built development and people's behaviour. Negligible effects are therefore likely for all four scenarios.</p>

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
17. To promote wise use of waste resources whilst reducing waste production and disposal.	0	0	0	0	None of the scenarios would have a direct effect on waste production and management which would instead be influenced by people's behaviour. While development on brownfield land could offer opportunities to minimise waste during development, nowhere in Cranbrook offers opportunities for significant brownfield site use. Negligible effects are therefore likely for all four scenarios.
18. To maintain sustainable growth of employment for East Devon, to match levels of jobs with the economically active workforce.	0	0	0	0	The same amount of employment land would be provided under all of the scenarios; therefore negligible effects are identified for all four.
19. To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Towns of East Devon.	-	-	+	+	Under Scenarios 1 and 2 Cranbrook would continue to develop in the same way as at present, resulting in low density development. The densities that are currently being achieved within Cranbrook are associated with suburban housing estates that tend to attract families, making it less likely that the town will accommodate a balanced community. This could have a negative effect on the overall vitality and viability of the town. Conversely, Scenarios 3 and 4 would involve higher density development which could have the opposite effect, achieving a more balanced and therefore vibrant community. Minor positive effects are therefore likely for those scenarios.
20. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment.	-/+	-/+	+	+	Under Scenarios 3 and 4 development would be higher density and so a second railway station could be located nearer to the town centre. This could have positive effects on the economy of Cranbrook by supporting the development of the town centre and encouraging inward commuting by train. Under Scenarios 1 and 2 a second railway station would be located less centrally as a result of the more dispersed settlement pattern which would reduce the potential economic benefits. Therefore, minor negative effects are likely to result from Scenarios 1 and 2 and minor positive effects are likely to result from Scenarios 3 and 4. However, the minor negative effects from Scenarios 2 and 3 are combined with a minor positive effect, resulting in a mixed effect overall, because these scenarios would involve development being located on both sides of London Road. This could have economic benefits as a result of the road becoming a gateway to the town, supporting commercial activities. The positive effects are considered to be minor rather

SA Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Justification
					<p>than significant because the lower density development associated with these scenarios would reduce the potential viability of commercial activity in the area.</p>

SA matrices for the Concept Masterplans 1 and 2 developed during the two day workshop in 2015

SA Objectives	Concept Masterplan 1	Concept Masterplan 2	Justification
1. To ensure everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home.	++	++	The two options relate to the distribution of development rather than the amount, and therefore the same amount and mix of housing would be developed at Cranbrook under both options. Therefore, both options could have an indirect significant positive effect on this SA objective due to the contribution they would make to delivering housing within East Devon.
2. To ensure that all groups of the population have access to community services.	++	-	<p>Option 1 would include three separate town centres, in the west, centre and east of Cranbrook, providing easy access to services and facilities for most people within the town. Under that option, the vast majority of Cranbrook's residents would be within a 10 minute walk of at least one of these centres and on a direct public transport route linking the three centres. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Under Option 2 there would be a more dispersed settlement pattern and a single town centre in the west, with many people in the east of Cranbrook being located outside of walking distance of the town centre. The public transport route would be less direct and likely to take longer to access each town centre. Under that option, access to services and facilities would therefore be relatively poor for a significant proportion of Cranbrook's population, although people living close to the main centre in the west would have good access. A minor negative effect is therefore likely.</p>
3. To provide for education, skills and lifelong learning	+	-	Neither option would affect the provision of schools or training opportunities within Cranbrook. However, the more dispersed settlement pattern and less efficient public transport services that are likely to exist under Option 2 may mean that access to the existing schools within Cranbrook would be less good, resulting in a minor negative effect. Under Option 1 the more coherent settlement pattern and efficient public transport links may provide better access to education facilities, resulting in a minor positive effect.
4. To improve the population's health	-/+	--	<p>Option 2 focuses high density development at the area in the west of Cranbrook which is most affected by noise from Exeter Airport, as identified in the Updated Noise Impact Assessment for Exeter Airport⁸. This could have a significant negative effect on residents' health and wellbeing. In addition, opportunities for people to walk and cycle day to day would be more limited as many people within Cranbrook would live outside of walking distance from the single town centre in the west. Therefore, levels of physical activity may be lower under Option 2.</p> <p>Option 1 is less vulnerable to airport noise as development in the area most affected would be less dense,</p>

⁸ Bickerdike Allen Partners (January 2016) EDDC Development Management and Environmental Health Joint Airport Noise Study: Updated Noise Impact Assessment, Exeter Airport – Part 2.

SA Objectives	Concept Masterplan 1	Concept Masterplan 2	Justification
			although there is still development in that part of the Cranbrook area; therefore a minor negative effect on health is identified. However, under this option people living in Cranbrook are likely to have good opportunities to walk and cycle day to day to access services and facilities as almost all residents would be within a 10 minute walk of one of the three town centres. Therefore a mixed (minor negative and minor positive) effect is identified for Option 1 overall.
5. To reduce crime and fear of crime.	0	0	Neither of the options would have a direct effect on levels of crime and fear of crime, which would instead be influenced by factors such as the design and layout of new development (e.g. the incorporation of lighting) and therefore cannot be determined at this stage. Under either option, consideration should be given to the need for footpaths and cycle paths to be appropriately lit to increase perceptions of safety after dark.
6. To reduce noise levels and minimise exposure of people to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.	-	--	Option 2 would focus high density development in the west of Cranbrook where people would be affected by noise from Exeter Airport; therefore a significant negative effect on this SA objective is likely. Under Option 1, fewer people would live in that part of Cranbrook as development there would be lower density, although some residents would still be exposed to aircraft noise. A minor negative effect is therefore likely under that option.
7. To maintain and improve cultural, social and leisure provision.	++	-/+	<p>Option 1 would include three separate town centres in the west, centre and east of Cranbrook, providing most residents with easy access to the facilities (including cultural, social and leisure facilities) located there. Under that option, the vast majority of people in the town would be within a 10 minute walk of a centre or a direct bus route; therefore a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Under Option 2 there would be a more dispersed settlement pattern and a single town centre in the west, with many people in the east of Cranbrook being located outside of walking distance of the town centre. The public transport route would be less direct and likely to take longer to access each town centre. Under that option, access to the cultural, social and recreational facilities located there would therefore be relatively poor for a significant proportion of Cranbrook's population, although people living close to the main centre in the west would have good access to a wide range of facilities in one location. A minor negative effect is therefore likely overall. However, this is combined with a minor positive effect as the option would still involve the provision of footpaths and cycle routes which could be used for recreational purposes.</p> <p>It is understood that there would be no difference in open space provision under the two options.</p>
8. To maintain and enhance built and historic assets and their	-?	-?	There are a number of cultural heritage assets within and around Cranbrook which could be affected by nearby development, including listed buildings (a small number within the development area and others

SA Objectives	Concept Masterplan 1	Concept Masterplan 2	Justification
settings.			outside) and the nearby Rockbeare Registered Park and Garden. However, development would take place within proximity of those assets under both options, and the specific effects of different types of nearby development cannot be assessed in detail until the planning application stage. Therefore, potential but uncertain minor negative effects are identified under both options.
9. To promote the conservation and wise use of land and protect and enhance the landscape character of East Devon.	-?	-?	Both options would involve development taking place within the same area - the differences between the options relate to how development would be distributed within the wider site. As detailed proposals for the development to take place under both options are not yet known (i.e. the design and specific layout of the built development), it is not possible to assess the differences between the options in relation to their effects on the landscape. Both options would involve the loss of greenfield land, but both cover the same total area of land (which includes Grade 3 land, which may be either Grade 3a or 3b). For these reasons, differences between the options cannot be determined at this stage and potential but uncertain minor negative effects are identified for both options.
10. To maintain the local amenity, quality and character of the local environment.	0	0	It is assumed that all new development at Cranbrook, under either option, will be high quality in terms of its design and will accord with policies in the Local Plan in relation to local character and amenity. Therefore, it is not possible to identify differences between the options in relation to this SA objective and negligible effects are identified for both options.
11. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of East Devon.	-?	-?	Development would take place within the same overall area under both options. Although there are no designated biodiversity sites within Cranbrook which would be affected differently by the alternative options, there may be valuable undesignated habitats and species onsite which could be affected by development. The specific effects of development proposals on small areas within the site cannot be determined at this level of assessment and would be considered during the planning application process when detailed proposals are put forward, through site surveys or other investigations as appropriate. Therefore, potential but uncertain minor negative effects are identified under both options.
12. To promote and encourage non-car based modes of transport and reduce journey lengths.	++	--/+	<p>Option 1 would involve having three town centres with at least one being within a 10 minute walk for the vast majority of Cranbrook's residents. This would enable more people to walk or cycle day to day in order to access services and facilities rather than needing to travel by car over longer distances. In addition, the proposed public transport route around Cranbrook would follow an efficient route with direct links to the three town centres under this option, providing an attractive and viable alternative to car use within the town. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under Option 2, the public transport route around Cranbrook would follow a less efficient route due to the dispersed settlement pattern, without direct links to the three town centres and therefore would be slower, so people may be less likely to use it in place of car travel. In addition, the fact that there would</p>

SA Objectives	Concept Masterplan 1	Concept Masterplan 2	Justification
			be a single town centre in the west of Cranbrook would mean that people (particularly those in the east of the town) would be more likely to drive over longer distances to access services and facilities instead of walking and cycling. However, some footpath and cycle links would still be provided under this option, connecting north/south, and the concentration of development in the west would be in close proximity of the rail station which may enable more journeys to and from the town to be made via train. Overall a mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect is therefore likely.
13. To maintain and enhance the environment in terms of air, soil and water quality.	+	-	Neither of the options would have a direct effect on soil or water quality. It is assumed that the necessary infrastructure to support the development would be provided under both options, including any required upgrades to sewage treatment works. Air quality could be affected by levels of car use within Cranbrook, however. Emissions from car use are likely to be higher under Option 2 than Option 1, as Option 2 would involve having a single town centre which would be outside of walking distance for many of Cranbrook's residents. Under Option 1, almost all residents would be within a 10 minute walk of at least one of the three town centres, and so may be more likely to walk and cycle day to day. The public transport loop within the town would also be more efficient and faster under Option 1 so more people may choose that option in place of car use. A minor positive effect is therefore likely in relation to Option 1 and a minor negative effect is likely in relation to Option 2.
14. To contribute towards a reduction in local emissions of greenhouse gases.	++	--/+	<p>Option 1 would involve having three town centres with at least one being within a 10 minute walk for the vast majority of Cranbrook's residents. This would enable more people to walk or cycle day to day in order to access services and facilities rather than needing to travel by car over longer distances, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles. In addition, the proposed public transport route around Cranbrook would follow an efficient route under this option, providing an attractive and viable alternative to car use within the town. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under Option 2, the public transport route around Cranbrook would follow a less efficient route due to the dispersed settlement pattern and therefore would be slower, so people may be less likely to use it in place of car travel with the associated greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the fact that there would be a single town centre in the west of Cranbrook would mean that people (particularly those in the east of the town) would be more likely to drive over longer distances to access services and facilities instead of walking and cycling. However, some footpath and cycle links would still be provided under this option, connecting north/south, and the concentration of development in the west would be in close proximity of the station which may enable more journeys to and from the town to be made via train. Overall a mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect is therefore likely.</p>
15. To ensure that there is no increase in the risk	0	0	Most of Cranbrook lies outside of high flood risk zones, although there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3 across the northern boundary and through the centre of the area. The same overall quantum of land

SA Objectives	Concept Masterplan 1	Concept Masterplan 2	Justification
of flooding.			would be developed under both options and both options would avoid focussing built development on the higher flood risk areas. Therefore, negligible effects are likely for both options.
16. To ensure energy consumption is as efficient as possible.	+	-	The main factor influencing the achievement of this objective under both options will be the design of built development which cannot be determined at this stage and it is assumed that all new development would be constructed to high standards of energy efficiency in line with the relevant policies in the East Devon Local Plan. However, the dispersed settlement pattern under Option 2 could make the district heating network within the town less efficient; therefore a minor negative effect is identified for that option. Conversely, under Option 1 the settlement pattern would be less dispersed, increasing the efficiency of the district heating network and a minor positive effect is likely.
17. To promote wise use of waste resources whilst reducing waste production and disposal.	0	0	The achievement of this SA objective will be determined by onsite waste management practices and not by the distribution of development within Cranbrook. Therefore, negligible effects are identified for both options.
18. To maintain sustainable growth of employment for East Devon, to match levels of jobs with the economically active workforce.	++	+	The same amount of employment land would be provided under both options, and both options would involve the provision of a hub in the west of the town where commercial development can be located within close proximity of neighbouring developments such as Sky Park. Under Option 1 the employment opportunities associated with shops, services and facilities would be spread throughout the town in three separate centres; therefore they would be accessible for most people within a short walk or via the direct public transport route linking the three centres. Under Option 2, employment opportunities would be focussed in the west of the town, with a less direct public transport route and therefore may be less easily accessible for people in the east. A significant positive effect is therefore likely for Option 1 and a minor positive effect for Option 2.
19. To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Towns of East Devon.	++	-	<p>Under Option 1, the three town centres within 10 minutes' walking distance of most residents should mean that the whole of Cranbrook and not just the western area are vibrant and will contribute to community cohesion. The main centre out of the three would be located in the centre of Cranbrook and would be well-connected to other parts of Cranbrook. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under Option 2, the development pattern would be more dispersed which could mean that community cohesion is less good and most commercial and social activities would be focused in the western end of the town, which could result in the eastern end being less vibrant. A minor negative effect is therefore likely.</p>

SA Objectives	Concept Masterplan 1	Concept Masterplan 2	Justification
20. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment.	++	++	The same amount of employment land would be provided under both options, and both options would involve the provision of a hub in the west of the town where commercial development can be located within close proximity of neighbouring developments such as Sky Park. Therefore, significant positive effects are identified for both options.