
Cranbrook Plan 2013-2031 Examination

Stage 2 Questions AQ17 - AQ19

Devon County Council Position Statement

Statement Prepared 29th September 2020

Devon County Council
County Hall
Topsham Road
Exeter
Devon
EX2 4QD



1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of this statement

- 1.1.1 This statement has been prepared to answer additional questions posed by the Planning Inspector in relation to Stage 2 of the Independent Examination of the Cranbrook Plan 2013-2031.
- 1.1.2 The comments set out in this further statement focus upon those issues in which Devon County Council (DCC) has a specific interest in order to fulfil its statutory responsibilities in terms of planning and infrastructure (in particular as the Local Highway Authority).

1.2. Summary of DCC approach and position

- 1.2.1. The County Council has worked closely with East Devon District Council throughout the preparation of the Cranbrook Plan including providing advice to inform the development of policies and proposals. This has included the attendance of numerous meetings, the preparation of evidence reports and the submission of representations at formal stages in the plan making process. This approach has drawn on the expertise of a number of county officers from various service areas including education, transportation, flood risk, waste management, adult, children's, youth and library.

2. AQ17: Are there any comments or views to take into account from the clarity provided in table 3.10 relating to Section 278 costs relating to highway improvements relating to London Road?

- 2.1.1. DCC understands that East Devon District Council has provided these Section 278 costs relating highway improvements on London Road in discussion with their consultants, Ward Williams. There has been no input from DCC into these costs. These highway improvement works would be undertaken by the developers in accordance with a Section 278 agreement, which is a legal agreement between the developers and DCC (as Local Highway Authority) allowing developers to make permanent alterations to a public highway as part of a planning approval as permitted under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. DCC needs to ensure the highways work is completed to the required standard but does not need to be involved in the associated costings.

3. AQ18: Is the revised position of Devon County Council in relation to sustainable transport contributions justified in the light of the available evidence? If it is not, what evidence do you rely on to support your comments?

- 3.1.1. As indicated by the question, DCC has provided a revised request for public transport S106 contributions from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas, dated 14 July 2020 (PSD26). This statement was provided because, during Stage 1 of the Cranbrook Plan Examination, a number of parties asked DCC to reconsider its request for S106 contributions relating to public transport arising from the expansion areas.

- 4. AQ19: The revised amount requested from DCC is lower than that now included in the revised IDP of £7,363,000. The Council is requested to clarify why there is a variance from the £6,378,000 in the DCC document)?**
- 4.1.1. DCC can confirm that its revised request for public transport S106 contributions from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas is for the total amount of £6,378,000 as of June 2020. This amount is shown as the Updated CEA cost for this item (number 18) in Appendix 2 of the revised IDP July 2020 (PSD24, pdf page 40) and in all other related listings. DCC understands that the figure of £7,363,000 shown for Sustainable Transport Provision in the Cranbrook Plan DPD Updated Viability Appendices (PSD21b, pdf page 108) includes other sustainable transport infrastructure costs relating to car club vehicles and/or e-bike docking stations (£300,000), travel planning (£285,000) and electric vehicle charging (£400,000 – which has not been requested by DCC).