

# **University of Exeter Science Park Supplementary Planning Document**

**Adopted November 2008**

## **Statement of Representations**

Regulation 18 (4) (b) Statement

This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004. This statement provides details of representations made in accordance with Regulation 18 (2) and sets out a summary of the main issues raised in these representations and how these issues have been addressed within the adopted SPD.

University of Exeter Science Park SPD  
Table of Comments Received and Responses

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	Neil Bromley	1 Lowerstone Cottage, Blackhorse Lane, Clyst Honiton. EX5 2AP			Not read entire document but am extremely concerned about the closure of Blackhorse Lane, and the fact that I have not yet had a say in this matter. As a resident of Blackhorse Lane for the last ten years, I reside at the lower end of the lane, nearer to the old A30. I currently run a small business from home, and I am in constant use of the lane to make use of the few amenities that Pinhoe offers, P.O., shop, as well as Pinhoe Sainsburys and access to the City, Stoke Canon, and beyond. I currently use payment meters for both Gas and Electric, and the local shop offers me both utilities. It is therefore important for me to have constant access to Pinhoe, as well as other residence, as there is NO local shop in the village of Clyst Honiton, nor are there any other amenities, and the local pubs are uninhabitable, and therefore it offers nothing to the residence. The public transport is few and far between, and therefore one is better off taking the car. Despite my awareness of growing emissions, the closure of the lane would mean I have to travel down the A30, up the new link road between Sowton and Pinhoe into Pinhoe, and back again, just for a pint of milk, to post letters, or for gas and electricity. Not environmentally friendly, even though I do cycle from time to time, I still must run my business, and this is time consuming. The road should remain open for residents, maybe by means of a gate, if rat runners are to be deterred by this.	Comments noted, no change proposed as any road closure will be subject to a separate procedure and consultation as referred to in paragraph 3.61 of the draft SPD.
2	Nick Gough	Development Planning Manager, Department of Engineering, South West Water.		5.12-5.18	I can confirm that we have met with consultants acting for the developer and the comments in paragraphs 5.12-5.18 on water supply and foul water drainage, accurately reflect our comments. We expect that the surface water drainage arrangements will be agreed with the Environment Agency.	Comments noted.
3	David Moon	davidmoon@btinternet.com			My concern with the plan is that you may close Blackhorse Lane while keeping Tithebarn Lane open. This would be complete madness on the Council's part, already Tithebarn Lane is a rat run at both the morning and evening rush hours, it is also a busy access road for two farmers whose fields are along this road, at harvest and silage time it is impossible to get along there now without a lot of extra traffic that now uses Blackhorse Lane! As for access to Pinhoe, the new Monkerton relief road is a better	Comments noted, text amended in response. Any road closure will be subject to a separate procedure and consultation as referred to in paragraph 3.61 of the

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					option for Sowton people anyway.	draft SPD.
4	Aaron Haile English Heritage	29 Queen Square, Bristol. BS1 4ND			Thank you for consulting us on the draft SPD for Exeter Science Park. Based on previous correspondence and visits to the site English Heritage has no comments to offer at this stage.	Noted
5	Mr Derek Gent	Mosshayne Cottage, Westclyst, Exeter. EX1 3TR	7		The closed roadway – now used as a footpath – through the site ending at the motorway is shown as a permissive path, surely this is wrong.	The public right of way on this stretch of Blackhorse Lane was extinguished when the road was stopped up. However, the route has been regularly used by walkers and horse riders over many years and indicating it as a permissive route is the most appropriate mapping reference.
			13	3.11	This [reduction in dependence on private car] is going to be hard to achieve – but it is most important that foot/cycle access be possible from the North (Pinhoe) side from the beginning of the development.	Agreed, this will be the case
			23	3.58	May be closed sooner – but if it happens, both Blackhorse Lane and Tithebarn Lane (at the eastern end) at the same time as through routes.	Noted, text changed.
			41	7.8	Most important – a lot of new housing this side of Exeter without much open space.	Noted
			2	1.10	<u>SA Report</u> This is going to be difficult [implementation of non-car travel modes] – will people cycle (or use public transport) from the University?	Noted
6	Mr C Hilditch Stagecoach	Belgrave Road, Exeter. EX1 2LB		<u>1.16</u>	<u>SA Report</u> Although this document supports 'sustainable transport' it does not do so. 1.16 No. 3 – to improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas.	Further text added to reinforce modal split proposals
			13	3.16- 3.17	In the Draft Supplementary Planning Document 'cop out' of making public transport sustainable. Our views on issue 10, Tithebarn Lane are being ignored in the response document option must exist for a through bus	Comments noted. Text added to paras 3.16 9High Quality Public Transport

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					service at the outset 3.16/7 is not good enough.	Link), 3.18 (bus service from opening day) 3.22 (bus route through site and across M5).
					<u>SA Report</u> It is advertising by a consultant and not a sustainability report. Bland statements. Glosses over detail. Has a lot of aspirations but it is unlikely to achieve any of these.	Comments noted, no change proposed
7	Neal Gray GOSW, D & C Planning & Housing Delivery Team	Mast House, Shepherds Wharf, 24 Sutton Road, Plymouth. PL4 0HJ			Further to our letter of 31 January 2008, I can confirm we have no comments on the SPD.	Noted
8	Mr & Mrs Waine	Meadowsweet, Sowton, Exeter. EX5 2AE			We have an over-riding objection to the proposed location of the UESP at Redhayes as this represents breaching the boundary of the City formed by the M5 motorway and developing in what has, until now, been regarded as open countryside. Notwithstanding this objection, we have various comments on the proposed SPD.	Comment noted.
				2.2	The boundary of the UESP shown on all the figures should be re-drawn. There is no reason why the "Remnant Ornamental Planting" shown on figure 2.2 should be included in the area for development on all the subsequent figures. The perverse inclusion of this important area of the parkland appears to be based solely, and quite wrongly, on purely commercial and advertising considerations.	This area is identified for information purposes. It is not parkland but the fragmented remains of an ornamental domestic garden.
				2.8, 2.12, 2.26, 3.29, 3.40 to 3.44	We can see no justification for the proposal to locate a "Landmark Building" on the ridgeline as indicated on figure 3.3, being the site of the former Redhayes House. Proposals for the UESP are formulated, quite rightly in our view, to protect as far as possible the existing parkland. The siting of a large building at the highest point in the most prominent position possible would appear to be contrary to the principles of good planning and landscape conservation. The fact that a building once stood there is no justification for a replacement, particularly as the main purpose seems to be to advertise a development which in every other respect is intended	Comment noted, it is considered that to entirely preclude development in that area would be unnecessarily inflexible. The sensitivity of that part of the site has been emphasised and reference to potential

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					to be well screened. Para 2.8 refers to existing hedgerows & trees forming strong ridgeline feature which is reinforced by para 2.12. This should be preserved and enhanced to accord with bullet point 6 in para 2.26. An isolated two or three storey building on the ridgeline will not accord with para 3.29 as will be subject to the cooling effect of any wind which blows. Fig 3.1 Landscape Analysis – Key Views and Vegetation highlights the view from the M5 northbound, and this should not be marred by an intrusive building. These very real concerns were highlighted during consultations at the Issues and Options stage and are reinforced in paras 3.40-3.44. This proposal should, therefore, be discarded.	building sizes removed.
				Fig 3.3	Fig 3.3 includes a reference to a Park and Ride site, although it does not form part of the UESP. As this would have a serious impact on local residents in Blackhorse Lane, and would be yet further erosion of open countryside, references to it in the text and fig 3.3 should be omitted. This leads on naturally to the question of access to the UESP, which in the initial stages will by way of the existing Redhayes route. This would appear to be an ideal arrangement, and should be preserved at all costs, as the alternative suggestion of a road across the parkland at a later date would be so destructive as to be unacceptable.	Comments noted. Park and Ride does not form part of the proposal. However, the Structure Plan proposes a new or improved Park and Ride to serve Exeter on the A30 east and the Structure Plan Key Diagram shows this to the east of the M5. It is logical for the SPD to acknowledge this.
				4.3	The current guidance in all planning documents is for the economical use of land. This is one feature of the Report on the emerging RSS where higher than usual housing densities are advocated. The whole concept of the UESP seems to be based on the principle of profligate use of land, apparently to match the wide open spaces of the University campus. At a time when sustainability and economical use of resources are regarded as being of paramount importance, it would appear that a more compact form of development is to be desired. An example of this profligacy is the suggestion in Para 4.3 that a Hotel might be introduced into a Masterplan. There are not only several hotels of varying price levels in the locality but also proposals for others, so the question of need must arise and this proposal should be abandoned.	Land take at the site would only take place in response to demand. Reference to campus style development has been deleted and more detail on potential development approach added.

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
				4.3	Para 4.3 appears to play a crucial role in the concept of the UESP as it suggests very strongly that it may not be commercially viable. The sentence "Also, some facilities, whether strictly ancillary to the main purpose of the park or not, may be a commercial necessity to bring other aspects of the UESP development forward" raises the twin spectres of either fast food outlets, retail stores and other enterprises or developments appropriate to a business park taking over. To the layman it would appear that the whole project is over-ambitious and driven by delusions of grandeur. It may well be that the high cost of both underused land and infrastructure development needed to provide a campus style development is the root cause for the weasel words in this most revealing paragraph.	Comment noted; para 4.3 has been modified, however reference to an hotel is retained as this is both a valid component of Science Park developments and important to the commercial business case for the scheme.
				4.3	The first part of the same paragraph also gives rise to similar and equally serious concerns, as it says "The possibility that the supply of such facilities may not be met with demand, ..., must be borne in mind". This suggests very strongly that the many promoters of the UESP share a common lack of confidence in the proposals, and that they are all prepared to sacrifice their lofty ideals on the altar of commercial necessity, so that we will end up with a ruined landscape and nothing more than a scruffy industrial estate. The inescapable conclusion must be that the unknown and unknowable demand for any science-based development should be satisfied by and located at a projected development such as Skypark.	See above
				3.85 – 3.88	Lighting, both of roads and buildings, is dealt with in paras 3.85 – 3.88, with apparently good intentions but with some aspects which give rise to misgivings. The third sentence in para 3.85 refers to a hierarchy including amenity lighting for breakout spaces (the meaning of which and intensity required is unclear) to accent lighting of buildings. The latter in particular could open the way for intense floodlighting of the worst kind. A particular example of this is provided by the unwarranted proposal to site a landmark building on the ridgeline, for publicity purposes, which would almost certainly be floodlit at night. We already have the extravagant and unsustainable floodlighting of buildings on the nearby business park to illustrate the loss of dark skies which is so damaging to our environment. Any lighting on the UESP will need to be minimal if it is to be acceptable, so that publicity seeking proposals for floodlighting at night should be ruled out.	Noted, paragraph reordered, the word 'appropriate' added to accent lighting and reference to need for lighting strategy predicated on need to avoid all off-site light pollution added.
			Figs	4.18,	Of major concern is that the UESP could and would degenerate into	Comments noted. para

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
			3.5, 3.6	4.3, 3.88	<p>nothing more than a business park or industrial estate. The proposed description of uses of the site in para 4.18 is cast so wide that almost anything would be acceptable when read in conjunction with the alternative uses in para 4.3 referred to above. It is also worthy of note that para 3.88 refers to the examples in figures 3.5 and 3.6 illustrating a premium business park. No amount of clever landscaping or attractive signs can hide what is almost certain to be the reality – a wasteful, over-ambitious industrial estate with an uncertain future.</p> <p>The SPD should concentrate in the provision of a compact unassuming area for small, well designed buildings suitable for research and development organisations set up in their formative years. Ideas of landmark buildings and accent lighting should be abandoned, along with the idea that wide open landscaped spaces will attract a higher class of clientele. The high land and infrastructure costs could well deter the most worthy but struggling organisation.</p>	<p>4.3 of the draft SPD modified. The planning description is considered sufficient to control the form of development. This is backed up by public acquisition of the land which will also ensure adequate control.</p> <p>Comment noted, no change proposed. The Science Park concept reflects demand for high quality and prestige accommodation for a specific economic sector.</p>
9	Mrs J White Clerk to Bishops Clyst PC	Ringmer, Culver Close, Bradninch	8		Issue 5 South West Quadrant Development: We believe that this section should not be developed at present certainly until junction 29 of M5 is sorted out and completed. Later if the issue should arise again, then only low density development so as to preserve as much of the original parkland as is possible.	These comments appear to refer to the Issues and Options stage of consultation, nevertheless the approach suggested is that which is being followed.
			14		Issue 10 Access: We agree that existing through routes, Tithebarn, Blackhorse and Langaton Lanes, should be closed off to through traffic.	This comment appears to refer to the Issues and Options stage of consultation Any road closure will be subject to a separate procedure and consultation as referred to in paragraph 3.61 of the draft SPD.
			17		Issue 13 Ridgeline Development: We think that there should be no development which would intrude onto the ridgeline in any way. It would spoil this aspect from the southerly viewpoints.	This comment appears to refer to the Issues and Options stage of consultation. It is considered that to entirely preclude development in

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
						that area would be unnecessarily inflexible. The sensitivity of that part of the site has been emphasised and reference to potential building sizes removed.
10	Alex Wilson, Fulfords Land and Planning	Leeward House, Fitzroy Road, Exeter. EX1 3LJ			I have been instructed on behalf of Western Power Distribution to draw your attention to the following errors regarding electrical supply as discussed on page 36.	Comments noted, text amended accordingly
			36	5.8	The 11kV line running along Blackhorse Lane is 'underground' and not on poles.	See above
				5.9	Connections are from the 11kV cable to pole mounted transformers and not from the 132kV line.	See above
				5.9	If new supply is to be derived from the 132kV line then a substantial new substation will be needed and not just an appropriate transformer.	See above
				5.10	Amend first sentence to "Western Power Distribution's preferred option to supply the development will depend on the size of the electrical demand being asked for and cost of connection and this needs further investigation. One option is to supply from the west at 33kV, requiring a new 33/11kV substation on the site. A supply from the 132kV line may not necessarily provide a more secure or better quality of supply and would require a new 132/11kV substation and possibly a new pylon or modifications to an existing one. Western Power Distribution will assess the most suitable option for the site, taking into account technical feasibility and cost".	See above
				5.11	Amend first two sentences: "In principle, electrical supply can be provided without capacity constraints but as the electrical demand increases, the cost and magnitude of the infrastructure needed to supply it is also likely to increase. The cost for providing supply to UESP will depend on the capacity needed and hence no maximum figure can be quoted at this stage".	See above
					WPD would also like to note that it is not possible to connect pole mounted transformers to the 132kV line. A new ground mounted substation will be needed (which could be of a reasonable size) and it would be connected to the most appropriate point on WPD's network and this may not be the 132kV line that crosses the site. WPD would like to state that the 132kV overhead line that crosses the subject site is of strategic importance to electricity supplies for the wider area and WPD will require that the line is	See above



<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					retained.	
11	Mr Douglas Fisher	Clytside, Blackhorse Lane, Clyst Honiton. EX5 2AR	14	10.3-10.5	I am very concerned regarding future traffic in Black Horse Lane, which as you are probably aware is a narrow winding lane where vehicles have to encroach on private property to pass each other, doing damage in the process, some vehicles being large enough to grind both sides of the lane at the same time. Several blind spots and the blatant ignoring of the 30 mph limit makes this lane a very dangerous place (30 mph being far too high). The new link road from Sowton to Pinhoe Road should have relieved the lane of through traffic, but not so. When all the new developments are started (Cranbrook – Skypark – airport extension – Inter Modal Freight – University Science Park ) Blackhorse Lane will be unable to cope.	Comments noted. Additional text added to clarify potential approach to the future of the lanes in the vicinity of UESP.
12	Mr Stephen Schlich	Sutherlake, Broadclyst, Exeter, EX5 3BL		3.88	I support the provision of a high standard of design quality to provide an attractive environment. It is important that members of the public should be able to come freely to the Science Park in the same way as they can wander freely round the main campus at the University of Exeter. Links should be made to nearby footpaths.	Agreed, text added to confirm this.
13	Cherry Herbert Environment Agency	Exminster House, Miller Way, Exeter, EX6 8AS		3.29	Discusses solar gain. In the longer term climate change may necessitate the consideration of solar shading rather than gain.	Text changed.
				3.3	UESP should be seeking to minimise waste first and then looking to facilitate recycling and reuse.	Text added.
				3.37	We are generally supportive of the landscape section, however, we recommend that the parkland setting of the south west section should not be further developed once the motorway junction has been finished. We fully support further parkland planting in the remaining area to enhance the landscape here. This would contribute to the UK and Devon Biodiversity Action Plans for parkland with specimen trees.	Comments noted, no change proposed.
				3.40	Ridgeline development will need to be done very sensitively as it is described in this draft SPG.	Comments noted, additional text provided.
				3.49	The proposed assessment is for biodiversity and significant landscape value. Therefore any planting should be retained if it is determined to be of biodiversity value as well as of significant landscape value. In time, a commitment should be required for financial contributions to the enhancement and management of open space and parkland areas.	Agreed, text amended
				5.19	We support your general approach to sustainable surface water drainage techniques (SUDS). The proper management of surface water will be particularly important as there is no ability to drain any significant volumes of water off site to either the Pinn Brook to the north or the Great Moor	Noted, text amended accordingly.

Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
					<p>Stream to the south. It is therefore critical as far as possible surface waters are disposed of "at source" via a comprehensive SUDS scheme – as referred to in this paragraph, where it states "There will therefore be no requirement to use existing surface water sewer capacity near the site". Given such an approach it is likely that, as with the Met. Office and other development on similar soils and geology, there may well be difficulties disposing of all surface water, following intense or prolonged rainfall, via infiltration techniques without some substantial water storage capacity being provided that will store and slowly release flows into the ground as conditions dictate. There will also be a need to provide a "fail safe" flood route for flows that may exceed the scheme's design.</p> <p>Large scale surface water storage capacity is best achieved above ground where it can benefit wildlife and landscaping (although due to the sloping nature of the site this will require clever and careful design to ensure that the features have biodiversity value), and not in holding tanks and sewers as suggested in 5.22. Such holding tanks and sewers do not generally conform to the aims of SUDS. Because of the inherent conflict between lakes/ponds, flocking birds and aviation, any such above ground water storage facility will need to be intelligently designed and planted to avoid the creation of open water bodies. At nearby Cranbrook such lagoons are to be narrow sinuous features, planted with scrub and tall grasses etc. to avoid the 'flicker effect' of any short term water bodies. This is the approach we will expect to be followed for those waters which will need to be stored temporarily because they cannot be readily infiltrated. Also it is stressed that any SUDS scheme will need to be designed to take full account of predicted changes in rainfall due climate change.</p>	
14	Trevor Bolshaw Devon Conservation Forum	Lower Ground Floor Annexe, County Hall, Exeter, EX2 4QD		3.2 3.7 3.8 and 3.9	<p>In the transport sub section 3.14 is essential. With regard to para. 3.18 the use of the Tithelane Lane M5 overbridge should be considered in the early stages of the development particularly in respect of encouraging rail usage to the site. Early development of a bus link from Pinhoe station to the site would assist in establishing a pattern of rail usage from the start rather than having to attempt to change peoples travel habits later in the development. Para. 3.20 places too much emphasis upon transport access from the south admitting that this will 'become more challenging as UESP expands'.</p> <p>With regard to the Parkland Area south west of the site we strongly urge that the temptation to inject 'sensitive development' at a later date be resisted. This area will already be reduced by future necessary works to</p>	<p>Comments noted, further text added to emphasis the phased nature of the transport strategy for the location.</p> <p>Noted, no change proposed, as this is a matter for future</p>

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>improve M5 Junction 29 and this will make retention of the retention of the remaining area along with intensification of the existing landscaping essential. Paras. 3.38 and 3.39 are strongly supported.</p> <p>Whilst not opposed to the building of a new landmark building upon the site of the old Redhayes this must be done in line with the stipulations set out in paras. 3.42 and 3.43.</p> <p>The Forum supports what is said in paras 3.45 to 3.52.</p> <p>On the question of circulation and access (para 3.60) we would support the view that all the surrounding lanes should cease to be used as through routes for private cars.</p> <p>When considering the question of the palette of materials we particularly support paras 3.69 and 3.70. With regard to formal hard landscapes, permeable paving materials are essential. The second sentence of para 3.74 is supported in this respect.</p> <p>The Forum supports what is said in paras 3.79 to 3.84 on the subject of site furniture and signage.</p> <p><b>Development Briefing Summary</b></p> <p>The requirements set out are generally agreed. However we would question building orientation due south to 'maximise solar gain opportunities'. In the light of global warming there needs to be an awareness of possible effects of over-warming from large window areas with a southerly aspect.</p> <p>The need to 'protect buildings from cooling airflows' is questioned. Again in light of global warming such airflows may be a welcome facility.</p> <p>We again welcome the intention to 'minimise non-porous hard surfaces' and the use of soakaways, filter strips, swales and wetland areas to attenuate surface water run-off.</p> <p>We support all that is said in the sections relating to Buildings, Heating and Cooling and Water Use. In particular we agree with 'moveable partition</p>	<p>consideration.</p> <p>Noted, further text added.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, text amended.</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>walls to maximise flexibility, the linking of buildings to achieve scale economies in heating and cooling' and all that is said under the heading Water Use.</p> <p><b>Securing the Form and Quality of Development</b></p> <p>In our previous submission we emphasised the need for a strict definition of Science Park and we are pleased to see that this is taken seriously not only with respect to immediate future development but also maintaining the use in the future. We previously opposed the siting of a hotel upon the site and would maintain our opposition to this. Para 4.3 refers to 'true ancillary uses on the site (café, crèche, gymnasium) these clearly would be acceptable. The remaining working of para 4.3 is dangerous. It implies that if a science park within the strict definition proves unviable then other uses outside the definition would have to be allowed. This could lead to a 'rag bag' of commercial uses with all the associated traffic, landscaping and design issues; In fact an industrial estate through the back door. There is no point in setting out the stipulations in 4.1 and 4.2 only to have them watered down by what is said in 4.3. We would urge the removal of para 4.3 The essence of our point here seems to be made in para 4.7 The phasing of development and future development control of this site should make sure that if the time comes when takers for true science park uses are not forthcoming for the whole of it then way remains should revert to rural uses. This would help in keeping the physical break between Exeter and the major developments of Skypark, Road/Rail Interchange and Cranbrook further East.</p>	<p>Noted; para 4.3 amended but reference to an hotel is retained as this is both a valid component of Science Park developments and important to the commercial business case for the scheme. The public acquisition of the land which will also ensure adequate control.</p>
15	John Thompson Exeter City Council	Civic Centre, Paris Street, Exeter, EX1 1NN			<p>Members are invited to endorse a response to East Devon District Council which states that the importance of the Science Park is recognised, the publication of the draft SPD is welcomed, and the contents are supported, subject to clarification that the definition of acceptable uses is restricted to those that accord with the Science Park objectives.</p> <p>The clarification needed refers to the inconsistencies between the text set out in paragraphs 4.12 to 4.17 and the description of acceptable uses in paragraph 4.18, particularly the broad reference to B1 and accompanying criteria in paragraph 4.13. The City Council supports the description in</p>	<p>Noted, text amended.</p>

Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
					paragraph 4.18 and considers that the accompanying text should aim to explain and justify the description. Text that implies a less restrictive approach should be deleted.	
16	Mr and Mrs David & Jean Lloyd	Byways, Blackhorse Lane, Clyst Honiton, Exeter, EX5 2AR	3	1.10	<b>Point of context</b> The sentence 'Skypark was felt to be too remote from the M5 and Exeter'. The proposed Skypark is approximately 1.5 miles from the M5 and would be adequately serviced by the new A30. We would not deem this as 'being too remote'.	Noted - this is a factual statement of a previous report's findings.
			6	2.3	We <b>support</b> the extension of the existing field boundary.	Noted
			18	3.38 and 3.39	If the area of parkland is to be kept as 'parkland' following the proposed improvements unction 29, then we <b>support</b> the idea of this area being properly managed and enhanced with new planting.	Noted
			18	3.40	We <b>support</b> the idea but agree that appropriate design safeguards must be in place. Any proposed building should be no higher than 2 storeys, equivalent to what would have been the existing house had it remained.	Noted
			20	3.42	We <b>strongly object</b> . Any buildings should be no more than a maximum of 2 storeys high to blend in with the local landscape and not to be intrusive on neighbouring residents.	Noted, references to building heights removed. Text added to paragraph 6.6 that this issue will be addressed through the masterplan.
			20	3.43	We <b>strongly support</b> .	Noted
			23	3.58 and 3.59	We <b>strongly support</b> the closure of Blackhorse Lane, allowing for access to residents and vehicular access to Sunnymead only. We would also <b>strongly support</b> this closure before occupation of phase 1 of the Science Park. Blackhorse Lane is already used as a 'rat run' and during the closure of Pinn Lane the amount of traffic using Blackhorse Lane increased significantly, such that some residents experienced verbal abuse from drivers. We do not wish to experience this again. We are also concerned how the other new developments in the area will affect the flow of traffic along Blackhorse Lane. The Monkerton Link Road is now in place; there should be no need for Blackhorse Lane to be used as a 'rat run'.	Noted. Any road closure will be subject to a separate procedure and consultation as referred to in paragraph 3.61 of the draft SPD.
			23	3.60	We object to the use of Mosshayne Lane being used as an alternative access to Pinhoe. However, we <b>support</b> the case for all lanes ceasing to be used as through routes for private cars. The closure of these lanes would also enhance the area for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, whilst still allowing required access for agricultural vehicles.	Noted, text added recognising this issue. See above.

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
			24	3.61	We <b>support</b> a stakeholder consultation, but the views and comments of the actual residents that live along these 'rat runs' must be seriously considered. For those stakeholders who merely use these lanes as through routes, should be made aware of the main alternative routes now available, such as the Monkerton Link Road.	Noted
			27	3.87	We <b>support</b> . Light pollution to surrounding residences should be avoided.	Noted
			33	4.3	We <b>strongly object</b> . A hotel facility should not be based at the proposed Science Park.	Noted. No change proposed; reference to an hotel is retained as this is both a valid component of Science Park developments and important to the commercial business case for the scheme.
			34	4.7	We <b>strongly support</b> . The proposed Science Park should not mutate into 'just another business park'. Exeter has many of these and as such these could be extended rather than prime agricultural land being used for this purpose.	Noted
			37	5.17	<b>Point of context</b> . We were under the impression that whilst planning permission may have been granted, the proposed location is still under dispute with the current landowner.	Noted
			39	6.7	We <b>strongly object</b> . The area of land fronting residences within the top part of Blackhorse Lane should be left as open farmland/nature area. As stated in previous correspondence, we decided, like others, to move here for the views/peace that this particular area had to offer, not to overlook a development.	Noted, no change proposed. This is not a proposal of the SPD and is an issue for future consideration.
			40	7.5	Bullet point 'Noise, vibration and air quality limits during construction and operation'. We are concerned, and hope that the development aims to keep this to a minimum and therefore to work with and not alienate its neighbours.	Noted
17	Walter Brown Campaign for Better Transport, Devon Group	20 Prince of Wales Road, CREDITON, Devon, EX17 2AG			University of Exeter Science Park: draft Supplementary Planning Document  Campaign for Better Transport, Devon Group, decided to <b>object</b> to these proposals, as far as concerns the provision of bus links.  In our view the <b>road layout</b> (with a spur road from a junction some distance east of the site entrance) is too indirect for through buses to	Noted, further text added clarifying bus service

Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
					<p>deviate. As the Council recognises (para 3.62 of the draft SPD), it is essential to reduce dependence on the private car for commuting. For most people, buses will be the only alternative. This is acknowledged at end of para 3.89 on p.32, where one of the "key development design requirements" is "Ensure provision is made for bus facilities at the outset of Phase 1, and increased bus penetration as UESP grows." We agree that this is vital.</p> <p>The Transport section (paras 3.11-3.22) seeks to fill out the detail. At para 3.20 it is assumed that "an A30 frontage bus stop" will be provided at the first stage of development (that closest to the A30). But westbound (Exeter-bound) buses will be unable to pass the site, nor any point nearby that motorists would accept as near enough. Indeed we must question the whole basis of para 3.17, where it is stated that initially a frontage bus stop and subsequently the diversion of through bus routes to serve UESP, will be "attractive to bus service operators".</p> <p>This surely only applies in the eastbound direction; and only then, if the indicative road layout can be altered to include an eastbound slip road (maybe buses-only) that will pass the entrance. It seems implausible that operators will be willing to divert via the indirect route necessitated by the proposals as they stand (other than, possibly, odd journeys at the busiest times only). The development will <b>not be effectively served by public transport</b>, other than by dedicated routes at certain times only if these are specified.</p> <p><b>It must be questioned whether the whole layout will meet sustainability requirements unless it is altered so that the east-west main road (or a 2-way bus lane accessing both east and west) directly passes the site entrance.</b></p> <p>Referring to the phasing plan (Fig 3.4, p.21), we also feel that when the site is fully developed, there need to be a uni-directional <b>bus link between the west and east sides</b> of the site. Para 3.18 needs to specify this. It should not merely be left as an implied "possibility" that "does not form part of proposals at present". If it is, then bus stops may have to be sited at an unacceptable distance from some parts of the future phases.</p>	<p>proposals.</p> <p>Noted, further text added clarifying bus service proposals.</p> <p>Noted, further text added clarifying bus service proposals.</p> <p>Further text added clarifying intentions.</p>

Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
					<p>In general (both for Phase 1 in isolation, and for the development as a whole), <b>dedicated bus routes</b> serving the site must be provided as a prior condition of such a large-scale, out-of-city scheme being allowed to progress. It is recognised as essential, in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy as well as DCC's Local Transport Plan and planning policies generally, that dependence on the private car must be curtailed. This cannot happen unless large-scale new developments, outside existing built-up areas, are required to make full provision for the necessary public-transport services.</p> <p>In discussing this, our Group felt that, as well as through services from and to Cranbrook and other places further east, a <b>bus route from Exeter terminating in the Science Park</b> is needed, possibly as an extension to a City route or park-and-ride. Moreover, it will not be satisfactory merely to provide such transport at one of two fixed start-and-finish times on weekdays only, as sometimes happens. Planning conditions need to be framed in such a way that the public-transport authority will be in a position to specify the full range of services judged to be needed when the complete scale of the development has become clear.</p> <p>Our Group did not specifically discuss <b>cycle routes</b>; but it is clearly essential that the best possible provision is made for cyclists, both on-site and on routes to and from.</p>	<p>Further text added clarifying intentions.</p> <p>Further text added clarifying intentions.</p> <p>Agreed; this is the intention.</p>
18	Ian Parsons Highways Agency	1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, Ash House, Falcon Road, Sowton Industrial Estate, Exeter, EX2 7LB			<p>As you will be aware the Agency has had extensive involvement in the development of the Area of Economic Activity and welcomes the opportunity to provide further comments on the contents of the Science Park SPD. These comments are further to previous representations submitted to the Issues and Options version of the draft Science Park SPD in February 2007. Our comments are as follows:</p> <p><b>Introduction, Background &amp; Site Selection</b></p> <p>The document has been drafted in consultation with a number of key stakeholders, but the Agency is disappointed that it was not involved in this process, particularly as the site is located adjacent to the M5 motorway and A30 for which the Agency has responsibility. We would welcome the opportunity to be involved in future discussions with the applicants and key stakeholders.</p> <p>We support the list of assessment criteria outlined within paragraph 1.9</p>	<p>Noted – this request will be drawn to the attention of relevant individuals and bodies.</p>



Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
					<p>and acknowledge that the impact of the site has been considered in terms of its proximity to the motorway junction as part of this process. As previously outlined in our representation dated 1 February 2007, the Agency supports in principle the location of the proposed Science Park at Redhayes. However, capacity constraints affecting the M5 motorway and A30 mean that it is of paramount importance to limit development within this location to 26,000 sq m in keeping with Phase II of the Access and Strategy which has been prepared for the Area of Economic Activity. This threshold may be exceeded once Phase III of the Access Strategy has been prepared and agreed, with appropriate funding secured and the works implemented. At this stage the Phase III works have yet to be agreed.</p> <p><b>Development Rationale</b> A 25 ha site has been allocated within the adopted Structure Plan for the provision of a Science Park. However, this allocation has still not come forward within the existing Local Plan or emerging Local Development Framework. The Agency still considers that the suitability of the site should be fully considered and assessed through the local plan system before an SPD is pursued.</p> <p><b>Sustainable Transport</b> The SPD's commitment to the promotion of public transport links is welcome, as is the encouragement of alternative means of transport such as walking and cycling. The Agency would be keen to work with the applicants on the preparation of Travel Plans as these are an important tool in minimising traffic generated by the development. Such demand management measures are important in managing traffic impacts. In principle the Agency support the proposals for the first phase of development but we would stress that public transport provision, cycle and pedestrian improvements should all be in place prior to the occupation of the first phase.</p> <p><b>Phasing and Siting of Development</b> The agency welcomes the reservation of part of the site for the delivery of the Phase II Access Strategy, comprising of improvements to Junction 29 of the M5.</p>	<p>Noted – this is the case</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This offer will be drawn to the attention of relevant individuals and bodies.</p> <p>Support noted</p>

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p><b>Circulation and Access</b> The Agency agrees that a range of amenities should be provided to support employees working within this location. However, we will need to be reassured that these facilities will not attract other users to the site, as this would further increase pressure on the strategic road network.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the suitability of road closures within the area as these are likely to have a direct impact on the safe and efficient operation of the M5 and A30. The Agency will need to be satisfied that the impact on the network will be acceptable before supporting any such proposals.</p> <p><b>Park and Ride</b> Whilst we are generally supportive of Park and Ride proposals, there are concerns about where such a facility would be located; how it will be accessed, who it would serve and how it would interact with the existing Park and Ride at Honiton Road, west of Junction 29.</p> <p>Once these matters have been addressed the Agency will be able to provide more detailed comments. However, it is regrettable that proposals for Park &amp; Ride have only been discussed with us at a relatively late stage. It is imperative that all relevant Authorities are fully apprised of such proposals as they come forward.</p> <p><b>Onsite Parking</b> Any car parking provision on site should reflect prevailing local and national policy and guidance. The Agency reserves the opportunity to comment on the quantum of parking once further information comes forward.</p> <p><b>Section 106 Planning Obligations</b> We welcome paragraphs 4.12-4.18 in respect of Section 106 obligations but reiterate that significant developer funding will need to be secured in order to deliver the Phase II works including improvements to public transport, pedestrian and cycle linkages.</p> <p>In principle the Agency supports the proposed uses for the site, provided that the Class A retail, D1 non residential institutions and D2 Assembly and Leisure are ancillary to the primary use of the site as a Science Park.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, further text added to refer to HA involvement in consultation.</p> <p>Noted. This is not a proposal of the SPD and is a matter for Devon County Council.</p> <p>Noted, this will need to be addressed through a full TA, which is identified in the SPD as required.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>As outlined within our previous submission, the Agency is unable to obtain funding to deliver improvements to Junction 29, as a result of the proposals for the Science Park. Therefore any Phase III improvements would need to be funded entirely by the developer and Major Scheme Bid Funding. As the Agency is unable to be a signatory on any Section 106 agreement we will seek to work with the applicants and local planning authority to agree the key principles.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b>  The Agency supports the use of the A30 at Blackhorse for access into Phase I of the Science Park subject to both the opening of the Clyst Honiton Bypass; and the developer submitting a comprehensive TA identifying the impact and working with us to agree an appropriate package of improvements to this junction. Any identified improvements will need to be funded and implemented by the developer in advance of the first occupation of Phase I of the development. The Agency would welcome the opportunity to begin discussions on this matter.</p> <p>We consider that proposals for a signalised junction to access the future Science Park off the A30 appear to be the most feasible option. However, further work is required to agree specific scheme details and this will be undertaken as the development of the design is progressed.</p> <p>The Agency is pleased to see that the SPD recognises that only 26,000 sq m of development can be delivered at the Science Park before Phase III of the Access Strategy will need to be implemented. It is anticipated that Phase III will require the use of the existing overbridge, north of Junction 29, for all vehicles. We continue to be concerned that the detailed design, environmental assessment and feasibility studies for Phase III has not been completed and therefore any development at the Science Park in excess of 26,000 sq m would require a financial contribution from the developer.</p> <p><b>Phasing and Future Growth</b>  The Agency acknowledges that the entire Science Park could eventually accommodate 50-55,000 sq m of gross floorspace up until 2026. As previously identified, development in excess of 26,000 sq m would require</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Text amended following discussions with the Highways agency and Devon County Council.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>the implementation of Phase III of the Access Strategy. Therefore the Agency is unable to support any development in excess of this figure until Phase III of the Access Strategy has been agreed, with funding secured and works implemented. We would welcome the opportunity to work with the local planning and highway authorities to identify an appropriate solution for Phase III.</p> <p>Without any further information or evidence to support it, the Agency would object to the proposals to increase the boundaries of the site or quantum of development above 55,000 sq m as this would potentially have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the M5/A30. We are concerned that any capacity enhancements delivered as part of Phase III of the Access Strategy would be lost with increased development in this location, and would therefore welcome the opportunity to be involved in any discussions on extensions to the Science Park proposals as they currently stand.</p> <p><b>Requirements of a Planning Application</b> The Agency supports the provision of a masterplan for the site which will set a series of agreed parameters within which to guide development. We also support the scope of the Parameters Plan that has been outlined in paragraph 7.5 and would welcome the opportunity to comment on the suitability of the plan in due course. Furthermore, we would agree that the application and Parameters Plan should take account of the cumulative impact of development within the Area of Economic Activity and wider Exeter area, in order to ensure that development comes forward at the appropriate time and is supported by the necessary investment and infrastructure improvements to services, etc.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the need for the planning application to be supported by a robust Transport Assessment and Workplace Travel Plan as these are essential in accurately considering the impact of forthcoming developments in the area. The Agency would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the applicant the scope of these documents.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>References to need for TA and Workplace Travel Plans added.</p>
19	Alice Ordidge South West	South West of England, Regional Development Agency, Sterling House,			The South West RDA welcomes the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the University of Exeter Science Park. It is considered that the SPD will provide detailed guidance to help facilitate the	Comments noted.

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
	RDA	Dix's Field, Exeter, Devon. EX1 1QA			<p>delivery of the development.</p> <p>The challenges for Exeter in achieving it's economic potential are identified in 'Spatial Implications- Place Matters', an annex to the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). This identifies the requirement to deliver sustainable land and sites, including a science park, for the future development of Exeter. This will help to promote successful and competitive businesses in the region. As such, this SPD will help to deliver the RES.</p> <p>In addition, support for the Science Park is identified in, The Way Ahead document 'New Ideas for Sustainable Growth' which identifies the growth ambitions for Exeter, and includes the science park. The New Growth Points submission also specifically identifies that the ambitions for Exeter and East Devon include a Science Park with links to the University of Exeter and the Met Office.</p> <p>The Exeter Science Park is a regional investment priority for the South West RDA, as part of a strategy to create a network of science parks across the region. This network includes SPark, Bristol and the Tamar Science Park, Plymouth. £20m has been invested in land, infrastructure and partnership engagement to deliver this project (including establishing a science park company to manage the project).</p> <p>In addition to this, the infrastructure improvements will support the wider and comprehensive growth of Exeter (which includes the new community, Sky Park employment site, Intermodal Freight Terminal and the growth of the Airport). The South West RDA's investment will help to deliver strategic transport improvements (through use of Regional Infrastructure Fund) to unlock this growth. It is considered that this SPD will contribute to, and strengthen, this comprehensive approach to growth.</p> <p>Therefore, the South West RDA support the preparation and content of this SPD. It is hoped that future planning applications submitted for the Science Park development will be determined in accordance with this SPD.</p>	
20	David Lobban	Penrilla Consultants Ltd, Aldor, Rilla Mill,			In general we find the revised document to be clearer and more competent that the earlier drafts however we retain a number of concerns and where	

Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
	(On behalf of Eagle One Limited)	Callington Cornwall PL17 7NT			<p>appropriate we have cross referenced these to specific paragraph numbers.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b>  We are of the view that the issue of the south west quadrant of the site is unclear to the point of confusion. Figures 1.1 and 2.2 provide an overall impression that this area is excluded from the Science Park, this is reinforced by the statements made in paragraph 2.12 (see note below) however it is not until paragraph 3.37 that the consequence of the impact of the junction 30 road improvements on this quadrant and the parkland area. We remain of the view expressed in this paragraph that because of the road and the need for the Science Park to have a "show case" of some type this area provides, albeit limited, potential for a landmark building. The issue of the junction needs to be set out more clearly and integrated with both the landscape and development format sections.</p> <p>We question the statement in paragraph 2.12 that the southwest quadrant has a very strong locally distinctive parkland character when viewed from the M5. Whilst we do not contest the parkland nature of the landscape we believe that this view is limited from the M5, is a snapshot view and because of the complexity of the road at this point does not really register as any more than countryside.</p> <p>The text should make clear what factors have defined the site boundary as set out in paragraph 2.5</p> <p><b>Design</b>  The principle of low and zero carbon construction is supported however this will have cost implications that may have other impacts on design and materials, consequently there is a need to ensure that a balance is struck between economic viability and achieving the best in design standards. The references to particular forms of construction in paragraph 3.24 are too prescriptive as are the statements in 3.28 and 3.29 concerning height, density heating and cooling; these are matters best left to a Master Plan. In this context it is particularly noticeable that no reference is made to securing a vibrant core to the Science Park or a sense of place and as a consequence that matters that have been picked out for inclusion within</p>	<p>Comments noted, This area will not form part of the forthcoming planning application for the Science Park. Additional text added regarding access to the Science Park through this quadrant and it is noted the text that it is possible that in the future this area could be considered for sensitive development.</p> <p>Comment noted, text adjusted to clarify it is the trees on the ridge that are a visual marker from the M5.</p> <p>Comment noted and text added to clarify the basis for defining the site boundaries</p> <p>Comments noted. Text adjusted to be less technically prescriptive while retaining objective of low/zero carbon.</p>

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>the SPD seem partial. With this last comment in mind we would suggest that if it is the role of the SPD to define the location of the centre then it should be more central.</p> <p><b>Land Use</b> The range of uses set out in section 4 and paragraph 4.3 in particular are supported and as a consequence the bold text following paragraph 4.18 should be adopted as the ruling land use policy for the site.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss these comments with you further should that appear useful.</p>	Support noted.
21	Mrs Sutton G	Lilacs, Blackhorse, Clyst Honiton, Exeter EX5 2AP		3.60	<p>I write concerning point 3.60 of the Draft SPD. I note that this point says that access to Pinhoe will still be available for residents of Sowton village and Blackhorse via what you refer to as Mosshayne Lane, (although it has never had a name plate). Our home Lilacs is the only property actually on the lane, which is already used as a rat run at present. Whilst we do not wish to lose our access to Pinhoe, there is no way that this lane, which is currently covered in mud, has large potholes at the sides, floods regularly and has grass growing up the middle would be suitable to cope with a larger throughput of traffic, particularly at the speeds currently used!</p> <p>I can only suggest that if that is your solution to the traffic in the area once the Science Park is built, then it is very badly thought out. Once again the people who are going to be most inconvenienced are the local residents, our quiet country area is being swamped as the city encroaches from the west, Cranbrook, the Rail Terminal and Skypark from the east.</p>	Text added to clarify suggested approach to Mosshayne Lane and other routes. Any road closure will be subject to a separate procedure and consultation as referred to in paragraph 3.61 of the draft SPD.
22	Mr Henry Gent	DF Gent (Partnership), Mosshayne Farm, Westclyst, Exeter. EX1 3TR	23	3.58	<p>..."As such, and to avoid the use of these routes as a rat run for commuters", <b>BLACKHORSE LANE AND THE SOUTHERN SECTION OF LANGATON LANE SHOULD BE CLOSED TO PRIVATE VEHICLES AS SOON AS THE DEVELOPMENT BEGINS.</b> (I agree on the closure point).</p>	Comment noted and further text clarifying this issue added.
				3.60	<p>Access to Pinhoe will be less of an issue with the development at a full range of facilities at Cranbrook. In any case the Monkerton Link Road is safer than Tithe Barn Lane (too narrow). Close Tithe Barn Lane as well, at the same time as Blackhorse Lane.</p>	Noted, text added reference this point.
23	Frazer Osment Partner, LDA Design,	King's Wharf, The Quay, Exeter. EX2 4AN			<p>As you may know we are preparing a masterplan for the Exeter and East Devon Growth Point Science Park. We have carried out some initial design work and have held a workshop with key stakeholders. This initial work has supported the general content of the Draft SPD and we therefore support the adoption of the document. However we do have some specific</p>	

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					comments, set out below, which we hope can be reflected in the final draft. The comments are numbered with reference to the paragraph numbers in the draft document.	
				3.6	The Standard of BREEAM Very Good is not actually very high. In order to achieve your sustainable development aspirations I suspect you will need to aim for BREEAM Excellent.	Agreed, BREEAM Excellent added.
				3.23	It may be better to call for building design to reflect the principles of sustainable development. This is a stronger driver of design than 'innovative and science-based activities' and will actively encourage the use of locally sourced (vernacular) materials called for elsewhere in the document.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.27	I'm not sure that this will necessarily be the range of building size. There may be a requirement for some smaller units to meet the needs of the local science-based activities. The key issue for the masterplan is to provide a coherent design strategy that is sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of unit sizes, whilst at the same time ensuring high standards of architectural and landscape design.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.29	The description of the development as a 'campus' style of development in which buildings are 'dispersed' is a bit simplistic. In developing the masterplan we are beginning to think that the best way to develop the masterplan and protect the landscape may be to cluster buildings in higher density groups at key points. This may mean that we can keep larger areas of open space between clusters. I think this possibility should be referred to, subject to meeting other landscape and visual criteria.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.30	This may contradict what you have said about BREEAM elsewhere.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.36	We understand the reasons why the parkland area has been omitted. However our own view is that the parkland concept could inform the design of the highways infrastructure - i.e. it could be a road through a parkland.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.42	We agree with the sensitivity of the Redhayes site. However we are concerned that the guidance proposing a single building of not more than 1500m <sup>2</sup> may be too blunt. We agree entirely with the need to retain the woodland as a key characteristic of the ridge but feel this could be done in a variety of ways, for example through a cluster of smaller buildings and courts within the trees. Some elements of some buildings could be higher than three storey. The key need is to ensure a design that responds positively to the landscape and visual sensitivities of the ridge.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.43	Is it possible to define what is meant by the ridge. If this statement means the whole ridge then it is possible too restrictive. We agree that development on the ridge should be handled very sensitively and probably	Noted and text adjusted.



<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					limited. However we do think there is a possibility of a cluster of development around Sunnymead and possibly another cluster closer to the motorway. Allowing for a few denser clusters of development may give us the opportunity to create larger expanses of more open landscape elsewhere.	
				3.44	Phase 1 is likely to consist of more than 3000m <sup>2</sup> . This figure refers to just the Science Park Building. This points also refers to Figure 3.4 which should also possibly be referred to as 'Possible Direction of Phase Growth'.	Noted and text adjusted to clarify extent of different phases.
				3.47	Whilst at this stage I don't disagree with this, it is possible that the masterplan will propose an alternative pattern of site development. These paragraphs may, therefore, need to be caveated.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.49	It would be useful if 'Structural Landscape' could be defined. It would be helpful if the specific groups of trees and landscape included by this term could be referenced.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.56	I am not sure that the description of the access and J29 improvements are right.	Text clarified
				3.78	Some of the descriptions of the Highways infrastructure seems overly specific and may not give the right solution. The description of kerbs seems particularly prescriptive. We may want to propose more innovative highways design solutions. The key issue that should be stressed is the need to minimise cut and fill in any highways design.	Noted and text adjusted.
				3.79	This paragraph is also possibly too prescriptive. Clearly a unified and coherent approach is essential but this can be achieved in a variety of ways.	Noted and text adjusted.
					Figure 3.5 It would have been good to see some inspiration drawn from the landscape of the site.	Noted, no change proposed.
				3.89	This should not be taken to mean that roads should be build on this alignment as well. The key issue here is to maximise passive design opportunities. This does not mean all buildings need to be at this alignment.	Noted and text adjusted.
				6.6	Whilst I agree that 2-3 storey buildings are appropriate, we need to be careful that this does not lead to a bland development. Roofscape form, colour and texture are important aspects of the scheme. This should be referred to.	Noted and text adjusted.
24	Cllr Paul Diviani	Otter View, London Road, Yarcombe, Honiton, Devon EX14 9ND	15	3.29 & 3.30	Relating to cooling, I found it to be conflicting and confusing - "to minimise the cooling effects of prevailing winds" and "mechanical plant... avoid it for cooling". I'm sure you mean that Climate Change is going to require as much cooling as heating and our building design should reflect that. You will probably have seen the articles on passive cooling systems/building	Noted and text adjusted. (paragraphs 3.32 and 3.33 in the revised SPD)

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					design by the Carbon Trust and CLEAR but I mention en passant as examples of what we should be aiming at.	
			20	3.42	The Redhayes House replacement building of quality to complement the landscape. I'm not sure where the figure of 1500m2 comes from - my single story bungalow is 267m2 X 3 floors which would indicate a building of twice the size... to say nothing of page 40 7.5 "below ground excavations and basements". Iconic buildings are likely to be larger if only not to be a folly in the park!	Reference to floorspace footprint (not total floor area) removed. NB note that 1500m <sup>2</sup> is c.15,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .
			36		It may be in the later detail, but a 3 phase electrical supply will be needed. Heathpark in Honiton suffers from under capacity so I'd watch "can be supplied without capacity constraints" enshrined in 5.11 on Page 37.	Noted. The section on electrical supply has been amended in accordance with Western Power Distribution advice.
			37		I do hope we can encourage SWW to be green. Are we stipulating waste-to-heat and/or anaerobic digestion?  As a general comment, we will be creating an attractive place for people to work and visit. There is no mention of public access apart from street furniture along the A to B routes. My assumption is that people in general may wish to access the parkland and we should be aware of the management aspects of that access (we mention litter bins but not dog bins?).	Proposals for waste water treatment are already programmed by SWW and the SPD is unable to influence those.  Agreed, text added to clarify this. New paragraph 3.71 added about public access.
25	Mr Tony Parsons	64, Haymans Close, Cullompton EX15 1EH			Does the Government have sufficient funds to develop this site? The project will consume vast amounts of taxpayers money and after construction will be run on Government grants. I know it seems that progress needs more technology but present day technology is making people redundant. Less intelligent people are finding it hard to make ends meet whereas the intelligent with computer skills earn good money. The horse was made redundant by the tractor and now we are suffering from the price of fuel. I am not pleased with the way planning authorities allow every vacant piece of land to be built on. The towns are becoming like cancerous sores on the face of the earth and the little oases where nature can rest are fast disappearing. When new developments are proposed, even industrial ones, it should be remembered that nature is part of our well being and needs to be protected. Land is expensive but space must be left for relaxation and the movement of nature.	Comments noted. The site has now been acquired for development with public funding. A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Exeter and East Devon New Growth Point is being prepared to ensure development enhances the living environment and supports improved biodiversity.

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
26	Steve Melligan MA MRTPI	Planning & Development Manager Property Investment Department Church Commissioners for England Church House Great Smith Street London SW1P 3AZ			The Church Commissioners have only one comment, in relation to Figure 1.1. To fully reflect the commitments in your Local Plan and the Structure Plan, and to provide an accurate representation of the situation, please could you amend Figure 1.1 by adding the 'phase 2' part of the proposed intermodal freight terminal site i.e. colour in pink the land immediately east of the land denoted at present.	This change has been made.
27	Amanda Newsome Conservation Officer - East Devon Natural England	Cornwall, Devon & Isles of Scilly Team Renslade House, Bonhay Road Exeter EX4 3AW			We are broadly supportive of the approach taken and the desire to create a sustainable development which is sensitive to landscape and biodiversity.  One general concern we have is the omission of any reference to the emerging GI strategy. It would be helpful if this could be embedded in the development principles now, even in a generic sense (as in "you must refer to/incorporate the requirements of the GI strategy within the development") rather than having to argue over it at a later stage.  Our more specific comments relating to the document are:	Reference to GI (Green Infrastructure) strategy added.
				2.2.7	None of the biodiversity policies are listed here. For example EN9 Wildlife habitats and corridors and EN10 Protected Species.	References added to policies in the adopted plan (those quoted are from the Revised Deposit Version and EN 10 was deleted.)
				3.7	<b>Development Design</b> We support the requirement for a construction Environmental Management Plan.	Noted
				3.2.7 and 3.42	The scale of building height will be critical to its impact on the landscape of this area given the prominent location of much of the site. We would hope that along the ridgeline the scale and mass would be such that it would not exceed the height of the tree line, to avoid an eyesore such as has been created at the new Exeter Rugby stadium! E.g. we would suggest 2 storeys rather than at Redhayes House. We strongly support the statements in 3.43 to this effect.	Comments noted; references to building heights removed and reference to possibility of sensitive development within trees on the ridge included.
				3.28	<b>Lighting</b> - this should be designed to minimise the impact on ambient light	Noted. Text added to

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					levels around what is currently an undeveloped area, regardless of the constraints imposed by the proximity to the airport.	clarify the context of the reference to lighting in this paragraph.
				3.31 and 3.32	Given the move towards increased carbon neutrality would it not be reasonable to insist that the 'Science Park Centre' at least to incorporate a wood fuel fired boiler for all heating and hot water (a perfect working demonstration of this as well as sustainable and vernacular design is right on the doorstep in the form of CDE office at Bicton Arena, who are also a local supplier of woodchip).	This requirement would be too prescriptive. The objective of BREEAM Excellent (the text has been amended to refer to this) will ensure that building design and operation must include appropriate technologies.
				3.37	We would not wish to see the remaining parkland in the SW quadrant developed given the loss of priority BAP habitat that will already have been lost through the Junction improvements and support the current SPD approach to retain the parkland. However in line with the statement on para 2.21 regarding opportunities to enhance biodiversity we would hope to see additional parkland planting within the science park area to replace and extend the existing habitat and provide continuity of mature trees in that area as proposed in 3.3.8.	Comment noted.
				Fig 3.3	Site opportunities: there is no reference in the document to the emerging Green Infrastructure strategy and the need to implement any elements of this which relate to the Science Park area. This map is an ideal opportunity to establish the desire/requirement to deliver these. For example the M5 overbridge was mentioned in the GI workshop as one of the only potential locations for a green bridge linking the remaining green space on the west side of the M5 to the wider countryside of East Devon. We would really like to see this principle adopted in the SPD, thus facilitating some developer contribution to its realisation.	GI strategy reference added. The SPD is not able to set out proposal for the M5 overbridge – that should be addressed through the Phase III Access Strategy or other Devon CC policy.
				3.49	Suggests that vegetation is assessed for "biodiversity value and visual amenity" but then fails to retain the biodiversity thread through to the retention stage, requiring retention only if of "significant landscape value". This is inconsistent and should include biodiversity value as well - whether that is a feature in its own right or acting as a corridor/stepping stone for species moving through the landscape.	Text amended to reflect comment.
				3.50	Continues to only refer to landscape and should include biodiversity and	Text amended

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					the intention to restore/reinforce existing features and create new ones in line with the aspiration in 2.21 (and PPS9) to enhance and not just minimise the impact of the development.	
				3.51 and 3.53	Support but add the words 'locally typical' alongside native to prevent atypical but still 'native' species being used.	Text amended
				3.85-3.88	<b>Lighting</b> - as previously mentioned under 3.28 lighting should be low level and directional to avoid light pollution.	Noted, text added to further confirm these requirements.
				3.89	<b>Development briefing summary</b> Bullet nos 2-4 Whilst solar gain is desirable at some times of the year provision also needs to be made for cooling in summer (again I refer you to the new CDE estate office at Bicton Arena which incorporates a roof venting system to allow cooling). It will be possible to design buildings to capitalise on low incidence solar gain in the Autumn-Spring period whilst shielding them from summers sun with awning type structures. Perhaps this should be made explicit to avoid the problems of overheating which have occurred in a number of Exeter's newly built schools?	Noted, text amended
28	R Maynard	Devon County Council Environment, Economy & Culture Strategic Plans County Hall Topsham Road Exeter EX2 4QW			<b>Overview – Science Park</b> Support the principle of developing the Science Park at Redhayes,	Support noted.
					<b>Overview – Masterplan</b> Support the need for a Master Plan to be prepared for the whole site prior to the commencement of development. Devon County Council request that DCC officers are engaged in identifying the travel and transportation, planning and other information that needs to be taken into account in preparing the Master Plan.	Support noted
					<b>Overview – Highway Improvements</b> Request that the phasing and layout for the proposed highway improvements scheme approved by Devon County Council Executive Committee on the 18 December 2007 (Report EEC/07/361/HQ Minute *691 attached as Appendix 1) as part of the East of Exeter Transport Package be reflected in the proposal for the development of the Science Park (see more detailed in Item 13 below).	Additional text added clarifying this.
				2.11	<b>Noise</b> The location and landform of the Science Park site, adjacent to the M5 Motorway, the A30 Dual Carriageway and close to flight path of	Noted, no change proposed

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					commercial jets and light aircraft landing at Exeter airport, results in a noise and visual impact to the site. The SPD should set out the requirements to mitigate the noise and visual impact on the site through landscaping, building design and other initiatives.	
				2.25	<b>Archaeology</b> Support the need to evaluate the archaeology within the site at the EIA stage, and Devon County Council to be involved in this process.	Support noted
			Chap 3		<b>Minerals</b> The site is partly underlain by the Dawlish Sandstone Formation, which provides a local source of building sand in the Exeter area at Bishops Court Quarry. It would be prudent for that part of Chapter 3 of the SPD dealing with 'Sustainable Design and Operation' to include reference to the potential for prior extraction of sand from the site in order to provide for the construction needs of the development in a sustainable manner. Such extraction may also have positive implications for the ground modelling of the site.	Text added to address this point.
				3.1 - 3.2	<b>Zero Carbon Strategy</b> The Science Park's sustainability commitments will need to accord with the East of Exeter Zero Carbon Energy Strategy	The draft SPD states this.
				3.3 - 3.6	<b>BREEAM Standards</b> Regarding BREEAM standards - as a an exemplar high technology development the development should be aiming for the highest standards at the time the buildings are constructed so that the site is appropriate for an exemplar 'zero carbon' sustainable development and not just a minimum of BREEAM Very Good as is presently proposed. Achievement of the highest possible standards is likely to be one of the project's Unique Selling Points. A minimum of BREEAM Excellent should be achieved in all buildings on the Science Park (or equivalent standard of the emerging Code for Non-Domestic Sustainable Buildings), and along with the other sustainability targets, it should be reviewed at the end of each development phase.	Agreed, BREEAM Excellent now proposed.
				3.8 and 3.10	<b>Minerals and Site Waste Management</b> The references in paragraph 3.8 to a net balance of excavation materials and in paragraph 3.10 to the sorting of construction waste are welcomed. It would be helpful to include a reference in paragraph 3.10 to the need for a 'site waste management plan' or 'waste audit statement' that outlines the waste that will be produced and the measures for its management.	Noted, text added.
				3.9	<b>Recycled products</b>	Text added.

Rep No.	Name/ Company	Address	Page No.	Para No.	Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD	Response
					The reference in paragraph 3.9 to the use of recycled products is endorsed, but the inclusion of a minimum proportion of such materials would strengthen this commitment.	
				3.11 - 3.18	<p><b>Transport</b></p> <p>The transport section of the SPD (especially Pg 13 and para 5.3 – 5.7) is potentially confusing, and needs to reflect the balance between the nature of Science Park developments and the needs of sustainable travel. Given the proximity of the Science Park (UESP) to Cranbrook and other major residential locations (both existing and planned), a clearer recognition of the need for a closer alignment between housing , employment and service provision is needed</p>	Text added to emphasis need to coordinate with travel plans of other new development east of Exeter.
				3.11 – 3.18 and 6.1 – 6.5	<p><b>Transport and Phasing</b></p> <p>The access and phasing arrangements in the draft SPD needs to more accurately reflect the East of Exeter Major Scheme bid for Phase 1 and 2 Transport infrastructure proposals to support the east of Exeter developments.</p> <p>The Development Rationale (Section 3) the Infrastructure (Section 4) and the Phasing (Section 6) sections should be amended to reflect the Transport Infrastructure constraints on the development of the Science Park that implies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the Science Park cannot be started in advance of completion of the Clyst Honiton Bypass - due to access constraints likely to be imposed by the Highway Agency.</li> <li>• The First Phase of Science Park development (about 2010) is dependent on the completion of <i>Phase 1 of the transport infrastructure proposals</i> that include the Clyst Honiton Bypass this will provide the opportunity to <u>develop the equivalent of up to 12,000 sq m gross floor space</u>, (i.e. the traffic generation equivalent to 500 dwellings at Cranbrook) this figure would have to be confirmed through a Transport Assessment and by building a temporary access using an access to the Blackhorse Slip road. The ambitions relating to the development of a hotel and/or a park and ride site (size to be determined) within or adjoining the Science Park site are unclear in terms of phasing, location and potential access needs.</li> <li>• Potential Second Phase of the Science Park (about 2012) - is dependant on the completion of <i>Phase 2 of the transportation infrastructure proposals</i> that includes improvements to the M5 Junctions 29 and 30, bus priority measures and a new access road to the A30 providing capacity for a <u>further 14,000 sq m gross floor space</u></li> </ul>	Text added detailing the strategy

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					to proceed. Again a Transport Assessment would need to be undertaken to confirm this figure. (The first two phases represents about half the planned floor space for the Science Park) Potential Final Phase of the Science Park - is dependant on the completion of <i>Phase 3 of the transport infrastructure improvement</i> , which are due to be worked up in the near future, and is intended to provide a new access to the Growth Point Area (route of which is yet to be determined). The completion of these improvements could allow the remaining <u>24,000 - 29,000 sq m gross floor space</u> to be developed	
				3.12	<b>Travel Planning</b> Rather than just one travel plan there should be a framework approach to travel planning. There should be an: a) overarching travel plan for the Science Park as well as b) each individual employer producing their own travel plan that accords and develops the overarching one, and substantiated with personalised travel planning to all new employees (see also comments in para 3.62 – 3.64 regarding need for ambitious modal split)	Text added accordingly.
				3.15- 3.16	<b>Links to new railway station</b> The SPD should include mention of potential linkages to Pinhoe station and the <i>new rail station</i> and to future-proofing for the High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) link	Text added to emphasise the need for these linkages.
				3.23 – 3.26	<b>Gateway recognition</b> The location of the Science Park represents an effective “gateway” to much of Devon and Cornwall. It is suggested that developers should consider the provision of an identifiable feature, such as an iconic building, bridge or statute, or which is unique to Exeter (Science Park). The designs of the buildings need to respect its position in the landscape with buildings of appropriate height and scale and the use of appropriate construction materials (buildings can be modern in style, but often incorporating local materials such as stone/wood/cob etc. where appropriate)	Noted, text added to address these points.
				3.24 – 3.28	<b>Design</b> It is essential that the design of the Science Park is informed by and informs the design of other strategic developments to the East of Exeter. The SPD is unclear regarding the balance between the delivery of a modern, IT-enabled, gateway development that matches the needs of 21 <sup>st</sup> Century knowledge-based businesses, and the provision of buildings that match the local vernacular and use “traditional, natural materials” laid out	Noted, text added and amended to address this point.



<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>in a “simple, traditional manner”. This lack of clear guidance must be addressed with the SPD providing clear overarching design principles. Statements such as “buildings will not exceed 3 storeys” are thus unhelpful.</p> <p>Further consideration needs to be given to a design rationale for the Science Park that focuses on low-rise buildings, and whether this sufficiently accords with PPS3/PPS1 objectives to compact, mixed-use development and the most efficient use of land.</p> <p>The potential for a consultative approach to master planning (e.g. Enquiry by Design) should be addressed in the SPD.</p>	
				3.24	<p><b>Embedded Renewables and design sustainability</b> Greater consideration needs to be given to the potential for building embedded renewables and ensuring the design of UESP supports sustainability (e.g. green roofs, solar orientation, flexible design)</p>	Noted, potentially too prescriptive, no change proposed.
				3.32	<p><b>Energy Hierarchy</b> The SPD needs to reflect the energy hierarchy - reduce energy consumption, then increase energy efficiency and then meet the remainder of the demand from zero carbon/renewable energy sources</p>	Text added
				3.33	<p><b>Waste Audit Statement</b> The intention in paragraph 3.33 to facilitate waste recycling and re-use is also welcomed, but would again benefit from being included in a waste audit statement dealing with the operational phase of the development.</p>	Text added
				3.36	<p><b>Parkland area</b> The exclusion of the “parkland area” from the site identified as the Science Park needs to be more clearly justified in terms of the overall design concept – given that there is potential for the Science Park to embrace this area as an integral part of its overall design and management.</p>	Noted, no change proposed.
				3.40 – 3.43	<p><b>Ridgeland / Landmark Building</b> Any proposal to develop the ridgeline with a landmark building on the Redhayes site has to be clearly and carefully assessed against the overall impact of the proposal on the wider landscape and its local environment. Opportunities to use the ridgeline as a multifunctional green infrastructure resource should be considered, providing a green infrastructure link between the developments to the east of Exeter across the M5 and into the city of Exeter. The potential for such resource to provide an appropriate backdrop and context for the buildings developed on the Science Park should be assessed.</p>	Noted, and text added to recognise this opportunity.
				3.44	<p><b>Phasing</b></p>	Agreed; text amended to

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
				– 3.52	The SPD needs to more clearly articulate a 'phasing strategy' and the 'key outcomes' that such a phasing strategy seeks to achieve. For example, the "moving focus" of the Science Park Centre will be particularly challenging in infrastructure and master planning terms.	make clearer the phasing proposals
				3.57	<b>Manual for Streets</b> The SPD could usefully emphasise the need for the Science Park to be designed in accordance with the principles of the DfT's Manual for Streets (e.g. connectivity, permeability, legibility, reduced signage and street clutter)	Noted; reference added to the DfT Manual for Streets
				3.62	<b>Park and Ride Provision</b> The SPD needs to give <i>greater certainty about the relationship to future park and ride provision</i> and guidance on a preferred location for a park and ride site at or adjacent to the Science Park.	Noted, no change proposed as it not a matter for this SPD .
				3.62 - 3.64	<b>Modal Split requirements</b> There will need to be an <i>ambitious modal split target, a clear car parking strategy, excellent public transport services from the commencement of development, attractive pedestrian/cycle routes and cycle parking in all buildings</i> . In addition, buildings should provide facilities that encourage walking/cycling (e.g. showers). The overall layout of the Science Park should reflect the hierarchy of modes and the need to reduce the need to travel.	Noted, text added to give added emphasis to modal split target and role of car parking provision.
					<b>Funding Sub regional impact</b> The SPD should state the importance of the Science Park helping to <i>fund wider sub-regional transport improvements</i> to mitigate its impact and deliver the overarching Sub-Regional transport objectives	Noted, no change proposed
				3.37 – 3.39	<b>Historic Parkland</b> Welcome the intention to protect the historic parkland	Noted
				Para 3.51	<b>Landscape/ Green Infrastructure</b> The SPD should mention the need for the design of the Science Park to integrate with the wider Green Infrastructure Strategy for the east of Exeter.	Reference added to GI Strategy
				3.55, 4.3 and 6.2	<b>Crèche / Day Nursery</b> The SPD needs to clarify what is proposed in terms of child care. There are significant differences between 'crèche' and 'day nursery' facilities.	Noted, no change proposed.
				3.58	<b>Closing of Blackhorse Lane and Langaton Lane</b> Greater consideration needs to be given to the timing of closing	Noted, text added to clarify

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					Blackhorse Lane and the southern section of Langaton Lane to private vehicles during Phase 1	
				3.78	<b>Public Transport infrastructure</b> SPD should encompass the need for an <i>innovative and ambitious approach to public transport</i> (e.g. real time information at bus stops and on services, attractive waiting facilities, smartcard infrastructure and ticketing on buses etc.) that accords with a long-term transport strategy for the sub-region (e.g. dedicated HQPT link between Cranbrook and Exeter)	Noted, no change proposed, this should be addressed through other documents
				3.85-3.88	<b>Lighting</b> The SPD should set challenging aims regarding light pollution and the environmental impact of lighting (e.g. dimming at night, zero upward transmission, motion-activated lighting).	Noted, text added to provide greater emphasis to lighting matters, including need for a Lighting Strategy.
				3.89	<b>Need to set targets for SPD</b> The SPD needs to enshrine the principle of challenging targets being set for the UESP regarding waste minimisation, recycling, construction, water minimisation, energy, training and employment opportunities.	Noted, no change proposed
				3.89	<b>Passive heating and cooling</b> This section should mention the need for designs to take account of “passive heating and cooling”, green infrastructure ,flexibility	References to passive heating and cooling added.
					<b>Training</b> SPD should mention the Science Park’s potential to provide training opportunities for construction workers, local residents and school-leavers	Noted, no change proposed.
				4.3	<b>Other facilities / Hotel</b> The range of ancillary facilities for networking, conferences and training facilities, café/restaurants to accommodate the specific requirements of the science park would appear to be appropriate. If a hotel is to be provided as part of the Science Park proposal, the SPD should clarify when such a proposal should be phased into the development and the requirements for its provision.	Comments noted, text amended to provide more detail on delivery of the hotel component.
				4.13	<b>Science Park Criteria</b> Some of the criteria for Science Park uses (e.g. “any science related uses”) could potentially detract from the type of uses appropriate. Whilst not advocating an overly prescriptive approach it is nevertheless important that uses at UESP are clearly defined and distinct from the employment offer of Skypark , Exeter City Centre and other employment areas.	Noted. It is considered that the criteria defined for determining the acceptability of uses at the site provide the necessary control without over-prescription
				Section 4	<b>Requirements of a Planning Application</b> Among those items already suggested, the outline application could also	Noted, text amended.

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Objecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					<p>usefully be accompanied by:</p> <p>a) A robust Phasing Strategy (RSS Policy F),</p> <p>b) A Transport Assessment,</p> <p>c) A Design Strategy/Guide,</p> <p>d) A detailed Sustainability Assessment (RSS Policy G) which includes an effective Health Impact Assessment (RSS Policy HE3).</p> <p>f) A Construction Environmental Management Plan and</p> <p>g) A Site Waste Management Plan</p>	
				5.3 – 5.7	<p><b>Infrastructure for pedestrians, cyclist and public transport</b></p> <p>The section on infrastructure (Chapter 5) could more fully consider the infrastructure needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport as well as private road transport.</p>	Noted, text modified.
				5.24	<p><b>Telephones/ Data Connections / ICT</b></p> <p>The SPD should require the most modern and flexible ICT infrastructure at development commencement to achieve a competitive edge and one of its Unique Selling Points. The highest bandwidth communications infrastructure and the latest ICT infrastructure should be provided on site and installed into every new building by the developer.</p>	Noted, text adjusted.
				5.26	<p><b>Gas</b></p> <p>It is important that the likely gas supply needs of the Science Park are understood at the outset of development and design.</p>	Noted, no change proposed
				6.5	<p><b>Future Options for Growth</b></p> <p>In view of the potential development pressures and competing demands for transport improvements such as a dedicated high quality public transport route, park and ride provision, green infrastructure and other uses of land in this area, the science park concept, and its design, needs to be set in the context of a longer term overarching framework for the wider development of the whole of the eastern Exeter / western East Devon area. The constraints and opportunities for longer term development will need to be clearly identified through the LDF / East Devon Area Action Plan to clarify the best options for future proofing the longer term development of the Science Park beyond 2026.</p>	Noted, no change proposed
					<p><b>Air Quality</b></p> <p>Air quality problems identified in Exeter are due to road traffic levels and congestion within the city.</p> <p>The importance of measures to minimise travel and the use of the car in addressing air quality issues should be more clearly identified in the SPD and the science park design concept</p>	Noted, references added to need to minimise adverse effects on air quality.

<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/ Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Comments for Support/Obiecting to University of Exeter Draft SPD</b>	<b>Response</b>
					The South West Regional Assembly acknowledged receipt of a copy of the draft SPD but did not submit any comments.	