

Filtered Data Export

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 1. Introduction

**1. To which part of the Introduction chapter does your representation relate?:** Paragraph

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** 1.1

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Introduction chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Introduction chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.:** 3.1

A new National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2024. However, it included provisions, within Annex 1, to enable draft Plans to continue preparation and examination, as part of the Transitional Arrangements, in accordance with the previous December 2023 version of the NPPF.

3.2

The Transitional Arrangements are set out at NPPF Paragraph 234, which identifies that for the purposes of preparing local plans, the policies in the current version of the Framework will apply from 12th March 2025.

3.3

This is the case except where the plan has reached Regulation 19 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12th March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need (refer to NPPF Paragraph 234(a)). In which case, the plan will be examined under relevant previous version of the Framework.

3.4

It is understood that East Devon District Council consider that the plan has reached Regulation 19 stage and therefore should be examined against the previous version of the Framework and that the Transitional Arrangements to examine it in accordance with the December 2023 NPPF engaged.

3.5

Greenhayes consider that the plan has “not reached Regulation 19 stage” in consideration of the meaning given at Footnote 82 and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

3.6

NPPF Footnote 82 explains that in this context “reached Regulation 19” refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with. Regulation 19 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 states, in full, that:

‘Before submitting a local plan to the Secretary of State under Section 20 of the Act, the local planning authority must:

(a)

Make a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available in accordance with Regulation 35;

(b)

Ensure that a statement of the representations procedure and a statement of the fact that the proposed submission documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected is sent to each of the general consultation bodies and each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make representations under Regulation 18(1)’.

3.7

Regulation 17 sets out the application and interpretation of Part 6 (which includes Regulation 19). This sets a definition for “proposed submission documents” and this extends to (e) “such supporting documents as in the opinion of the local planning authority are relevant to the preparation of the local plan”. i.e. the full local plan supporting evidence base.

3.8

In this instance, the full evidence base has not yet been published as beyond the 12th March 2025. Within the evidence base published on the Council website, various references are made to missing documentation:

- 

HOU-015 “Additional document to follow consultation”

- 

CCF-001 Water Cycle Study “to follow”

- 

HCO-004 Playing Pitch Strategy “to follow soon”

- 

HCO-005 Open Space Strategy “potential study that may be produced”

- 

HRD-004 East Devon Heritage Strategy (2024-2042) “to follow consultation”

3.9

Clearly, the Council consider these missing documents to be entirely relevant to the preparation of the plan, being listed on the Council’s own published evidence and examination library.

3.10

Additionally, Policies WS01 and WS02 acknowledge that critical evidence base documents such as an Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Second New Community and a viability assessment have not yet been commissioned. This is a serious failing.

### 3.11

Furthermore, various evidence base documents were published following the start of the consultation, meaning that the full six-week period was not available to representors with the benefit of the full local plan and comprehensive evidence base. A request was made in writing by Greenhayes for an extension to the consultation in order to ensure the full six-week period was available to representors, however this was declined. This in itself is contrary to the Regulations. Please refer to evidence attached at Appendix 1.

### 3.12

The Plan itself (ref Page 5) recognises that this consultation represents the first planned phase of Regulation 19 consultation with second phases planned to run from Spring 2025 to early summer. It is also acknowledged that “the plan in current draft form covers all local plan matters with the exception of full policy details on the new community proposals”.

### 3.13

It is also stated that “Evidence work, as at early 2025, is ongoing in respect of the new community as well as on other inter-related local plan matters. Once this evidence work is completed, and policy gaps in the plan can be filled in, and further policy refinement undertaken, the second phase of consultation will take place”.

### 3.14

The Plan consultation does not fully accord with Regulation 19 at the time of writing and certainly not by 12th March 2025. In accordance with NPPF Paragraph 234, the plan should therefore be examined under the policies of the current version of the Framework.

### 3.15

Plainly, under normal circumstances, the plan would not have proceeded to Regulation 19 in its current premature and incomplete state and has only been published merely to seek to comply with the Transitional Arrangements set out at NPPF Paragraph 234. This is completely contrived position which wholly disregards the policy and procedural requirement to plan positively.

### 3.16

Moving forward, the Plan should be examined in accordance with the December 2024 NPPF and meet its full housing requirement, having regard to the up-to-date Standard Methodology.

### 3.17

Of particular relevance for this Regulation 19 consultation are the Tests of Soundness, set out at NPPF Paragraph 36, namely, whether the plan is:

(a)

Positively prepared;

(b)

Justified;

(c)

Effective; and

(d)

Consistent with national policy.

3.18

It is Greenhayes position that there is much to be applauded within the Local Plan as currently drafted. However, it plainly does not go far enough to meet the full objectively assessed needs and development requirements of the District in a sound manner.

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 1. Introduction

**1. To which part of the Introduction chapter does your representation relate?:** Figure/Image

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** Policies Map

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Introduction chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Introduction chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** 2.1

The Greenhayes promotion site is defined by the site location plan at Appendix 1. As set out above, it is within the control of two landowners and there are no barriers to delivery, in contrast to the negative landowner assessment set out in the Sustainability Appraisal.

2.2

The majority of the Greenhayes land control was previously given HELAA reference GH/ED/64 and this mostly covers the land south of the A3052 Sidmouth Road between Crealy and Greendale Business Park, incorporating the current Farm Shop site.

2.3

The Greenhayes land control also incorporates: two fields adjacent to the Sidmouth Road between the Farm Shop site and the access to the Business Park (forming part of ref GH/ED/63); and a single field to the north of the Sidmouth Road (ref GH/ED/62).

2.4

Subsequently, the Greenhayes land control was consolidated into a single HELAA reference Farr\_03 shown overleaf below.

2.5

The majority of the land control at Greenhayes was incorporated into Option 2 shown below which was assessed in the CBRE October 2022 report East Devon: Options for a Potential New Settlement (ref GEV003).

2.6

In response to the Regulation 18 consultation, Greendale Group and Crealy Farms submitted representations in January 2023 which principally set out the shortcomings of the CBRE October 2022 report.

GREENDALE GROUP AND CREALY FARMS MARCH 2025 | PAGE 7

2.7

With reference to the published policies maps, including the inset maps produced, it is our understanding that Option 1 identified in the CBRE report has been identified by the Council as being an appropriate area of land for a Second New Community to be allocated under Policy WS01. The location of Option 1 is shown in yellow to the north of the Sidmouth Road on the inset policy map below. It is understood that an extension of the Clyst Valley Regional Park (CVRP) is proposed to expand to the south of the Second New Community under Policy WS09.

## 2.8

Furthermore, it is also understood that the Greenhayes land control is broadly inset between the proposed Second New Community (WS01) and extension of the CVRP (WS09) within so-called “white land”.

## 2.9

The proposed extension of the CVRP appears to broadly accord with the Greenhayes masterplan submitted to the Regulation 18 consultation. This masterplan is provided at Appendix 2. The overlay provided below demonstrates that most of the proposed built form is located within “white land”. However, some conflicts between the Greenhayes masterplan and the CVRP are apparent in the following areas:

- 

Ref 6 – the proposed employment area in the east of the masterplan

- 

Ref 8 – the proposed lower density residential area adjacent to parkland (southern part)

- 

Ref 9 - the proposed park and ride facility to the west of Crealy (western part)

- 

Ref 20 – the proposed medium density residential area in the east of the masterplan

## 2.10

The CVRP has been incorporated on the land controlled by Greenhayes without consultation and, as currently set out, they object to the proposed designation of the CVRP over these areas. Greenhayes are supportive of a plan-led system and are open to engagement, but at this stage, it does raise a relevant concern about the deliverability of parcels in the absence of any meaningful engagement.

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 1. Introduction

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 1. Introduction

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP02

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** 5.1

NPPF Paragraph 36 sets out that local plans are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are 'sound' if they are:

a.

Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with having achieved sustainable development;

b.

Justified - an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;

c.

Effective - deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and

d.

Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

5.2

As set out earlier within this representation, the Plan has not fully met the Transitional Arrangements as set out in Annex 1 of the December 2024 NPPF and should be meeting its full housing requirement, having regard to the up-to-date Standard Methodology.

5.3

Unfortunately, as plan preparation has been accelerated to circumnavigate having to plan for a higher housing requirement, the plan currently only manages to incorporate a maximum of 80% of its needs numerically, albeit it is considered there is insufficient evidence (as recognised in

the Plan) to reasonably demonstrate whether the emerging strategic allocations will be deliverable.

#### 5.4

For example, the absence of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Second New Community to understand the extent and cost of necessary infrastructure is a major failing at this stage of the Plan. Evidently, the Plan has not been positively prepared and is therefore not consistent with national policy.

#### 5.5

Furthermore, the plan is not currently meeting the areas full affordable housing needs. Strategic Policy HN02 explains that bespoke viability work is required to define the exact affordable housing provision to be expected from the Second New Community through policy and that it will be defined through further Regulation 19 consultation to follow. Affordable housing delivery is an express component of Objectively Assessed Needs. How much affordable housing a Plan delivers should be informed by a Housing Needs Assessment, as set out at NPPF Paragraphs 61 and 62.

#### 5.6

As set out, under normal circumstances, the Plan would not have proceeded to Regulation 19 in its current premature and incomplete state and has evidently been published to seek to comply with the Transitional Arrangements. This is completely contrived position which wholly disregards the policy and procedural requirement to plan positively.

#### 5.7

Furthermore, the Plan as set out is not currently based upon proportionate evidence base. As explained, not all of the evidence base documents are yet published, with some very clearly not having been undertaken at the time of writing. Yet, the main components of the spatial strategy appear to have been decided upon. This is in clear conflict with national policy requirement to develop an appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence.

#### 5.8

There is currently little evidence to demonstrate that the Second New Community will realistically contribute to housing delivery within the plan period. Alongside the failure to objectively conclude how much affordable housing it will contribute, the Plan is also not effective in its current form. As set out in Section 4, the failure to assess the reasonable alternatives on a consistent basis, whilst not being legally compliant, also undermines the justification for the spatial strategy, as currently set out.

#### 5.9

The conclusions, in respect of matters of soundness, are broadly reached on the basis that the evidence base is currently not sufficiently advanced to support the spatial strategy set out. This will require a Plan to be prepared to meet its full needs and assessed in full, necessary, detail.

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 4. Development at the West End

**1. To which part of the Development at the West End chapter does your representation relate?:** Paragraph

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** 4.1

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development at the West End chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development at the West End chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** 6.1

These Representations have been prepared by Black Box Planning on behalf of Greenhayes, comprised of Greendale Group and Crealy Farms, in response to the Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) consultation for the East Devon Local Plan 2020-2042 which runs between Thursday 13th February and Monday 31st March 2025.

6.2

Greenhayes is a strategic promotion for a new, thriving community which seeks to utilise and build on existing assets locally, such as the Greendale Farm Shop complex which already offers a range of services and facilities, taking advantage of the strong connections to significant employment hubs in the locality and the proposed expansion of the Clyst Valley Regional Park.

6.3

Greenhayes is identified within the emerging Plan evidence base as a reasonable alternative considered as part of the proposed delivery of a Second New Community. Greenhayes is supportive of a new community in the West End of the District. However, the Plan will require several modifications if it is to be concluded as sound.

6.4

The proposal is the vision of two local farming families, the Carter family (FWS Carter & Sons Ltd) and the Down family (Crealy Farms) who have been working comprehensively for several years to promote a carefully designed and sustainable new community to integrate into the established employment sites at Greendale Business Park, Greendale Farm Shop and Crealy Theme Park and Resort. There is a cogent case to incorporate it within the emerging Plan, but it has been excluded without detailed rationale. This is in the context of a broad location for the new community which is not sufficiently evidenced at this stage.

6.5

The Greenhayes masterplan sets out an opportunity to deliver:

- 

A new, thriving rural community south of the A3052 Sidmouth Road potentially comprising of circa 2,000 no. homes (including both affordable and self-build and custom-build properties);

- 

A ready-made, thriving neighbourhood centre with an enhanced Farm Shop and café / restaurant at its core, together with a variety of supporting community services and facilities, such as retail, nursery and medical facilities;

- 

A new two-form entry 420-place primary school facility;

- 

A sustainable active travel corridor focused on the A3052 providing wheeling and walking connections into Exeter, Clyst Mary and into the proposed new community;

- 

Highway infrastructure improvements along the A3052 enabling access;

- 

Park and ride facility shared with Crealy visitor parking;

- 

Significant green infrastructure, providing strong recreational and biodiversity linkages into the Clyst Valley Regional Park project;

- 

Health and sports venue with playing pitches, gym, facilities and events venue;

- 

Rebalancing the resident to jobs ratio locally given the established and significant employment provision at Greendale and Hill Barton Business Parks and Crealy Theme Park and Resort already providing in the region of 3,600 no. jobs on the doorstep, meaning that place of work is located alongside place of residence, reducing the

necessity for out-commuting;

- 

Increased renewable energy infrastructure, building on the 1.3MW anaerobic digestion plant already operated at Greendale Business Park.

## 6.6

The emerging Plan and this consultation have clearly been prepared to fall within the provisions of the Transitional Arrangements for Plan Making as set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF at Annex 1: Implementation. However, it does not fully meet the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It is also clear that, in accelerating the Local Plan timetable, to meet the Transitional Arrangements, there are several unresolved matters which, as acknowledged in the Plan, require a further consultation (in accordance with Regulation 19) and additional evidence to support it. These shortcomings go to the heart of the tests of soundness and should be available prior to consultation of a pre-submission Local Plan.

6.7

The Plan does not meet the Transitional Arrangements. It will be necessary to reconvene work on the emerging spatial strategy to incorporate sufficient development to meet the full objectively assessed needs of the area. This should be done alongside the full evidence base to assess the likely infrastructure requirements and amount of affordable housing the Plan will deliver necessary components to understand the deliverability of the strategy.

6.8

These Representations have set out matters in respect of soundness and legal compliance which require resolution prior to the Plan being advanced for submission to the Secretary of State for Examination.

6.9

If the Plan were submitted at this stage, it could not be concluded as being positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development at the West End chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Development at the West End chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 6.10**

It has been set out that, in addressing serious issues of soundness, to meet identified housing needs that it would be entirely appropriate (and necessary to be sound) to identify the missing 2,000 homes at Greenhayes, immediately to the south of the current preferred location for the Second New Community. This would enable the community to come forward in accordance with the Government's New Town Programme, as well as aiding housing delivery within the Plan period in a sustainable manner.

6.11

Greenhayes would welcome further engagement with the Council to set out a Local Plan which is robust, with sustainable development at its heart. This also includes provisions relating to the CVRP.

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** 4. Development at the West End

**1. To which part of the Development at the West End chapter does your representation relate?:** Paragraph

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** 4.1

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development at the West End chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development at the West End chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** 1.1

These Representations have been prepared by Black Box Planning on behalf of “Greenhayes”, comprised of Greendale Group and Crealy Farms, in response to the Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) consultation for the East Devon Local Plan 2020-2042 which runs between Thursday 13th February and Monday 31st March 2025.

1.2

Greenhayes is a strategic promotion for a thriving new community which seeks to utilise and build on existing assets locally, such as the Greendale Farm Shop complex which already offers a range of services and facilities, taking advantage of the strong connections to significant employment hubs in the locality and the proposed expansion of the Clyst Valley Regional Park.

1.3

Greenhayes is identified within the emerging Plan evidence base as a reasonable alternative considered as part of the proposed delivery of a Second New Community. Greenhayes is supportive of a new community in the West End of the District. However, the Plan will require several modifications if it is to be concluded as sound.

1.4

The proposal is the vision of two local farming families, the Carter family (FWS Carter & Sons Ltd) and the Down family (Crealy Farms) who have been working comprehensively for several years to promote a carefully designed and sustainable new community to integrate into the established employment sites at Greendale Business Park, Greendale Farm Shop and Crealy Theme Park and Resort. There is a cogent case to incorporate it within the emerging Plan, but it has been excluded without detailed rationale. This is in the context of a broad location for the new community which is not sufficiently evidenced at this stage.

1.5

The Greenhayes masterplan sets out an opportunity to deliver:

- 

A new, thriving community south of the A3052 Sidmouth Road potentially comprising of circa 2,000 no. homes (including both affordable and self-build and custom-build properties);

- 

A ready-made, thriving neighbourhood centre with an enhanced Farm Shop and café / restaurant at its core, together with a variety of supporting community services and facilities, such as retail, nursery and medical facilities;

- 

A new two-form entry 420-place primary school facility;

- 

A sustainable active travel corridor focused on the A3052 providing wheeling and walking connections into Exeter, Clyst Mary and into the proposed new community;

- 

Highway infrastructure improvements along the A3052 enabling access;

- 

Park and ride facility shared with Crealy visitor parking;

- 

Significant green infrastructure, providing strong recreational and biodiversity linkages into the Clyst Valley Regional Park project;

- 

Health and sports venue with playing pitches, gym, facilities and events venue;

- 

Rebalancing the resident to jobs ratio locally given the established and significant employment provision at Greendale and Hill Barton Business Parks and Crealy Theme Park and Resort already providing in the region of 3,600 no. jobs on the doorstep, meaning that place of work is located alongside place of residence, reducing the

necessity for out-commuting;

- 

Increased renewable energy infrastructure, building on the 1.3MW anaerobic digestion plant already operated at Greendale Business Park.

## 1.6

The emerging Plan and this consultation have clearly been prepared to fall within the provisions of the Transitional Arrangements for Plan Making as set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF at Annex 1: Implementation. However, it does not fully meet the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It is also clear that, in accelerating the Local Plan timetable, to meet the Transitional Arrangements, there are several unresolved matters which, as acknowledged in the Plan, require a further consultation (in accordance with Regulation 19) and additional evidence to support it. These shortcomings go to the heart of the tests of soundness and should be available prior to consultation of a pre-submission Local Plan.

## 1.7

These Representations set out matters in respect of soundness and legal compliance which require resolution prior to the Plan being advanced for submission to the Secretary of State for Examination.

## 1.8

It will be set out that, in addressing serious issues of soundness, to meet identified housing needs that it would be entirely appropriate (and necessary to be sound) to identify the missing 2,000 homes at Greenhayes, immediately to the south of the current preferred location for the Second New Community. This would enable the community to come forward in accordance with the Government's New Town Programme, as well as aiding housing delivery within the Plan period in a sustainable manner.

**Full name:** Dan Trundle

**Organisation (where relevant):** Black Box Planning Ltd

**Other party name (if relevant):** of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

**Proposal:** Sustainability appraisal

**If you would like to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) please provide your comments here, stating to which part of the SA your comments relate.:** 4.1

NPPF Paragraph 33 requires that local plans should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered).

4.2

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) further explains that a sustainability appraisal is a systematic process that must be carried out during the preparation of local plans. Its role is to promote sustainable development by assessing the extent to which the emerging plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives.

4.3

At the time of writing, it is understood that Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (ref CSD-003) – Appendix Six and pages 265 through 280 represents the full extent of the Council SA work in respect of consideration of the Second New Community.

4.4

Firstly, it is somewhat surprising for such a critical component of the Council's Plan and overall spatial strategy, that the SA work extends to only 15 pages of a 614-page document. This point is especially pertinent in consideration of the reasonable alternatives, the complexity of these and their requisite assessment in order to arrive at an evidenced and methodical conclusion.

4.5

Secondly, whilst it is understood that the SA is required to assess reasonable alternatives, and that the Options from the October 2022 CBRE report were chosen as the basis for undertaking that assessment, there is little in the way of discussion around alternative options or sub-options for assessment.

4.6

By way of example, despite Greenhayes submitting a representation in January 2023 definitively confirming the extent of their land control and the basis on which a strategic promotion could be brought forward and contribute towards the Council spatial strategy and objective to deliver

a Second New Community, the reasonable alternative assessed by the SA in February remains as per the broad Option 2 set out in the October 2022 CBRE report.

#### 4.7

Option 2 is not consistent with the Greenhayes promotion land control as set out in the January 2023 Regulation 18 representation, instead it is based upon more outdated 2017 and 2021 Call for site submissions. Indeed, the very western extent of the Greenhayes promotion straddles into Option 3. The SA itself acknowledges on page 266 that land not being submitted to a Call for sites exercise would not necessarily prevent it from being considered.

#### 4.8

The SA sets out on page 265 that:

- 

The Local Plan 2020-2042 will allocate land for 8,000 homes and accompanying employment, services and facilities etc, but there is a longer term vision for 10,000 homes at the new community;

- 

Long lead-in times and build-out rates for a new settlement mean that 3,300 dwellings are proposed in the plan period up to the year 2032;

- 

The remaining 4,700 dwellings would be delivered after 2042 on the remainder of the allocated land;

- 

The land required for the additional 2,000 dwellings and associated land uses will be allocated in a future Local Plan.

#### 4.9

The SA recognises that the location of the three options recognise existing land uses that are not likely to relocate, such as Greendale Business Park and Crealy Theme Park and Resort. Nevertheless, Option 2 appears to wash over both land uses. The Greenhayes promotion demonstrates how the co-location of residential uses with these employment hubs and ensuring strong links between them, could contribute significantly to meeting wider sustainability objectives, including reducing the necessity to commute by private vehicle and to encourage active travel as part of the daily commute.

#### 4.10

The assessment in SA Objective 4 and 13 and also the conclusion that Option 2 is isolated from existing cycle infrastructure, fails to recognise that the Clyst Valley & New Communities Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) January 2025 (ref TRI-018) identifies the A3052 Sidmouth Road as a critical active travel route that all new settlement options will further increase demand upon. It is stated that 'a high-quality protected route, separated from the carriageway by a buffer should be delivered between Clyst St Mary and Greendale. To include

crossing points (e.g. signalised crossings) for the Clyst Valley Trail, Cat & Fiddle, Crealy, and Greendale. This would required engagement and negotiation with landowners’.

#### 4.11

Option 2 is the only option which would offer land control on both sides of the A3052 corridor to enable delivery of the critical active travel route as set out by the LCWIP. It would also be the only option which would enable the delivery of the requisite connections into Crealy and Greendale.

#### 4.12

The assessment in SA Objective 4 recognises the potential in Option 1 for a low carbon district heating network by connecting to the proposed Energy from Waste (EfW) plant at Hill Barton. However, it fails to consider that Option 2 would also benefit from this facility, given its location adjacent to Hill Barton Business Park and the Local Development Order boundary for the District Heating Network.

#### 4.13

It also fails to recognise that Option 2 would also enable opportunities to build upon the existing energy infrastructure at Greendale Business Park in the form of the anaerobic digester facility. The plant currently processes farm crops and livestock manure into biogas and bio fertiliser. The biogas is used to produce electricity for the Business Park, whilst the bio fertiliser is used in local agricultural practice in place of fossil fuel derived fertilisers.

#### 4.14

The assessment in the conclusion that Option 2 is in multiple ownership with significant land assembly required is unfair in consideration of the same challenges that would equally apply to Options 1 and 3. The Greenhayes promotion predominantly to the south of the A3052 is a single entity with two landowners involved. In consideration of the HELAA mapping, the landownership to the north of the A3052 appears more granular meaning that the same land assembly challenges will equally apply to Option 1.

#### 4.15

In respect of SA Objective 8, it is unclear why Option 2 does not score better than Option 3 in consideration that the SA acknowledges that “a relatively large proportion of the land in Option 3 has not been submitted by the landowners”. An inconsistent approach is unlawful on the basis that it would be irrational.

#### 4.16

The assessments in SA Objectives 10 and 12 fail to acknowledge the established hub of facilities and services at the Greendale Farm Shop site, including a café / restaurant, farm shop, nursery, medical facility and various tourism and visitor attractions.

#### 4.17

The assessment in SA Objective 11 that Options 1 and 3 benefit from employment opportunities arising from proximity to Exeter, yet Option 2 is limited only to employment opportunities arising from Greendale and Hill Barton Business Park is nonsensical. Option 2 equally benefits from

such a location and sits on a direct public transport route and proposed active travel corridor into the city.

#### 4.18

It is recognised that Option 1 provides ease of access to several employment hubs around the A30 corridor, but the Greenhayes promotion would achieve the same objectives through proximity to Crealy and Greendale Business Park. The business park is home to approximately 150 companies, providing approximately 2,000 no. jobs in the local Exeter and East Devon economy. The park comprises over 1.8 million square feet of existing industrial and commercial space hosting a variety of business tenants.

#### 4.19

It is recognised that, in preparing the Sustainability Appraisal, a number of the core sustainability objectives will need to be assessed by applying evaluative judgement. This can account for differences i