

Schedule of amendments made to the SA Update 2017 (and included in the SA Update 2018), following the advice and recommendations provided by Land Use Consultants to Mid Devon District Council

January 2018

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in italics. The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the **SA Update 2017**, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Ref	Page	Paragraph	Amendment
SA1	2	Para 1	<p>Reason: To set out the context of the SA Update 2018</p> <p>Add new paragraph:</p> <p><u>“Mid Devon District Council commissioned consultants LUC to undertake an independent review of the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) that was prepared by Mid Devon District Council in relation to proposed modifications to the Local Plan Review. The recommendations from LUC have been applied in this Sustainability Appraisal Update. For a full account of the LUC review and MDDC responses please refer to the ‘Review of Sustainability Appraisal Update for the Mid Devon Local Plan Review: Review of Legal Compliance (January 2018)’ and ‘Mid Devon District Council response to the Review of Sustainability Appraisal Update for the Mid Devon Local Plan Review: Review of Legal Compliance (January 2018)’.”</u></p>
SA2	2	Para 2	<p>Reason: To update the context of the SA Update 2017</p> <p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>“Theis 2017 update to the Sustainability Appraisal has been was undertaken to take into account comments made at the 2015 Proposed Submission Stage consultation and proposed modifications to the Local Plan Review. The Local Plan Review: Proposed Submission Consultation Sustainability Appraisal (2015) <u>and Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u> is are available on the website at www.middevon.gov.uk/localplanreview and the main Council office, Phoenix House, Tiverton.</p>
SA3	2	Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide additional text prior to the contents section of the update to provide a clearer explanation of work carried out during the SA Update.</p> <p>Add new paragraph / text and :</p>

			<p><u>“Consultation feedback from the 2015 consultation included general comments on the SA as well as specific issues related to individual policies. Responses to general comments relating to contents of the SA text, methodology and cumulative impacts are set out in Annex 1. Proposals for alternative policy options, including proposed modifications, are assessed alongside new information and comments on the scoring of the 2015 SA in Annex 2. Only proposed alternatives deemed ‘reasonable alternatives’ are considered as part of the SA update; for example, this excludes alternatives considered in previous iterations of the SA and where only minor amendments are proposed. A summarised re-assessment is included in Annex 2. Where there are distinct alternatives proposed, significant new information or substantial changes to the SA scoring a full appraisal is included in Annex 3, with amended SA scoring where applicable. The main body of this SA Update is accompanied by the following three annexes:”</u></p>
SA4	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a clearer explanation of work carried out during the SA Update stage of the SA at the front of the SA Update.</p> <p>Move references to Annexes 1, 2 and 3 to the front of the SA Update:</p> <p><u>“Annex 1 – Sustainability Appraisal text, methodology and cumulative impact comments (p.67-80)</u> <u>This annex sets out comments from the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Consultation (2015) on the contents of the sustainability appraisal (SA) text, methodology and cumulative impacts.</u></p> <p><u>Annex 2 – Further reasonable alternatives, new information and comments on the sustainability appraisal of policies and sites (p.81-222)</u> This annex provides a summary of additional reasonable alternatives considered and proposed changes to the sustainability appraisal for example through new information. Minor proposed changes to the Local Plan have not been assessed as these were deemed to not give rise to significant effects.</p> <p><u>Annex 3 – Additional Reasonable Alternative Appraisals (p.223-395)</u> <u>This annex provides the full appraisals used to assess reasonable alternatives where deemed necessary as summarised in Annex 2.”</u></p>
SA5	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a summary of revised appraisal work carried out in the SA Update.</p>

			<p>Add paragraphs providing a summary why additional SA work was carried out in the 2017 SA Update:</p> <p><u>“Summary of Sustainability Appraisal work carried out in Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)”</u></p> <p><u>Arising from the SA Update (2017), a number of alternatives were identified through comments on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Consultation (2015) or new information. A number of modifications were also proposed through the SA Update. For a full account of proposed modifications to the Local Plan Review, including minor amendments not considered to give rise to reasonable alternatives, reference should be made to the Schedule of proposed modifications published in November (2016). This provides a list of proposed modifications following in the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (incorporating proposed modifications). The schedule of proposed modifications published in March (2017) provides a list of proposed modifications following the 2017 consultation on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (incorporating proposed modifications). These documents are available on the Council’s website (see paragraph 2 above). A number of comments were received at each stage of the Local Plan Review process; all representations received are available to view in full on the Mid Devon District Council website (as before). Furthermore a summary of representations received is provided for each stage of the Local Plan Review process. The 2015 and 2017 Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (February 2015) Consultation Summary Documents set out responses from Mid Devon District Council to each comment received.</u></p> <p><u>The following table sets out a summary of the reasons why additional SA work was carried out in the 2017 SA Update:</u></p>						
SA6	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a summary of revised appraisal work carried out in the SA Update.</p> <p>Add Table 1:</p> <p><u>“Table 1 – summary of 2017 SA appraisal work</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="564 1805 1442 2047"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="564 1805 983 1883"><u>Policy</u></th> <th data-bbox="983 1805 1442 1883"><u>Revised SA appraisal work</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="564 1883 983 1964"><u>Strategic Policies</u></td> <td data-bbox="983 1883 1442 1964"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="564 1964 983 2047"><u>S2 Amount and distribution of</u></td> <td data-bbox="983 1964 1442 2047"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Revised SA appraisal work</u>	<u>Strategic Policies</u>		<u>S2 Amount and distribution of</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u>
<u>Policy</u>	<u>Revised SA appraisal work</u>								
<u>Strategic Policies</u>									
<u>S2 Amount and distribution of</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> 								

		<u>development</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
		<u>S3 Meeting housing needs</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>S4 Ensuring housing delivery</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>S5 Public open space</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
		<u>S6 Employment</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
		<u>S10 Tiverton</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u>
		<u>S12 Crediton</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>S13 Villages</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
		<u>S14 Countryside</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>Sites</u>	
		<u>Tiverton</u>	
		<u>TIV1-TIV6 Eastern Urban Extension</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>TIV7 Town Hall/St Andrew Street</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>TIV8 Moorhayes Park</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>TIV12 Phoenix Lane</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
		<u>TIV13 Tidcombe Hall</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
		<u>TIV14 Wynnards Mead</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u>
		<u>OTIV2 Hartnoll Farm</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
		<u>OTIV4 Blundells School (Proposed for allocation TIV16)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>

			<u>OTIV13 Exeter Hill</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>OTIVNEW New site land at Seven Crosses Hill</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>Cullompton</u>	
			<u>CU1-CU6 North West Cullompton</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CU7-CU12 East Cullompton</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CU13 Knowle Lane</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CU14 Ware Park and Footlands</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CU15 Land at Exeter Road</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CU16 Cummings Nursery</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CU17 Week Farm</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>CU18 Venn Farm</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>CU19 Town Centre Relief Road</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CU20 Cullompton Infrastructure</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>

			<u>OCUNEW Tiverton Road</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>CU21 Land at Colebrook</u> <u>CONTINGENCY SITE</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>Crediton</u>	
			<u>CRE1 Wellparks</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CRE2 Red Hill Cross,</u> <u>Exhibition Road</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CRE3 Cromwells Meadow</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CRE4 Woods Group, Exeter</u> <u>Road</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CRE5 Pedlerspool</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CRE6 Sports fields, Exhibition</u> <u>Road</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CRE7 Stonewall Lane</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>New information</u>
			<u>CRE9 Alexandra Close</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>CRE10 Land south of A377</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed New information</u>
			<u>CRE11 Crediton Infrastructure</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>Options to the West of</u> <u>Crediton – OCRE10</u> <u>Westwood Farm and OCRE11</u> <u>Land at Chapel Down Farm</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>Junction 27</u>	
			<u>Land at Junction 27</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Comment(s) on secondary/ cumulative/ synergistic effects</u> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> • <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>

			<u>Rural areas</u>	
			<u>BA1 Newton Square, Bampton</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>School Close, Bampton (proposed for allocation BA4)</u>	• <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>BO1 Land adjacent to Hollywell, Bow</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>BO2, West of Godfrey's Gardens, Bow</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>BR1 Hele Road, Bradninch</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>CH1 Barton, Chawleigh</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>CB1 Land off Church Lane, Cheriton Bishop</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>CF1 Barnshill Close, Cheriton Fitzpaine</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>CF2 Land adjacent school, Cheriton Fitzpaine</u>	• <u>New information</u> • <u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>OCF2 Landboat Farm, Cheriton Fitzpaine</u>	• <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>OCFNEW Bramble Orchard, Cheriton Fitzpaine</u>	• <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
			<u>HA1 Land adjacent Fishers Way, Halberton</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>OHA1 Land at Blundells Road, Halberton</u>	• <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>OHANEW The Pethers, Halberton</u>	• <u>Comment(s) on the Sustainability Appraisal</u>
			<u>HE1 Depot, Hemyock</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>NE1 Court Orchard, Newton St Cyres</u>	• <u>New information</u>
			<u>ONENEW New Estate Site A,</u>	• <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>

			<p><u>Newton St Cyres</u></p> <p><u>ONENEW New Estate Site B, Newton St Cyres</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> <p><u>OSP1 Higher Town, Sampford Peverell (Proposed for allocation SP2)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> <p><u>SA1 Fanny's Lane, Sandford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u> <p><u>SI1 Land at Old Butterleigh Road, Silverton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u> <p><u>SI2 The Garage, Silverton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New information</u> <p><u>TH1 South of Broadlands, Thorverton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> <p><u>OTHNEW Land north east of Silver Street, Thorverton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> <p><u>OTHNEW Land to the west of Lynch Close and Cleaves Close, Thorverton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> <p><u>OUF3 Land West of Uffculme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u> <p><u>W11 Land east of M5, Willand</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> <p><u>W12 Willand Industrial Estate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u> • <u>New information</u> <p><u>Development Management Policies</u></p> <p><u>DM28 Other protected sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alternative(s) proposed</u>
SA7	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a table setting out a summary of reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Add paragraph summarising reasonable alternatives considered:</p> <p><u>“Summary of reasonable alternatives considered</u></p>

			<u>The following table sets out the reasonable alternatives considered through the 2017 SA update.”</u>												
SA8	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a table setting out a summary of reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Add Table 2:</p> <p><u>“Table 2: Summary of reasonable alternatives considered through the 2017 SA update</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Local Plan Policy</u></th> <th><u>Summary of Reasonable Alternative Options considered by SA update (2017)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Strategic Policies</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S2: Amount and distribution of development</u></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Amount of housing: six alternative options for total housing numbers were considered in range 7200 – 8800 over plan period, including the Council’s preferred option of 7860.</u> - <u>Distribution of housing: rural distribution, Tiverton and Crediton focussed alternatives were considered.</u> - <u>Amount of commercial development: higher growth scenario including J27 option.</u> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S3: Meeting housing needs</u></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>35% affordable housing target.</u> - <u>Remove the requirement to provide 5% of serviced plots for self-build.</u> - <u>Alternatives for the distribution of gypsy and traveller pitches: town focussed urban extensions and rural distribution.</u> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S4: Ensuring housing delivery</u></td> <td>- <u>Delete the policy.</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S5: Public open space</u></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) to be considered as public open space.</u> - <u>The provision of open space should be applied to towns rather</u> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Local Plan Policy</u>	<u>Summary of Reasonable Alternative Options considered by SA update (2017)</u>	<u>Strategic Policies</u>		<u>S2: Amount and distribution of development</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Amount of housing: six alternative options for total housing numbers were considered in range 7200 – 8800 over plan period, including the Council’s preferred option of 7860.</u> - <u>Distribution of housing: rural distribution, Tiverton and Crediton focussed alternatives were considered.</u> - <u>Amount of commercial development: higher growth scenario including J27 option.</u> 	<u>S3: Meeting housing needs</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>35% affordable housing target.</u> - <u>Remove the requirement to provide 5% of serviced plots for self-build.</u> - <u>Alternatives for the distribution of gypsy and traveller pitches: town focussed urban extensions and rural distribution.</u> 	<u>S4: Ensuring housing delivery</u>	- <u>Delete the policy.</u>	<u>S5: Public open space</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) to be considered as public open space.</u> - <u>The provision of open space should be applied to towns rather</u>
<u>Local Plan Policy</u>	<u>Summary of Reasonable Alternative Options considered by SA update (2017)</u>														
<u>Strategic Policies</u>															
<u>S2: Amount and distribution of development</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Amount of housing: six alternative options for total housing numbers were considered in range 7200 – 8800 over plan period, including the Council’s preferred option of 7860.</u> - <u>Distribution of housing: rural distribution, Tiverton and Crediton focussed alternatives were considered.</u> - <u>Amount of commercial development: higher growth scenario including J27 option.</u> 														
<u>S3: Meeting housing needs</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>35% affordable housing target.</u> - <u>Remove the requirement to provide 5% of serviced plots for self-build.</u> - <u>Alternatives for the distribution of gypsy and traveller pitches: town focussed urban extensions and rural distribution.</u> 														
<u>S4: Ensuring housing delivery</u>	- <u>Delete the policy.</u>														
<u>S5: Public open space</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) to be considered as public open space.</u> - <u>The provision of open space should be applied to towns rather</u> 														

				<u>than parishes.</u>
			<u>S6: Employment</u>	- <u>Small scale allocations in rural locations.</u> - <u>Allocation for major tourism and leisure.</u>
			<u>S13: Villages</u>	- <u>Edge of village development.</u>
			<u>Site Allocations</u>	
			<u>TIV1-5: Eastern Urban Extension</u>	- <u>Range of dwellings (1580 – 1830)</u>
			<u>TIV12: Phoenix Lane</u>	- <u>Delete policy.</u>
			<u>TIV13: Tidcombe Hall</u>	- <u>Delete policy.</u> - <u>8.4ha with 200 dwellings.</u>
			<u>TIV14: Wynnards Mead (Contingency site)</u>	- <u>Delete policy.</u>
			<u>OTIV2: Hartnoll Farm</u>	- <u>1000 dwellings and 20,000sqm employment.</u>
			<u>OTIV4: Blundells School (proposed for allocation TIV16)</u>	- <u>Reconsider site in light of EA and HEA evidence: allocate for 200 dwellings.</u>
			<u>OTIVNEW: New site at Seven Crosses Hill</u>	- <u>7.69ha for 184 dwellings.</u>
			<u>CU1-CU6: North West Cullompton</u>	- <u>Include education provision as part of the commercial floorspace allocation.</u> - <u>Extend site area, incorporating all 'Growen Farm' land.</u>
			<u>CU7-CU12: East Cullompton</u>	- <u>No quantum of green infrastructure and public open space should be specified.</u> - <u>Proposed land swap; 'land at Newland Persey' replaced by</u>

				<p><u>'land at Cooke'</u>.</p> <p>- <u>Land at Aller Barton Farm/ south of Honiton Road, 181ha site.</u></p>
			<u>CU15: Land at Exeter Road</u>	- <u>Reduce allocation to 24 dwellings.</u>
			<u>CU17: Week Farm</u>	- <u>Include space for larger retail outlets.</u>
			<u>CU18: Venn Farm</u>	- <u>Extend allocation area to 8ha.</u>
			<u>CU21: Land at Colebrook (Contingency Site)</u>	- <u>Include full site area proposed at options stage: 19.3ha, 400 dwellings.</u>
			<u>OCUNEW: Tiverton Road</u>	- <u>New site proposed for up to 19 dwellings.</u>
			<u>CRE6: Sports fields, Exhibition Road</u>	- <u>Alternative to proposed allocation: 2.8ha with 50 dwellings.</u>
			<u>CRE10: Land south of A377</u>	- <u>Extension of settlement limit to include all land within 2009 planning permission.</u>
			<u>CRE11: Crediton Infrastructure</u>	- <u>Include provision of works to reduce flood risk in policy.</u>
			<u>J27: Land at Junction 27</u>	- <u>Proposed allocation of 71 hectares between M5 Junction 27 and Willand for mixed commercial floorspace including a travel hub, agronomy visitor centre, outdoor adventure zone and outlet shopping village.</u>
			<u>School Close, Bampton (proposed for allocation BA4)</u>	- <u>Allocate 0.54ha site for 26 dwellings (site omitted in error from 2015 proposed submission)</u>
			<u>OCFNEW: Bramble Orchard, Cheriton Fitzpaine</u>	- <u>New alternative site proposed in preference to current plan allocations.</u>

			<p><u>OHANEW: The Pethers</u></p> <p>- <u>Site put forward in preference to HA1.</u></p>
			<p><u>ONENEW: New Estate Site A and B, Newton St Cyres</u></p> <p>- <u>New site options (A &B) at Newton St Cyres</u></p>
			<p><u>OSP1: Higher Town, Sampford Peverell (proposed for allocation SP2)</u></p> <p>- <u>Option site reconsidered; proposed allocation of 6ha, 60 dwellings site.</u></p>
			<p><u>TH1: South of Broadlands, Thorverton</u></p> <p>- <u>Proposed extension of site to include allotment land; 1.15 ha, 20 dwellings</u></p>
			<p><u>OTHNEW: Land north east of Silver Street, Thorverton</u></p> <p>- <u>New land submitted for consideration.</u></p>
			<p><u>OTHNEW: Land to the west of Lynch Close and Cleaves Close, Thorverton</u></p> <p>- <u>New land submitted for consideration.</u></p>
			<p><u>OUF3: Land west of Uffculme, Uffculme</u></p> <p>- <u>3.5 ha, 60 dwelling site considered for inclusion in plan following appeal decision (February 2016) granting outline planning permission.</u></p>
			<p><u>WI1: Land east of M5, Willand</u></p> <p>- <u>Increase area of proposed allocation; 14.8ha, 174 dwellings</u></p>
			<p><u>WI2: Willand Industrial Estate, Willand</u></p> <p>- <u>Full allocation of 9.2ha 22,000sqm of commercial floorspace</u></p> <p>- <u>Allocate for residential development; 53 dwellings</u></p>
			<p><u>Development Management Policies</u></p>
			<p><u>DM28: Other protected sites</u></p> <p>- <u>Include compensatory measures as part of policy</u></p>
SA9	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a table the proposed modifications that have arisen through the SA Update (2017).</p>

			Add paragraph: “The following table sets out the proposed modifications that have arisen through the 2017 SA update.”																				
SA10	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a table the proposed modifications that have arisen through the SA Update (2017).</p> <p>Add Table 3: “<u>Table 3: Summary of proposed modifications set out in the 2017 SA update</u>”</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Local Plan Policy</u></th> <th><u>Summary of Proposed Amendments</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Strategic Policies</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S2: Amount and distribution of development</u></td> <td><u>Total housing need over plan period increased to 7860 to meet revised need. Amount of commercial development: higher growth scenario to include Junction 27 allocation.</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S3: Meeting housing needs</u></td> <td><u>Increase objectively assessed housing need to 380 per year to reflect SHMA evidence + 260 over plan period for Junction 27 allocation.</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S4: Ensuring housing delivery</u></td> <td><u>Increase objectively assessed housing need (as above).</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S12: Crediton</u></td> <td><u>Additional criterion for community and education facilities.</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>S14: Countryside</u></td> <td><u>Remove reference to new traveller sites in open countryside (in response to updated National Policy guidance).</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Site Allocations</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>TIV1-5: Eastern Urban Extension</u></td> <td><u>Amend policy to give range of dwellings (1580 – 1830).</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>TIV14: Wynnards Mead</u></td> <td><u>Proposed for deletion.</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Local Plan Policy</u>	<u>Summary of Proposed Amendments</u>	<u>Strategic Policies</u>		<u>S2: Amount and distribution of development</u>	<u>Total housing need over plan period increased to 7860 to meet revised need. Amount of commercial development: higher growth scenario to include Junction 27 allocation.</u>	<u>S3: Meeting housing needs</u>	<u>Increase objectively assessed housing need to 380 per year to reflect SHMA evidence + 260 over plan period for Junction 27 allocation.</u>	<u>S4: Ensuring housing delivery</u>	<u>Increase objectively assessed housing need (as above).</u>	<u>S12: Crediton</u>	<u>Additional criterion for community and education facilities.</u>	<u>S14: Countryside</u>	<u>Remove reference to new traveller sites in open countryside (in response to updated National Policy guidance).</u>	<u>Site Allocations</u>		<u>TIV1-5: Eastern Urban Extension</u>	<u>Amend policy to give range of dwellings (1580 – 1830).</u>	<u>TIV14: Wynnards Mead</u>	<u>Proposed for deletion.</u>
<u>Local Plan Policy</u>	<u>Summary of Proposed Amendments</u>																						
<u>Strategic Policies</u>																							
<u>S2: Amount and distribution of development</u>	<u>Total housing need over plan period increased to 7860 to meet revised need. Amount of commercial development: higher growth scenario to include Junction 27 allocation.</u>																						
<u>S3: Meeting housing needs</u>	<u>Increase objectively assessed housing need to 380 per year to reflect SHMA evidence + 260 over plan period for Junction 27 allocation.</u>																						
<u>S4: Ensuring housing delivery</u>	<u>Increase objectively assessed housing need (as above).</u>																						
<u>S12: Crediton</u>	<u>Additional criterion for community and education facilities.</u>																						
<u>S14: Countryside</u>	<u>Remove reference to new traveller sites in open countryside (in response to updated National Policy guidance).</u>																						
<u>Site Allocations</u>																							
<u>TIV1-5: Eastern Urban Extension</u>	<u>Amend policy to give range of dwellings (1580 – 1830).</u>																						
<u>TIV14: Wynnards Mead</u>	<u>Proposed for deletion.</u>																						

			<u>(Contingency site)</u>	
			<u>OTIV4: Blundells School (proposed for allocation TIV16 Blundells School)</u>	<u>New Policy: New site allocation to meet need arising from J27 employment; reconsidered in light of new Environment Agency (EA) & Historic Environment Appraisal (HEA) evidence.</u>
			<u>CU1-CU6: North West Cullompton</u>	<u>Contribution from development towards Town Centre Relief Road/Junction 28 and change in commercial floorspace in line with masterplan. Re-allocation of land to south west of site.</u>
			<u>CU7-CU12: East Cullompton</u>	<u>Additional criterion and text in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CU15: Exeter Road</u>	<u>Reduced allocation to 24 dwellings.</u>
			<u>CU19: Town Centre Relief Road</u>	<u>Additional criterion and text in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CU20: Cullompton Infrastructure</u>	<u>Additional criterion and text on works to reduce flood risk.</u>
			<u>CRE2: Red Hill Cross</u>	<u>Additional supporting text to add context in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CRE3: Cromwells Meadow</u>	<u>Additional criterion and text in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CRE4: Woods Group, Exeter Road</u>	<u>Additional supporting text to add context in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CRE5: Pedlerspool</u>	<u>New primary school included in policy following representation from Devon County Council.</u>
			<u>CRE7: Stonewall Lane</u>	<u>Additional supporting text to add context in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CRE10: Land south of A377</u>	<u>Extension of settlement limit to include all land included in 2009 Planning Permission.</u>

				<u>Amendments to supporting text have been made in response to the HEA and latest flood risk information.</u>
			<u>CRE11: Crediton Infrastructure</u>	<u>Amend policy to include provision of works to reduce flood risk</u>
			<u>J27: Land at Junction 27</u>	<u>New policy: Proposed allocation of 71 ha between M5 Junction 27 and Willand for mixed commercial floorspace, including a travel hub, agronomy visitor centre, outdoor adventure zone and outlet shopping village.</u>
			<u>School Close, Bampton (proposed for allocation BA4)</u>	<u>New Policy: 0.54 ha site, 26 dwellings. Site omitted in error from 2015 proposed submission, now included and fully appraised as part of SA.</u>
			<u>CH1: Barton, Chawleigh</u>	<u>Additional criterion and text in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>CF1: Barnshill Close, Cheriton Fitzpaine</u>	<u>Additional text proposed in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>HA1: Land Adjacent Fishers Way, Halberton</u>	<u>Delete reference to archaeological investigation/mitigation following new information from Devon County Archaeology service.</u>
			<u>HE1: Depot, Hemyock</u>	<u>Site now won't be available in near future: removed from plan as no longer reasonable alternative.</u>
			<u>NE1: Court Orchard, Newton St Cyres</u>	<u>Additional criterion and text in response to HEA.</u>
			<u>OSP1: Higher Town, Sampford Peverell (proposed for allocation SP2)</u>	<u>New Policy: 6 ha, 60 dwelling site included in options consultation and 2015 SA; re-considered to meet increased housing need due to J27 employment opportunities, now included as</u>

			<p><u>proposed modification.</u></p> <p><u>OUF3: Land west of Uffculme, Uffculme</u></p> <p><u>3.5 ha, 60 dwelling site included as proposed modification following appeal decision February 2016 granting outline planning permission.</u></p> <p><u>WI2: Willand Industrial Estate, Willand</u></p> <p><u>Proposed to allocate full site area; 9.2 ha site for 22,000 square metres commercial floorspace.</u></p> <p><u>Development Management Policies</u></p> <p><u>DM28: Other protected sites</u></p> <p><u>In response to Environment Agency comments, proposed policy amendment allows for consideration of compensatory measures where mitigation measures are not possible.</u></p>
SA11	2	Following Para 3	<p><u>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to add a signposting table to identify how the SA has met the Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA) Directive requirements for clarity.</u></p> <p>Add the following paragraphs explaining the compliance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Regulations:</p> <p><u>“Compliance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Regulations</u></p> <p><u>The Council has a duty to consider the sustainability of its plans through the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It also has to prepare a Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA) as a result of requirements contained in the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. It is believed that the requirements of both pieces of legislation have been met by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which has been prepared following Government guidance.</u></p> <p><u>The SA is an iterative, ongoing process and integral to plan making. During the process of preparing the Local Plan Review, consultation was held in July 2013 on the Scoping</u></p>

			<p><u>Report and SA Scoping Report, in January 2014 on the Options Report and SA Interim Report, in February 2015 on the Proposed Submission document and the SA Proposed Submission Report and in January 2017 on the Proposed Submission (incorporating proposed modifications) document and the SA Update Report.</u></p> <p><u>The interim SA (2014) provided a signposting table in Chapter 1 which set out how the SEA Directive and Regulations requirements were met at the time of publishing the 2014 report. The Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015) provided an updated signposting table in Chapter 1 which set out how the SEA Directive and Regulations requirements had been met at the time of publishing the 2015 report which included compliance with any items not covered by previous iterations of the SA.</u></p> <p><u>A further signposting table has been provided in this SA Update. For clarity the inclusion of each stage of the SA process is provided where compliance with the SEA Directive requirement has been met.”</u></p>						
SA12	2	Following Para 3	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to add a signposting table to identify how the SA has met the Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA) Directive requirements for clarity.</p> <p>Add table 4:</p> <p><u>“Table 4 – Signposting table, ‘Information to be included in the Environmental Report’</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>SEA Directive Requirements</u></th> <th><u>Covered in SA</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>Information to be included in the Environmental Report – Article 5 and Annex 1 of SEA Directive</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</u></td> <td> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 1 Introduction’ of this report sets out the contents and main objectives of the plan.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 2 Relevant plans and programmes’ of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 7 Appendix: Reviewed</u></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>SEA Directive Requirements</u>	<u>Covered in SA</u>	<u>Information to be included in the Environmental Report – Article 5 and Annex 1 of SEA Directive</u>		<u>a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</u>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 1 Introduction’ of this report sets out the contents and main objectives of the plan.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 2 Relevant plans and programmes’ of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 7 Appendix: Reviewed</u></p>
<u>SEA Directive Requirements</u>	<u>Covered in SA</u>								
<u>Information to be included in the Environmental Report – Article 5 and Annex 1 of SEA Directive</u>									
<u>a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</u>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 1 Introduction’ of this report sets out the contents and main objectives of the plan.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 2 Relevant plans and programmes’ of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 7 Appendix: Reviewed</u></p>								

			<p><u>plans and programmes (full list)</u> provides a full list of reviewed <u>plans and programmes.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 1 Background'</u> of this report sets out an outline of the contents and main objectives of the Local Plan. This chapter also identifies the compliance of report at the time of publication with the SEA Directive and Regulations.</p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context'</u>. This chapter sets out the conclusions from the review of relevant plans and programmes.</p> <p><u>'Appendix 1: Full review of plans and programmes'</u>. This appendix provides a full review of plans and programmes.</p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 1 Background'</u> of this report sets out the contents and main objectives of the Local plan. This chapter also identifies the compliance of the report at the time of publication with the SEA Directive and Regulations.</p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context'</u>. This chapter sets out the conclusions from the review of relevant plans and programmes.</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p><u>'Appendix 1: Full review of plans and programmes'. This appendix provides a full review of plans and programmes.</u></p>
			<p><u>b) the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan;</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 3 Baseline information about Mid Devon' of this report considers the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and considers trends that are likely to continue without the implementation of the plan e.g. likely historic trends of biodiversity expected to continue and the trend for the delivery of sustainable homes based on existing relevant plans and programmes.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context' looks at the relevant aspects of the state of the environment and considers trends that are likely to continue without the implementation of the plan.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Modifications Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context' looks at the relevant aspects of the state of the environment and considers trends that are likely to continue without the implementation of the plan. The</u></p>

				<p><u>likely Evolution of the State of the Environment without Implementation of the Local Plan Review is set out in full at para 2.60 and accompanying table.</u></p>
			<p>c) the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 2 Relevant plans and programmes’ of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes which have been grouped into themed areas. This first picks up on the potential impact of the Plan, in particular how the promotion of new development may impact on these themes.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 3 Baseline information about Mid Devon’ of this report considers the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment, it provides some identification of existing environmental characteristics that could be affected by the Plan e.g. Natural England has advised that any development that encourages through-traffic through the A361 may impact on the Culm Grasslands SAC.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 4 Sustainability issues and problems’ of this report summarises the sustainability issues within Mid Devon identified by the Sustainability Appraisal scoping report.</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 7 Appendix: Reviewed plans and programmes (full list)’</u></p>

			<p><u>provides a full list of reviewed plans and programmes and provides greater detail on environmental characteristics likely to be affected and therefore which should be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability context' looks at the relevant aspects of the state of the environment including the consideration of environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</u></p> <p><u>'Appendix 1: Full review of plans and programmes' provides a full list of reviewed plans and programmes and provides greater detail on environmental characteristics likely to be affected and therefore which should be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability context' looks at the relevant aspects of the state of the environment including the consideration of environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</u></p>
--	--	--	--

				<p><u>‘Appendix 1: Full review of plans and programmes’ provides a full list of reviewed plans and programmes and provides greater detail on environmental characteristics likely to be affected and therefore which should be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>The SA Update (2017) is an addendum to the SA work undertaken to date. As such the context and methodology previously set out in the SA still applies. The SA framework objectives borne out of previous iterations of the SA are repeated in the SA Update for clarity.</u></p>
			<p><u>d) any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>‘Chapter 3 Baseline information about Mid Devon’ of this report considers the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment, it provides some identification of existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including advice from Natural England on the impact of through-traffic on the A361 on the Culm Grasslands SAC.</u></p>

				<p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context' looks at the relevant aspects of the state of the environment it provides some identification of existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including advice from Natural England on the impact of through-traffic on the A361 on the Culm Grasslands SAC.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context' looks at the relevant aspects of the state of the environment it provides some identification of existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including advice from Natural England on the impact of through-traffic on the A361 on the Culm Grasslands SAC.</u></p>
			<p><u>e) the environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Relevant plans and programmes' of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes which have been grouped into themed areas. This chapter identifies factors and policy defined by EU or UK legislation, national policies and other plans</u></p>

			<p><u>and strategies at a local level which are relevant to the plan, including environmental considerations to be taken into account during the Plan preparation.</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 7 Appendix: Reviewed plans and programmes (full list)' provides a full list of reviewed plans and programmes which is summarised in Chapter 2. The chapter provides sustainability conclusions under each theme which include environmental considerations to be taken into account in the Plan's preparation.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context' of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes which have been grouped into themed areas. This chapter identifies factors and policy defined by EU or UK legislation, national policies and other plans and strategies at a local level which are relevant to the plan, including environmental considerations to be taken into account during the Plan preparation.</u></p> <p><u>'Appendix 1 Full review of plans and programmes' provides the full list of reviewed plans and programmes which is summarised in Chapter 2. The chapter provides sustainability conclusions under each theme</u></p>
--	--	--	---

				<p><u>which include environmental considerations to be taken into account in the Plan's preparation.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>'Chapter 2 Sustainability Context' of this report sets out the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes which have been grouped into themed areas. This chapter identifies factors and policy defined by EU or UK legislation, national policies and other plans and strategies at a local level which are relevant to the plan, including environmental considerations to be taken into account during the Plan preparation.</u></p> <p><u>'Appendix 1 Full review of plans and programmes' provides the full list of reviewed plans and programmes which is summarised in Chapter 2. The chapter provides sustainability conclusions under each theme which include environmental considerations to be taken into account in the Plan's preparation.</u></p>
			<p><u>f) the likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors (these effects</u></p>	<p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Appendix 2 Sustainability appraisal of policies and site options' presents the findings of appraisal work that has been carried out. The effects are illustrated using matrices and scoring system set out in 'Chapter 3 Sustainability</u></p>

			<p><u>should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative impacts):</u></p>	<p><u>appraisal methodology’. The likely significant positive and negative effects are shown by applying the scores +3 and -3 respectively. The SA objectives used throughout the SA process address all the required SEA topics. Appendix 2 also includes secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary impacts.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>‘Appendix 2 Sustainability appraisal of policies and site options’ presents the findings of appraisal work that has been carried out. The effects are illustrated using matrices and scoring system set out in ‘Chapter 3 Sustainability appraisal methodology’. The likely significant positive and negative effects are shown by applying the scores +3 and -3 respectively. The SA objectives used throughout the SA process address all the required SEA topics. Appendix 2 also includes secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary impacts.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>Annex 1 ‘Sustainability Appraisal text, methodology and cumulative</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><u>impact comments' updates the cumulative effects noted in appendix 2 of the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Annexes 2 and 3 in the SA Update present the findings of the additional appraisal work that has been carried out. Effects are illustrated using the same matrices and scoring system that was used earlier in the SA process and that is described in paragraphs 2-9 of the SA Update (2017). As described in paragraph 6, likely significant positive and significant negative effects are shown by applying the scores +3 and -3 respectively. The SA objectives used throughout the SA process address all of the required SEA topics.</u></p> <p><u>Annex 4 in the SA Update (2017) summarises the updated cumulative sustainability effects of the Local Plan review as a whole, taking into account the changes proposed to the Plan.</u></p>
			<p><u>g) the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan;</u></p>	<p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p> <p><u>'Appendix 2 Sustainability appraisal of policies and site options' presents the findings of appraisal work that has been carried out. Under each appraisal a summary of recommendations are made to prevent, reduce or as fully as possible offset any</u></p>

			<p><u>significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015):</u></p> <p><u>‘Appendix 2 Sustainability appraisal of policies and site options’ presents the findings of the appraisal work that has been carried out. This updated version of the SA introduces a column considering potential mitigation measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan. The revised scores in the final column of the SA matrices illustrate how the proposed mitigation would affect the SA scores. In a number of places this results in potential significant effects being reduced.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>Annex 2 considers further reasonable alternatives, new information and comments on the sustainability appraisal of policies and site. Where appropriate measures are recommended as ‘Changes to the Plan’ to prevent, reduce and as fully possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan.</u></p>
--	--	--	---

				<p><u>The detailed SA matrices in Annex 3 include a column considering potential mitigation measures, and the revised scores in the final column of the SA matrices illustrate how the proposed mitigation would affect the SA scores. In a number of places this results in potential significant negative effects being reduced.</u></p>
			<p><u>h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information:</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013)</u></p> <p><u>This appraisal first introduces the proposed framework to assess sustainability in Chapter 5 'A framework to assess sustainability'.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014)</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 3 'Sustainability appraisal methodology' sets out a description of the methodology use to undertake the assessment and the assessment of policy options is undertaken in Appendix 2. Alternatives were not selected at this stage as the report was based on policy options.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 3 'Sustainability appraisal methodology' sets out a description of the methodology use to undertake the</u></p>

				<p><u>assessment. This chapter also sets out where there were technical deficiencies in which specific data was not available at the time of the SA assessments an uncertain effect was identified in the full appraisals.</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 4 'Reasons for selecting/rejecting policy alternatives' sets out an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with.</u></p> <p><u>Appendix 2 'Sustainability appraisal of policies and site options' provides the full appraisal of policy and site options. The appraisal applies the sustainability appraisal methodology including identifying any difficulties encountered in compiling the required information, where there were technical deficiencies in which specific data was not available at the time of the SA assessments, an uncertain effect was identified in the full appraisals. Page 192 sets out the appraisal guidance followed when applying the pre-mitigation scoring system to potential allocation sites. It's noted that in some cases the scoring could differ from the guidance due to site specific context and a cumulative approach was taken when assessing allocation sites within each objective.</u></p> <p><u>Appendix 3 'Undeliverable site options' sets out the sites which were not deemed deliverable by the SHLAA panel.</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>Paragraphs 2-9 of the SA Update (2017) describe the methodology that has been used throughout the SA process including where there were technical deficiencies in which specific data was not available at the time of the SA assessments an uncertain effect was identified in the full appraisals. The table following paragraph 9 sets out the assumptions that have been applied to the SA of potential site allocations.</u></p> <p><u>Information about the reasons for selecting additional reasonable options for appraisal is provided in Annex 2 of the SA Update (2017).</u></p>
			<p><u>i) a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring:</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 5 'Monitoring' of the report sets out a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring.</u></p>
			<p><u>j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>A non-technical summary was published with the full Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015).</u></p>
			<p><u>The report must include the information that may reasonably be required taking</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013)</u></p>

			<p><u>into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Article 5.2)</u></p>	<p><u>Provided an introduction and context of Mid Devon District and the proposed Plan. The Report considered relevant plans and programmes, baseline information about Mid Devon, Sustainability issues and problems and set out a framework to assess sustainability for consultation.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014)</u></p> <p><u>Provided the same provisions as the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013) and was updated to demonstrate the latest information available at the time of publication and in response to the initial consultation the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013). This report also first introduces the findings of appraisal work on the policies proposed in the Local Plan Review and the likely significant effects. It provides a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties encountered in compiling the required information. It also makes recommendations for mitigation measures. However decisions for preferred alternatives were not taken at this stage as the Plan was out for consultation on the options for the Local Plan Review. Chapter 1 set out the compliance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Regulations which identifies three areas that would</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><u>be more appropriately addressed at a later stage of the SA process; the outline of the reasons for selecting alternatives dealt with, a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring and the non-technical summary.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Provided the same provisions of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014) and was updated to demonstrate the latest information available at the time of publication. The update also responded to the consultation on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014). This report introduces a mitigation column in the appraisals which sets out revised scores demonstrating how the mitigation proposed could affect the SA scores. The Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015) also sets out an outline of reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring and provides a non-technical summary. The SA Proposed Submission incorporates all of the information reasonably required.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>As noted in paragraph 1 of the update report, the update to the</u></p>
--	--	--	---

				<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken to take into account comments made at the 2015 Proposed Submission Stage consultation and proposed modifications to the Local Plan Review. The requirements not met in the SA Update (2017) are met in previous iterations of the Sustainability Appraisal.</u></p>
<u>Who should be consulted during SEA/SA process</u>				
<p><u>Authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Article 5.4)</u></p>			<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013):</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 6 'Consultation' identifies that the Council provided the opportunity to the three statutory environmental consultation bodies at the time of the scoping report which were Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage (now Historic England). The opportunity to comment on the scope and level of detail of the information contained within the scoping report was also provided to local communities and other bodies on 8 July 2013 for 6 weeks. Every person and organisation including statutory consultees that appeared on the Mid Devon Local Development Framework database at the time of publication was informed of the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan Review Scoping Report and associated documents including the Sustainability Appraisal.</u></p>	
<p><u>Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public.</u></p>			<p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2014):</u></p>	

			<p><u>shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Article 6.1, 6.2)</u></p>	<p><u>Chapter 4 'Next steps' invites representations on the contents of the Local Plan Review and this accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. Consultation was held on 24th January 2014 for 8 weeks. Every person and organisation including statutory consultees that appeared on the Mid Devon Local Development Framework database at the time of publication was informed of the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan Review Options Consultation Report and associated documents including the Sustainability Appraisal.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Consultation was held on 9th February 2015 for 11 weeks. Every person and organisation including statutory consultees that appeared on the Mid Devon Local Development Framework database at the time of publication was informed of the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Report and associated documents including the Sustainability Appraisal.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>Consultation was held on 3rd January 2017 for 6 weeks. Every person and organisation including</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><u>statutory consultees that appeared on the Mid Devon Local Development Framework database at the time of publication was informed of the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Report (incorporating proposed modifications) and associated documents including the Sustainability Appraisal.</u></p>
		<p><u>Other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Article 7)</u></p>	<p><u>Not relevant to the SA of the Mid Devon Local Plan.</u></p>
<p><u>Decision-making</u></p>			
		<p><u>The environmental report and the results of the consultations must be taken into account in decision-making (Article 8)</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013)</u></p> <p><u>Consultation was undertaken on the Local Plan Review Scoping Report and the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.</u></p> <p><u>Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (2014)</u></p> <p><u>The Local Plan Review Options Consultation report was submitted to Cabinet on 9 January 2014 and was agreed for approval for public consultation and authority to be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, to make minor editorial</u></p>

			<p><u>changes to the text and maps.</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 3 'Sustainability appraisal methodology' of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (2014) sets out a summary of the consultation responses received during 2013 consultation Local Plan Review Scoping Report and the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2013) and noted that the SA would be updated following consultation to take account of the responses received during the consultation.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015)</u></p> <p><u>The Local Plan Review Proposed Submission report was submitted to three Cabinet meetings for approval for publication and submission subject to confirmation by Full Council by area (West, Central and East) on 27 November, 4 December and 11 December 2014. Relevant extracts from the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report was provided at each Cabinet meeting. The full Sustainability Appraisal was also made available to members on the Council's website to be considered alongside reports pack. Approval was also sought for the Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the Strategic Environmental Assessment, the Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment and other evidence produced in the process of the plan's preparation to be</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>published for consultation alongside the Local Plan. Thirdly approval was sought for authority given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, to make minor changes to the text and maps. Final approval by Full Council was made on the 17th December 2014 for consultation in 2015.</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 3 'Sustainability appraisal methodology' of the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015) sets out a summary of the consultation responses received during the two previous consultations on the Local Plan Review and Sustainability Appraisal and notes that the comments were incorporated into the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015).</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 4 'Reasons for selecting/rejecting policy alternatives' sets out a summary of the reasons for selecting/rejecting the strategic, allocation and development management policy alternatives.</u></p> <p><u>A statement of consultation before Local Plan publication was provided at the same time of consultation which set out the main issues raised during previous consultation and how these were responded to. Comments received in previous consultations and how the sustainability appraisal results</u></p>
--	--	--	---

				<p><u>were taken into account in decision-making are also demonstrated through the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (February 2015) Consultation Summary Document.</u></p> <p><u>Request for a J27 implications Report (2016)</u></p> <p><u>A request by members was made in 2016 for a J27 implications Report which looked at the implications if members were minded to allocate J27 as part of the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission. This report was taken to Cabinet on the 15 September 2016 which set out the history of the J27 proposal and decisions previously made by members and the implications of allocating J27. The report also identified that if members were minded to make a modification to the plan to allocate land at J27, sites for an additional 260 dwellings will also need to be allocated in the Local Plan. Alternative housing option sites were set out to members based on a selection criteria as follows: sites previously consulted on as part of the Local Plan Review Options consultation (January 2014) or received as a local plan representation; sites considered by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Panel; compliance with the Local Plan Review Distribution Strategy; and proximate to the development proposal at Junction 27.</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><u>The 2015 SA was publically available at the time the Implications Report was presented to members in 2016 and the draft 2015 SA was presented to members previously in the 2014 Cabinet (27 November, 4 December, 11 December) and Council meetings (17 December 2014). The Sustainability Appraisal was not mentioned in the Implications Report; however there is an apparent synergy in the reasons set out in the Implications Report and the Sustainability Appraisal (2015).</u></p> <p><u>Cabinet proposed a recommendation to Council that a 6 week consultation period take place prior to the submission of the Local Plan, Land at Junction 27 of the M5 be allocated for leisure retail and tourism development and associated additional housing sites giving the extra provision of 260 additional homes be allocated at Blundells Road, Tiverton and Higher Town, Sampford Peverell. The recommendations of Cabinet as set out above were taken to Council on 22 September 2016 and were approved. The plan as a whole was subsequently considered at the meetings of Cabinet on 21 November and Council 01 December 2016 where it was agreed that the Local Plan Review incorporating proposed modifications be publicised and consulted on for 6 weeks, and that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Cabinet</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><u>Member for Planning for the plan's subsequent submission to the Planning Inspectorate for examination together with its supporting documentation. After consultation, the plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate together with supporting documentation on 31st March 2017 under the delegated authority.</u></p> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017)</u></p> <p><u>The Local Plan Review Proposed Submission report (incorporating proposed modifications) was submitted to Cabinet on 21 November 2016 for a recommendation of approval for publication and consultation, and that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning for the plan's subsequent submission to the Planning Inspectorate for examination together with its supporting documentation to full Council. The amended Local Plan Review incorporated the recommendations made at Council on 22 September 2016. A summary of the modifications proposed were summarised in the report pack with the full schedule of modifications appended to the report for viewing.</u></p> <p><u>The report references the Sustainability Appraisal and the findings of the Sustainability</u></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><u>Appraisal process. The report notes that the Local Plan Review has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal during its preparation. The appraisal is an iterative process informing the development of the Local Plan Review and has been published alongside each stage of consultation. The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the likely significant effects of the Local Plan, focussing on the environmental, economic and social impacts. The latest version was updated to consider the latest available evidence including reasonable alternatives proposed through consultation responses. The Sustainability Appraisal Update concludes that the proposals set out in the Local Plan Review together with the schedule of modifications are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives available. The report identifies that the Sustainability Appraisal and other updated evidence produced in the process of the plan's preparation will be made available for comment during the Local Plan Review proposed modifications consultation.</u></p> <p><u>The report also makes reference to the Planning Policy Advisory Group which considered all paperwork accompanying the report. The report summarises the considerations of the group and their recommendations to Cabinet. The recommendations to Cabinet on the 21 November 2016 were agreed and were submitted to full Council on 01 December 2016. The submission</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>to full Council included the report pack presented to Cabinet which contained reference to the Sustainability Appraisal for approval and were agreed.</u></p> <p><u>Para 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) sets out that this update to the Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken to take into account comments made at the 2015 Proposed Submission Stage consultation and proposed modification to the Local Plan Review. The summary matrices in Annex 2 relating to the additional reasonable alternative options considered for each policy topic include a final row which states which option has been taken forward as a proposed change to the Plan if relevant, or if no changes are proposed to the Plan policies, why this is.</u></p> <p><u>Consultation was undertaken on the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) and the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (incorporating proposed modifications) (2017). A statement of consultation was provided at the same time as this consultation which set out the main issues raised during previous three consultations and how these were responded to. Schedule of Proposed Modifications (Proposed Submission consultation) (November 2016) and the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) also demonstrate how the results of the consultations were</u></p>
--	--	--	---

				<p><u>taken into account.</u></p> <p><u>Comments received during this consultation including how the sustainability appraisal results were taken into account in decision-making are demonstrated through the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document and the schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications (2017).</u></p>
<u>Provision of information on the decision</u>				
			<p><u>When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Article 7 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the plan or programme as adopted</u> • <u>a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report of Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Article 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and</u> • <u>the measures decided concerning monitoring (Article 9)</u> 	<p><u>N/A – this requirement should be met at a later stage of the SA process.</u></p>

			<p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><u>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation must be undertaken (Article 10)</u></p> </td> <td> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 5 'Monitoring' sets out how the Plan will be monitored.</u></p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><u>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation must be undertaken (Article 10)</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 5 'Monitoring' sets out how the Plan will be monitored.</u></p>
<p><u>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation must be undertaken (Article 10)</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 5 'Monitoring' sets out how the Plan will be monitored.</u></p>				
SA13	30	Para 12	<p>Reason: to correct a typographical error in the SA Update (2017)</p> <p>Delete the word 'is' and 'as' from paragraph 12 as follows:</p> <p>“A framework is used to understand the sustainability effects of the Local Plan Review as has been developed, consisting of sustainability objectives, each of which include a number of elements against which a policy will be appraised. The framework includes all those factors highlighted within the SA that will affect the sustainability of the Local Plan Review and is central to the process of SA.</p>		
SA14	37	n/a	<p>Reason: Reference to Annex 1-3 now moved to p.2 of the SA Update in response to LUC recommendation to provide a clearer explanation of work carried out during the SA Update stage of the SA at the front of the SA Update. Annex 4 following LUC recommendation is now presented as a conclusions sections in the main body of the SA Update.</p> <p>After the SA Framework table delete the following text:</p> <p>“This update to the Sustainability Appraisal is set out as follows:</p> <p><u>Annex 1 – Sustainability Appraisal text, methodology and cumulative impact comments (p.10 – 23)</u></p> <p>This annex sets out comments from the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Consultation (2015) on the contents of the sustainability appraisal (SA) text, methodology and cumulative impacts.</p> <p><u>Annex 2 – Further reasonable alternatives, new information and comments on the sustainability appraisal of policies and sites (p.24 – 165)</u></p> <p>This annex provides a summary of additional reasonable alternatives considered and proposed changes to the sustainability appraisal for example through new information. Minor proposed changes to the Local Plan have not been assessed as these were deemed to not give rise to significant</p>		

			<p>effects.</p> <p><u>Annex 3 – Additional Reasonable Alternative Appraisals (p.166 – 337)</u> This annex provides the full appraisals used to assess reasonable alternatives where deemed necessary as summarised in Annex 2.</p> <p><u>Annex 4 – Non technical summary and overall sustainability appraisal of Plan (p.339 – 345)</u></p> <p>This annex summarises the main changes made to the Local Plan Review following the appraisal of alternatives set out in Annex 2 and assesses the overall sustainability of the proposed Local Plan. “</p>
SA15	38	Para 20	<p>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to provide a brief statement within the SA Update to evidence why disaggregated options are not considered as reasonable options for the purposes of the SA and how the J27 proposal was selected.</p> <p>Insert the following paragraphs: explaining the Junction 27 proposal and options for disaggregation and location:</p> <p><u>“Junction 27 proposal and options for disaggregation and location</u></p> <p><u>A key principle of retail planning is that main town centre uses should be allocated on the basis of a sequential test (NPPF paragraph 24). Case law in relation to development management decisions establishes that sequential test site selection must relate to the suitability of a site for the developer’s proposal not some alternative (and reduced) scheme which might be suggested by the Planning Authority (or others); see Tesco Stores Ltd v Dundee City Council [2012] UKSC13. This principle has been upheld in subsequent decisions, such as Aldergate Properties Ltd and Mansfield DC and Regal Sherwood Oaks [2016] EWHC1670. The Secretary of State also agreed with his Inspector that there was no requirement to disaggregate a mixed use tourism and retail proposal at “Rushden Lakes, Northamptonshire (APP/G2815/V/12/2190175). In relation to planning policy and plan making the National Planning Guidance provides that the sequential approach requires a thorough assessment of the suitability, viability and availability of locations for main town centre uses. It requires clearly explained reasoning if more central opportunities to locate main town centre uses are rejected. It states:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Has the need for main town centre uses been assessed? The assessment should consider the</u>

			<p><u>current situation, recent up-take of land for main town centre uses, the supply of and demand for land for main town centre uses, forecast of future need and the type of land needed for main town centre uses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Can the identified need for main town centre uses land be accommodated on town centre sites? When identifying sites, the suitability, availability and viability of the site should be considered, with particular regard to the nature of the need that is to be addressed</u> • <u>If the additional main town centre uses required cannot be accommodated in town centre sites, what are the next sequentially preferable sites that it can be accommodated on? Local Plans should contain policies to apply the sequential test to proposals for main town centre uses that may come forward outside the sites or locations allocated in the Local Plan.</u> <p><u>The Junction 27 policy is for the delivery of a major leisure destination providing mixed use development comprising travel hub, agronomy visitor centre, outdoor adventure zone and outlet shopping village. The retail element is integral to the overall proposal. It ensures the development provides a unique multifaceted visitor attraction and assists delivery in terms of viability and the inter-relationship between the elements which is seen as essential.</u></p> <p><u>In terms of Sustainability Appraisal, reasonable alternatives must be of a similar size to accommodate the proposed development i.e. around 71 ha. Apart from a “business as usual” option (i.e. not including a major mixed use tourist/retail proposal), smaller areas cannot be considered as reasonable alternatives as they would be too small to accommodate the proposal without disaggregation. It would not be appropriate to require an SA to consider sites that were ruled out as being suitable sequentially preferable sites.</u></p> <p><u>The Council’s Hearing Statement on Junction 27 as well as paragraph 3.184c of the Submitted Local Plan indicates that other areas have been considered. CBRE assessed 6 sites within and close to town centres at, Tiverton, Crediton, Taunton and Exeter and Exmouth. However these sites are too small to accommodate the proposal without disaggregation. The Council commissioned Lichfields to consider additional sites which it did not feel were fully assessed by CBRE. These were Exeter Bus and Coach Station, Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension, North West and East Cullompton. Exeter Bus and Coach Station was too small (3.3 ha) and would require disaggregation. It also appeared that the site was being promoted for a different type of development to the J27 proposal. Whilst sites within</u></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>urban extensions were in principle large enough these are subject to other proposals and are not therefore reasonable alternatives to Junction 27 (see paragraph 3.15- 3.19 of the Council's Hearing Statement J27 Issue 3</u> <u>https://www.middevon.gov.uk/media/344022/j27-mddc-2-mid-devon-council-issues-2-3-4-8-hearing-statement.pdf</u></p> <p><u>The Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) assessed the proposed modifications of the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission, including J27. It notes (p115-117) that: "On the 22nd September 2016 Full Council resolved to propose an allocation of 71 hectares between M5 Junction 27 and Willand for mixed commercial floorspace including a travel hub, agronomy visitor centre, outdoor adventure zone and outlet shopping village. The policy includes transport provision, environmental protection, a comprehensive phasing programme and public master planning exercise. In comparison to the Proposed Submission Sustainability Appraisal option, this commercial option encompasses a smaller site area, a number of the town centre uses have been withdrawn and new information has been provided to determine the retail impact. Taking the policy amendments and new information into account the allocation has been reappraised".</u></p> <p><u>It reappraised the J27 proposal against the Proposed Submission option, which was the rejected 96ha commercial scheme. The 71ha scheme (26% smaller) was found to perform better than the larger alternative. A summary matrix was presented for the Junction 27 option setting out a summary of the comparison between the 96ha site appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission (2015) report and the 71ha scheme appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017), this is reflected below.</u></p>
--	--	--

Summary Matrix – OJ27

	Preferred	Alternative
Sustainability Objective	Proposed Modifications Policy 71ha	Proposed Submission Option 96ha
A	-1	-2/?
B	0/?	0/?
C	-1/?	-1/?
D	-2	-3/?
E	+3	+3
F	+3	-3/?
G	0	0
H	+1	+2
I	+2/?	+2/?

The 2015 Sustainability Appraisal supported the Proposed Submission Local Plan Review (2015). This considered a spatial strategy and site allocations that were at the time the Council's preferred option, and as such constitutes an assessment of reasonable alternative strategies which did not incorporate a major tourism/retail proposal. The assessment from page 30 et seq of the SA sets out why sites were preferred and others rejected including options for potential a new community at Cullompton, Hartnoll Farm and J27 Willand which are assessed at page 35 and Appendix 2 p135 onwards.

A site of 96 ha at J27 is assessed for potential mixed use commercial development in Appendix 2 from p605 onwards and a more extensive urban extension of 104 ha in this location is assessed from p611. Neither of these options were considered sustainable and therefore not at that time included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan Review.

Sites to allocate in relation to the Junction 27 proposal

A request by members was made in 2016 for a J27 implications Report which looked at the implications if members were minded to allocate J27 as part of the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission. This report was taken to Cabinet on the 15th September 2016 and Council on 22nd September 2016 which set out the history of the J27 proposal and decisions previously made by members and the implications of allocating J27. The report also identified that if

			<p><u>members were minded to make a modification to the plan to allocate land at J27, sites for an additional 260 dwellings will also need to be allocated in the Local Plan. Alternative housing option sites were set out to members based on a selection criteria as follows: sites previously consulted on as part of the Local Plan Review Options consultation (January 2014) or received as a Local Plan representation; sites considered by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Panel; compliance with the Local Plan Review Distribution Strategy; and proximate to the development proposal at Junction 27.</u></p> <p><u>Individual sites were considered at an officer level where they met the selection criteria. These were then presented to members at Cabinet on 15th September and Council on the 22nd September 2016 in a collated format. Not all sites or all village locations that were considered at an officer level were referred to in the committee paperwork on the 15th or 22nd September 2016. However the reasons for rejecting site options set out in the Implications Report and the Sustainability Appraisal (2015) are broadly the same. The 2015 SA was publically available at the time the Implications Report was presented to members in 2016 and the draft 2015 SA was presented to members previously in the 2014 Cabinet (27 November, 4 December, 11 December) and Council meetings (17 December 2014).</u></p> <p><u>Following the recommendations undertaken on the 15th and 22nd September, a report was presented to Cabinet on 21st November 2016 and full Council 1st December 2017 which sought approval for publication of the Local Plan Review including main modifications and supporting evidence. This report makes reference to the Sustainability Appraisal Update and that the Planning Policy Advisory Group which considered all paperwork accompanying the report and provided their recommendations to the 15th September Cabinet. The report summarises the considerations of the group and recommendations.</u></p> <p><u>The tables below sets out a summary of the site option areas and the site options that met the criteria identified in the Implications Report. Sites with planning permission or which are already proposed for allocation are not considered as reasonable alternatives for the additional dwellings.”</u></p>
SA16	41	n/a	<p><u>In response to LUC recommendation to collate work undertaken to date to be used to inform a review of the decision making process regarding which sites to allocate in relation to Junction 27.</u></p> <p>Add Table 5 as follows:</p>

“Table 5: Summary of site option areas

<u>Site option area</u>	<u>Reason</u>
<u>Cullompton</u>	<u>Cullompton is the main focus of growth during the plan period; a significant amount of development is already programmed for Cullompton during this period. Analysis which forms part of the Local Plan Review Evidence base considers the level of infrastructure improvements, in particular strategic highways work, which would need to be delivered to accommodate the proposed level of growth. The required infrastructure improvements will be delivered in line with the phased delivery of the key strategic housing allocations planned for Cullompton. Any additional development on top of the current Local Plan allocations would therefore not be appropriate until longer-term strategic highway improvements have been delivered. Cullompton is therefore not considered as a reasonably appropriate location to meet the extra housing need.</u>
<u>Crediton</u>	<u>Crediton is not well related to the proposal at Junction 27 and is therefore not an area considered for additional residential development to meet this need.</u>
<u>Tiverton</u>	<u>Tiverton is considered as a site option area to consider reasonable alternatives for additional residential development to meet this need.</u>
<u>Villages proximate to J27</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Culmstock</u> • <u>Halberton</u> • <u>Hemyock</u> • <u>Holcombe Rogus</u> • <u>Kentisbeare</u>

			<p><u>Proximate is considered to be: 30 minutes of J27 by walking, cycling or public transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sampford Peverell</u> • <u>Uffculme</u> • <u>Willand</u>
			<p><u>Villages proximate to J27 and referred to in committee paperwork on 22nd September 2016</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Hemyock</u> • <u>Kentisbeare</u> • <u>Sampford Peverell</u> • <u>Uffculme</u> • <u>Willand</u>
			<p><u>Villages not proximate to J27</u></p> <p>The following villages were not considered as proximate to J27 and therefore were not to be considered as reasonable alternatives for additional residential development to meet this need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bampton</u> • <u>Bow</u> • <u>Bradninch</u> • <u>Chawleigh</u> • <u>Cheriton Bishop</u> • <u>Cheriton Fitzpaine</u> • <u>Copplestone</u> • <u>Lapford</u> • <u>Morchard Bishop</u> • <u>Newton St Cyres</u> • <u>Sandford</u> • <u>Silverton</u> • <u>Thorverton</u> • <u>Yeoford</u>
			<p><u>Areas not consistent with the proposed Local Plan Review distribution strategy</u></p> <p>The following areas were not considered as consistent with the proposed Local Plan Review distribution strategy as they are not defined as villages in S13 and therefore were not considered as reasonable alternatives for additional residential development to meet this need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bickleigh</u> • <u>Butterleigh</u> • <u>Burlescombe</u> • <u>Colebrooke</u> • <u>Oakford</u> • <u>Shillingford</u>
SA17	43	n/a	In response to LUC recommendation to collate work

undertaken to date to be used to inform a review of the decision making process regarding which sites to allocate in relation to Junction 27.

Add Table 6 as follows:

“Table 6 – Site options which meet the selection criteria as set out in the Implications Report

<u>Site options considered during the SA process for the Local Plan Review</u>	<u>Reasonable alternative option for additional site allocations?</u>	<u>Location of site appraisal matrix</u>	<u>Reason for selecting / rejecting option for additional housing allocation</u>
<u>Sites at Tiverton</u>			
<u>Hay Park</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u>	<u>Rejected:</u> <u>This option has not been taken forward as development would result in the loss of historic barns (to ensure adequate access visibility displays) and has surface water flooding issues associated with the water course on site.</u>
<u>Blundells School</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u>	<u>Selected:</u> <u>The site is proposed to be taken forward as an allocation and addressed in the Sustainability Update through policy TIV16. The</u>

					<p><u>site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016. It was noted at this time that the site is currently allocated in the adopted Local Plan for 200 dwellings and was due to be deleted in the Local Plan Review as the site had not come forward. However officers now understand that the land is available and developable.</u></p> <p><u>The site is significantly a brownfield site which is accessible from Tiverton town centre. Development of the site provides the opportunity for remodelling of the site to reduce flood risk downstream.</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p><u>Whilst it is located further from J27 than some other assessed sites, it is on a bus route that serves both the Tiverton town centre and J27, and the sites otherwise sustainable location is considered to outweigh the issue of distance from J27.</u></p>
			<u>Leat Street</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>In the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015) it is noted in Chapter 4 'Reasons for selecting/rejecting policy alternatives' that this option had not been taken forward as it is an existing show room and as a residential allocation would result in the loss of employment land. A large proportion of the site is also located in</u></p>

						<p><u>flood zone 2 and even with mitigation measures there would remain flooding concerns.</u></p>
			<u>The Avenue</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>Although the site scores positively on sustainability grounds the site is not being comprehensively promoted by all land owners and has not received confirmation of delivery. It is also noted that the site is located within the settlement boundary and can come forward as a windfall allocation.</u></p> <p><u>The site is potentially a reasonable alternative, but uncertainty over deliverability means that it is rejected as an allocation.</u></p>
			<u>Exeter Hill</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The site is a steeply sloping</u></p>

					<p><u>(Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p> <p><u>The SA Update in 2017 also included a revised appraisal of this site to take into account a consultation comment received.</u></p>	<p><u>site with large views of Tiverton and would be highly visible from the town. Although the level of development is relatively low, development of the site is still likely to result in a negative impact on the character of the landscape.</u></p> <p><u>It was rejected as an option for the additional housing allocation as the site would be more intrusive than other allocations.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land at Bampton Street/William Street Car Park (mixed use)</u></p>	<p><u>Uncertain</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>Although in sustainability terms the sites regeneration would be positive, the SCLAA panel has raised deliverability concerns.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst the site may be a reasonable alternative, however it is in</u></p>

						<p><u>different</u> <u>ownerships,</u> <u>which is not</u> <u>being actively</u> <u>promoted.</u> <u>The</u> <u>uncertainty</u> <u>over</u> <u>deliverability</u> <u>resulted in its</u> <u>rejection.</u> <u>However it is a</u> <u>town centre</u> <u>site and could</u> <u>be developed</u> <u>as a windfall</u> <u>site, should a</u> <u>proposal come</u> <u>forward.</u></p>
			<p><u>Hartnoll Farm</u> <u>(considered for</u> <u>both housing</u> <u>or mixed use)</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for</u> <u>the Local Plan</u> <u>Review</u> <u>(Proposed</u> <u>Submission</u> <u>consultation)</u> <u>February 2015</u> <u>– Appendix 2</u></p> <p><u>The</u> <u>Sustainability</u> <u>Appraisal</u> <u>Update (2017)</u> <u>included</u> <u>revised</u> <u>appraisal work</u> <u>to consider the</u> <u>site as a</u> <u>revised mixed</u> <u>use allocation.</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The</u> <u>full site area</u> <u>would extend</u> <u>Tiverton to the</u> <u>East</u> <u>substantially</u> <u>on the valley</u> <u>floor which</u> <u>would</u> <u>significantly</u> <u>close the gap</u> <u>between urban</u> <u>areas and</u> <u>nearby</u> <u>villages,</u> <u>especially</u> <u>Halberton. It</u> <u>would also</u> <u>increase the</u> <u>distance from</u> <u>the town</u> <u>centre and</u> <u>services,</u> <u>resulting in</u> <u>increased car</u> <u>use and</u> <u>reduced</u> <u>sustainability.</u> <u>The majority of</u></p>

					<p><u>the site is classed as agricultural grade 1 land development could impact on the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area to the South and the East of the site which is also classed as a County Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve.</u></p> <p><u>The Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) included revised appraisal work to consider the site as a revised mixed use allocation which was proposed through the Sustainability Appraisal (2015) consultation. It was rejected as an option given the issues around the protection and promotion of a quality built and historic environment in which the coalescence of</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><u>Tiverton and the village of Halberton which has its own separate identity cannot be mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016, options presented included an addition of 480 dwellings which could be provided within the existing planned for infrastructure constraints recognised in the existing adopted Local Plan site Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension. The report notes that if the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension site which is currently allocated in the Local Plan was to be extended to allow for the</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p><u>additional housing it would be logical for this to include land at Hartnoll Farm which abuts the current urban extension. The full extent of the Hartnoll Farm site (70ha) was considered as part of the Local Plan Review Options Consultation (2014) and Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015). The implications report noted that if only part of this site was needed it would be sensible for this to comprise the western and southern parts of the site which are predominantly Grade 3 agricultural land and are well screened from wider views. This would allow for the areas</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p><u>adjoining the Grand Western Canal to be left undeveloped whilst also maintaining the strategic green gap between the edge of Tiverton and Halberton village which was identified as one of the key reasons for rejection in the Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission report (2015). The Implications Report notes that a new access, or reconfiguration of the current Hartnoll Farm/employment land access arrangements, would be needed to allow development to occur independently of the development of the current eastern urban extension. The report recommends</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p><u>that if members were minded to allocate some land at the Hartnoll Farm an option 200 dwellings should be proposed to allow flexibility for the further refinement of densities at the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension should this be necessary. This site was not preferred at the Full Council meeting on 22nd September 2016 and therefore not taken forward as a proposed allocation for the additional dwellings.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land at Seven Crosses Hill</u></p>	<p><u>No</u></p>	<p><u>The Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) included appraisal work to consider the site.</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> This site came forward during the consultation on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (2015) but it was rejected as a housing allocation as there were a number of</p>

					<p><u>constraints to the site including topography and highways access.</u></p> <p><u>The site is to the south west of Tiverton and is steeply sloping. It is 7.69 ha and would therefore be too large to meet the identified need.</u></p>	
Sites at the Villages						
			<p><u>Culmstock Glebe and Rackfields, Culmstock</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The two sites ‘Glebe and Rackfields’ and ‘The Croft’ in Culmstock were not preferred as they were within the elevated southern part of the village, with greater potential for landscape and visual impacts. This part of the village also contains the core of the conservation area, which is focussed around All Saints Church. There is</u></p>

						<p><u>greater potential for the impact on the conservation area should either of these sites be developed which can be avoided by selecting others. In addition these two sites in the village received the greatest level of objection of all the village's sites during the Options consultation.</u></p>
			<p><u>The Croft, Culmstock</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The two sites 'Glebe and Rackfields' and 'The Croft' in Culmstock were not preferred as they were within the elevated southern part of the village, with greater potential for landscape and visual impacts. This part of the village also contains the core of the conservation area, which is focussed around All</u></p>

						<p><u>Saints Church.</u> <u>There is greater potential for the impact on the conservation area should either of these sites be developed which can be avoided by selecting others. In addition these two sites in the village received the greatest level of objection of all the village's sites during the Options consultation.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land at Blundells Road, Halberton</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The site is within the conservation area with the potential for negative impacts which can be avoided by allocated other sites. Land at Blundells Road was also not favoured by the Parish Council.</u></p> <p><u>The Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) refers to a</u></p>

						<p><u>number of consultation comments relating to this site but no changes have been made to the SA work undertaken previously and it remains rejected as a site option.</u></p>
			<p><u>New Site: The Pethers, Halberton</u></p>	<p><u>Yes No</u></p>	<p><u>This site came forward during the consultation on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (2015). The Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) included appraisal work to consider the site.</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The site is rejected as a preferred site.</u></p> <p><u>The site was put forward as an alternative to Policy HA1 in Halberton with a capacity of up to 10 dwellings in 2015. It has outline permission (17/0019/OUT) for 5 dwellings.</u></p> <p><u>It is therefore too small to be a reasonable alternative for additional site allocation to meet the need for J27.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land South West of Conigar Close, Hemyock</u></p>	<p><u>No</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015</u></p>	<p><u>The site now has planning permission (17/00746/MA RM for 22 dwellings 23/08/2017)</u></p>

					<u>– Appendix 2</u>	<u>so is no longer a reasonable option for meeting the additional housing need, but will instead be part of the general local plan requirement.</u>
			<u>Culmbridge Farm, Hemyock</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u>	<u>Rejected:</u> <u>The four alternative sites presented in Hemyock are all greenfield sites within the location of the Blackdown Hills AONB and the impact on the special qualities of the landscape designation is a factor to consider. The four greenfield sites all have the potential for some landscape and visual impact in the context of the Blackdown Hills AONB and therefore are not preferred.</u> <u>The site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to</u>

						<p><u>Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016. It was noted that sites in Hemyock were not favoured owing to their scale and impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land north of Culmbridge Farm, Hemyock</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The four alternative sites presented in Hemyock are all greenfield sites within the location of the Blackdown Hills AONB and the impact on the special qualities of the landscape designation is a factor to consider. The four greenfield sites all have the potential for some landscape and visual impact in the context of the Blackdown Hills AONB and therefore are not preferred.</u></p>

						<p><u>The site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016. It was noted that sites in Hemyock were not favoured owing to their scale and impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land adj. cemetery. Hemyock</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>The four alternative sites presented in Hemyock are all greenfield sites within the location of the Blackdown Hills AONB and the impact on the special qualities of the landscape designation is a factor to consider. The four greenfield sites all have the potential for some landscape and visual impact in the context of the</u></p>

						<p><u>Blackdown Hills AONB and therefore are not preferred.</u></p> <p><u>The site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016. It was noted that sites in Hemyock were not favoured owing to their scale and impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land by Kentisbeare Village Hall, Kentisbeare (mixed use)</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>This site received a number of objections during the Options Consultation. Although it is an existing allocation, it has not come forward since being allocated in 2010, for these reasons it is not proposed to be retained in the Local</u></p>

						<p><u>Plan Review.</u></p> <p><u>The site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016. It was noted that land was previously included in the Local Plan at Kentisbeare next to the Village Hall as an affordable housing allocation for 20 dwellings. This was removed owing to a lack of impetus in the site coming forward for affordable housing and due to strong objection from the Parish Council. However if allocated for a mix of market and affordable housing it is considered that it would come forward for development. This site was</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><u>not supported by the Planning Policy Advisory Group and was not preferred.</u></p>
			<p><u>Higher Town, Sampford Peverell</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Selected:</u> In the <u>Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Submission Report (2015)</u> it is noted in <u>Chapter 4 'Reasons for selecting/rejecting policy alternatives'</u> it is stated that <u>this option was not preferred because it had the potential for greater landscape or visual impacts. As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017), criteria have now been included in the policy to ensure landscaping and design respects the setting and character of the area, conservation area and listed</u></p>

						<p><u>building.</u></p> <p><u>The site is proposed to be taken forward as an additional allocation and addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017) through policy SP2. The site was considered as part of the J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016. It was noted at this time that Land at Higher Town could provide 60 dwellings. The site is elevated and would require careful landscaping and mitigation measures.</u></p> <p><u>The development is proportionate to the scale of the existing village. The Highway Authority has advised that</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><u>any development of the site should be phased until after improved access to the A361.</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that other potential sites in Sampford Peverell were not considered to be of an appropriate scale or would impact adversely on heritage assets.</u></p> <p><u>Several of the sites in Sampford Peverell are reasonable alternatives, and have similar landscape or heritage characteristics. They have an advantage of being slightly closer to J27 than Higher Town.</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><u>However, they are part of more extensive tracts of land, and their allocation would result in larger housing sites than the identified additional need for 60 dwellings. It would not be realistic to seek to artificially subdivide sites to limit the number of units that are developed. As such, development of a number of potentially suitable sites in Sampford Peverell would result in much more significant expansion of the village This would be contrary to the spatial strategy in Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Review, which concentrates development in the three main towns and has limited development</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p><u>in other settlements aimed at meeting local needs and promoting vibrant communities.</u></p> <p><u>Conversely SP2 is a naturally enclosed site, bounded by hedgerows and road, and its development would be of a scale acceptable within the parameters of Policy S2 and local infrastructure constraints.</u></p> <p><u>The location of the site on the west of the village is considered to be only a minor disadvantage compared to the other sites in the village.</u></p> <p><u>The site is being actively promoted and is deliverable.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land off Whitnage Road, Sampford Peverell</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission</u></p>	<p>Rejected: <u>This option is located adjacent to the A361, sharing</u></p>

					<u>consultation)</u> <u>February 2015</u> <u>– Appendix 2</u>	<u>a long</u> <u>boundary with</u> <u>this busy road.</u> <u>Such a site</u> <u>therefore has</u> <u>greater</u> <u>potential for</u> <u>negative</u> <u>impacts from</u> <u>noise on the</u> <u>general</u> <u>amenity of</u> <u>future</u> <u>residents</u> <u>which can be</u> <u>avoided by</u> <u>allocating</u> <u>alternative</u> <u>sites.</u> <u>The J27</u> <u>Implications</u> <u>Report</u> <u>presented to</u> <u>Cabinet 15th</u> <u>September</u> <u>2016 and Full</u> <u>Council 22nd</u> <u>September</u> <u>2016 noted</u> <u>that other</u> <u>potential sites</u> <u>in Sampford</u> <u>Peeverell were</u> <u>not considered</u> <u>to be of an</u> <u>appropriate</u> <u>scale or would</u> <u>impact</u> <u>adversely on</u> <u>heritage</u> <u>assets.</u>
			<u>Land at</u> <u>Mountain Oak</u> <u>Farm,</u> <u>Sampford</u> <u>Peeverell</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for</u> <u>the Local Plan</u> <u>Review</u> <u>(Proposed</u> <u>Submission</u> <u>consultation)</u>	<u>Rejected: This</u> <u>option is a</u> <u>large site</u> <u>slightly</u> <u>divorced from</u> <u>the main body</u>

					<p><u>February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p> <p>of the village, and does not offer the most logical extension to the built extent.</p> <p>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that other potential sites in Sampford Peverell were not considered to be of an appropriate scale or would impact adversely on heritage assets.</p> <p>See above under the rationale for selecting Higher Town.</p>	
			<p><u>Morrells Farm, Sampford Peverell (SHLAA site 6)</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p>Rejected: This option is a very large site which has a poor spatial relation with the village, it is out of scale with the settlement and divorced from the main built</p>

						<p><u>extent of Sampford Peverell. Although a smaller element of the site could be allocated there is currently very little development in the vicinity of the site and as such there is the greater potential for landscape and visual impacts.</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that other potential sites in Sampford Peverell were not considered to be of an appropriate scale or would impact adversely on heritage assets.</u></p> <p><u>See above under the rationale for selecting Higher Town.</u></p>
			<u>Morrells Farm</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for</u>	<u>Rejected: This</u>

			<p><u>adj. the main road, Sampford Peverell (SHLAA site 3&4)</u></p>		<p><u>the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>option would likely have an impact on the Grade II farmhouse, and would have a detrimental impact on the significance, character and appearance of the conservation area, particularly as the proposed access point requires demolition of a stone frontage wall and a group of traditional farm buildings (all within the conservation area).</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that other potential sites in Sampford Peverell were not considered to be of an appropriate scale or would impact adversely on</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p><u>heritage assets.</u></p> <p><u>See above under the rationale for selecting Higher Town.</u></p>	
			<p><u>Land adjoining Poynings, Uffculme</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> <u>This option is located within an area of the village which is elevated and has a more distinctly rural character, with fewer buildings and with access being from the generally narrow Chapel Hill. The potential for change in character and visual and or landscape impacts determined the decision not to allocate this site.</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Uffculme were considered.</u></p>

						<p><u>however were not proposed as allocations for the additional housing as the sites were not deemed to be appropriate extensions to the village, had access difficulties and some were in Minerals Safeguarding Areas.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land adjacent Sunnysdene, Uffculme</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> This option is <u>located at the edge of the settlement where the nearest dwellings are very low density and is accessed off the narrow Clay Lane. Although technically deliverable, the nature of the location of the site at some distance along the single carriageway lane is considered sufficient basis not to allocate.</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report</u></p>

						<p><u>presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Uffculme were considered, however were not proposed as allocations for the additional housing as the sites were not deemed to be appropriate extensions to the village, had access difficulties and some were in Minerals Safeguarding Areas.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land off Chapel Hill, Uffculme</u></p>	<p><u>No</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>This option has been confirmed as unavailable since the inclusion in the Local Plan Review Options Consultation (2014). Therefore this site is not a reasonable alternative to consider.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land off Ashley Road, Uffculme</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review</u></p>	<p><u>Rejected:</u> This option has planning</p>

					<p><u>(Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>permission on the southern extent and the northern extent is within the Hillhead Quarry Consultation Zone. The northern extent is also elevated in comparison with the adjacent housing to the east which could result in overlooking. For these reasons, the site is not preferred.</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Uffculme were considered, however were not proposed as allocations for the additional housing as the sites were not deemed to be appropriate extensions to the village, had access</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

						<p><u>difficulties and some were in Minerals Safeguarding Areas.</u></p>
			<p><u>Land west of Uffculme, Uffculme</u></p>	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p>	<p><u>The development of this site would extend the pattern of the village in a linear fashion along the B3440. It would also result in long walking distances to the village's facilities, in particular the primary and secondary schools. In addition, inspectors have previously drawn attention to the present boundary of the village, to the front of Harvester, being a defined feature beyond which the village should not be extended. Further to a subsequent appeal decision and alternative inspector's comments, the</u></p>

						<p><u>majority option site area now has planning permission. The area with planning permission is now included in the Local Plan Review to reflect the decision at appeal. The option is therefore no longer reasonable.</u></p> <p><u>The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Uffculme were considered, however were not proposed as allocations for the additional housing as the sites were not deemed to be appropriate extensions to the village, had access difficulties and some were in Minerals Safeguarding Areas.</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<u>Quicks Farm. Willand</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u>	<u>Rejected:</u> <u>Although the site scores favourably in the SA, it received the greatest level of objection of all sites in the village during the Options consultation and therefore was not preferred at the time. The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Willand were considered. Although there were developable sites in the village, sites in Willand were not recommended as Devon County Council had advised that development of these sites would exacerbate traffic problems prior to planned future</u>
--	--	--	-----------------------------	------------	--	---

					<u>improvements.</u>
			<u>Dean Hill Road, Willand</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u></p> <p>Rejected: <u>The site is divorced from the main body of Willand by the motorway. The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Willand were considered. Although there were developable sites in the village, sites in Willand were not recommended as Devon County Council had advised that development of these sites would exacerbate traffic problems prior to planned future improvements.</u></p>
			<u>Land NE of Four Crosses Roundabout, Willand</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<p><u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission</u></p> <p>Rejected: <u>The site is very large which would expand the village</u></p>

					<u>consultation) February 2015 – Appendix 2</u>	<u>beyond the boundary currently delineated by the busy roads of the B3181 and B3440. The J27 Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Willand were considered. Although there were developable sites in the village, sites in Willand were not recommended as Devon County Council had advised that development of these sites would exacerbate traffic problems prior to planned future improvements.</u>
			<u>Lloyd Maunder Way, Willand</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>SA Report for the Local Plan Review (Proposed Submission consultation) February 2015</u>	<u>Rejected: The site is divorced from the main body of Willand by the motorway. The J27</u>

					– Appendix 2	<p><u>Implications Report presented to Cabinet 15th September 2016 and Full Council 22nd September 2016 noted that sites in Willand were considered. Although there were developable sites in the village, sites in Willand were not recommended as Devon County Council had advised that development of these sites would exacerbate traffic problems prior to planned future improvements.</u></p>
SA18	60	Para 32	<p><u>Reason: In response to LUC recommendation to present Annex 4 which includes a summary of updated SA findings could usefully be presented as a conclusions section in the main body of the SA Update.</u></p> <p><u>Move Annex 4 to the main body of the report and re-title 'Summary and Conclusions'.</u></p> <p><u>“Summary and Conclusions</u></p> <p><u>This chapter summarises the main changes made to the Local Plan Review following the appraisal of alternatives set out in Annex 2 and assesses the overall sustainability of the proposed Local Plan. The development of the Local Plan</u></p>			

Review has been an on-going and iterative process with key pieces of evidence influencing the selection and rejection of options. Through the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Consultation (2015) a number of alternatives were proposed, along with the presentation of new information. As a result a number of modifications to the proposed policies and supporting text of the plan are proposed. The full details of these proposed alternatives and new information are provided in annex 2 and 3. Annex 2 also sets out the reasons for selecting/rejecting the alternatives proposed. This annex summarises the main changes to the Local Plan Review following the appraisal of alternatives set out in annex 2, and assesses the overall sustainability of the Local Plan Review.

Strategic Policies

Policy S2: Amount and Distribution of development

An alternative to amend the dwelling target to 7,860 to meet the objectively assessed housing need (OAN) with the additional housing requirements of Junction 27 is preferred due to new information presented in the finalised Strategic Housing Market Area report which became available during the consultation on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (2015) and following the Council decision on 22nd September 2016 to propose to allocate land at Junction 27 for a strategic scale employment site. Similarly the higher commercial growth scenario including the Junction 27 option is proposed as a modification to the plan.

Policy S3: Meeting housing needs

Updates to the policy are proposed given the change to the OAN suggested in policy S2.

Policy S4: Ensuring housing delivery

Updates to the policy are proposed given the change to the OAN suggested in policy S2.

Policy S5: Public open space

A change to the wording is proposed to clarify that the policy refers to the parish boundaries of the settlements noted.

Policy S12: Crediton

An additional criterion is proposed in the policy which is as follows 'community and education facilities and other infrastructure to support the development proposed' to reflect the need for a new primary school in Crediton.

Policy S14: Countryside

The removal of reference to the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation in this policy is proposed to ensure the Plan is in conformity with national policy in which the 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' (2015) which requires that new sites for travellers should be very strictly limited in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan.

Site Allocations

Tiverton

TIV1-TIV5 Eastern Urban Extension

The policy is proposed to be amended to consider a housing range of 1580-1830 which reflects the permissions granted on area A and the potential for increased density in area B.

TIV14 Wynnards Mead

The policy is proposed to be deleted to reflect new information regarding the historic environment and flood risk.

OTIV4 Blundells School (Proposed for allocation TIV16)

This site is proposed to be allocated following the Council decision on the 22nd September to allocate land at Blundells School for residential development. New information provided includes the support of developing the site from the Environment Agency which has resulted in this proposed policy scoring more positively than the option considered in the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission consultation (2015).

Cullompton

CU1-CU6 North West Cullompton

Contributions from development to the Town Centre relief road and Junction 28 are proposed as modifications to the policy. In-line with the adopted North West Cullompton masterplan a change to the total commercial floorspace is proposed. The re-allocation of land to the south west of the site is also proposed.

CU7-CU12 East Cullompton

An additional criterion is proposed to ensure the setting of listed buildings adjoining the site is respected.

CU19 Town Centre Relief Road

Two additional criteria are proposed to ensure the protection of the setting of listed buildings and conservation area, and the provision of archaeological investigation and mitigation.

CU20 Cullompton Infrastructure

An additional criterion to state 'provision of works to reduce flood risk' has proposed as a modification to the plan.

Crediton

CRE2 Red Hill Cross, Exhibition Road

Additional supporting text is proposed to reflect the recommendation in the HEA to provide appropriate mitigation for Shobrooke Park to the east.

CRE3 Cromwells Meadow

Additional supporting text is proposed to reflect the recommendation in the HEA to provide appropriate mitigation for Shobrooke Park to the east. An additional criterion is also proposed to ensure archaeological investigation and mitigation.

CRE4 Woods Group

Additional supporting text is recommended which identifies non-listed heritages within the site.

CRE5 Pedlerspool

Amendment to the policy is made which includes the provision of a new school but removes the extra care scheme element in the policy.

CRE7 Stonewall Lane

A change to the supporting text of the Plan is recommended to ensure that adequate landscaping is provided to protect the heritage assets associated with the adjoining Creedy Park.

CRE10 Land south of A377

A change to the policy is proposed to include a small area to the south of the allocation up to the edge of the swale, covered by recent consent sought by Mole Avon. Although the scoring is lower for the pre-mitigation score of objective c)

mitigating the effects of climate change, it is considered appropriate and reasonable to allocate the original site area which has outline consent. Detailed design to mitigate flood risk will be considered at the reserved matters planning application stage. Mitigation through sensitive design with appropriate choice of materials and landscaping is also recommended for inclusion within the policy. An amendment to the supporting text is further proposed to make reference to the latest flood data and implications from redevelopment with mitigation measures such as layout, site and flood levels.

CRE11 Crediton Infrastructure

The following criterion is proposed for inclusion 'provision of works to reduce flood risk'.

Junction 27

Junction 27, M5 Motorway

An additional policy is proposed to reflect the Council decision on 22nd September 2016 to allocate land for tourism, leisure and retail at Junction 27 of the M5 motorway. Changes to the policy are reflected in the sustainability appraisal.

Rural Areas

School Close, Bampton

An allocation for 0.54(ha) 26 dwellings is proposed as a modification to the Plan. The site is currently allocated and was omitted in error as some of the site has been built out. For consistency, similar to other sites in the plan, the remaining area of the allocation which has not yet been built is proposed to remain as an allocation in the Plan.

CH1 Barton, Chawleigh

An additional criterion to state 'design solutions which respects the setting of the conservation area and listed building' is proposed. An amendment to the supporting text is also proposed to ensure appropriate landscaping to mitigate any potential impact on the conservation area and listed buildings.

CF1 Barnhill Close, Cheriton Fitzpaine

An additional criterion to minimise the impact on the conservation area and listed building is proposed.

HA1 Land adjacent Fishers Way, Halberton

An amendment to policy HA1 is proposed to delete reference to the need to 'archaeological investigations and appropriate mitigation measures' given the new information provided by the Devon County Council Archaeology Team that the proposed allocation will not impact on any known heritage assets and state that they would not need to be consulted should an application come forward. The addition of a criterion to ensure mitigation through appropriate design, materials and landscaping is proposed to protect the setting of Halberton conservation area is also proposed.

HE1 Depot, Hemyock

This site is proposed for deletion given the representations made during the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (2015) consultation raises an issue with the deliverability of the site during the plan period and is therefore no longer considered a reasonable alternative. The site will have a limited impact on the Local Plan as a whole given its size of 10 dwellings and may still come forward as a windfall site as it falls within the settlement limit.

NE1 Court Orchard, Newton St Cyres

A change to the policy and supporting text is proposed to ensure design which respects the setting of the conservation area.

OSP1 Higher Town, Sampford Peverell (Proposed for allocation SP2)

This site is proposed to be allocated following the Council decision on the 22nd September to allocate land at Higher Town for residential development. Since the proposed submission SA there has been confirmation that access is achievable and therefore the uncertainty has been removed.

OUF3 Land west of Uffculme (Proposed for allocation UF1)

A change to the plan is proposed to allocate this site given a 2016 appeal decision (APP/Y1138/W/15/3025120) allowing outline planning permission for a site of 3.49ha with 60 dwellings. Conclusions in the inspectors report have fed into the sustainability appraisal in which objectives b) built and historic environment and h) ensuring community health and wellbeing score more positively.

WI2 Willand Industrial Estate

The full allocation of 9.2ha, 22,000sqm of commercial

floorspace is proposed to be allocated given that the Council's original reasons for not allocating the full site have been addressed as the remainder of the site is now deliverable.

Managing Development

DM28 Other protected sites

The inclusion of reference to compensatory measures is proposed as a change to the policy to raise that in some cases where mitigation measures are not possible then compensatory measures may be appropriate.

Secondary/Cumulative/Synergistic impacts

Tiverton

Additional detail has been provided in the supporting text of S10 to reflect the cumulative traffic impacts on Junction 27 to be considered.

Cullompton

Additional criterion and supporting text has been included under a number of Cullompton allocation policies to reflect the cumulative impact on the road network.

Crediton

Additional text is provided in CRE7 to recognise the need for a Transport Assessment that will comprehensively assess the transport issues related to the development of the site, taking into account the potential cumulative impact of nearby allocations.

J27 Commercial Development

Additional evidence since the previous SA was commissioned specifically to examine the potential related housing implications of the proposed strategic scale employment site at Junction 27 on the M5 motorway. The results suggest a need of an additional 260 dwellings within Mid Devon District Council over the plan period. A Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Mid Devon Local Plan Review including Junction 27 has been undertaken which concludes that the J27 site allocation, alone or in combination with the Local Plan proposals, will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Culm Grasslands SAC.

Overall Sustainability of the Local Plan Review

In this latest update to the SA, changes to the Plan are proposed to take into account comments from representations, additional reasonable alternatives considered and new information presented including the latest national policy changes. Updates from the latest appeal decisions and planning applications have also been taken to account to ensure policies proposed are as up-to-date as possible.

Of the changes, the majority propose minor alterations to the proposed policies or supporting text. The main amendments to the Plan include the proposed allocation of land at Junction 27 of the M5 motorway and associated housing and an amended housing total to reflect the most recent evidence on the housing needs in the area. OSP1, Sampford Peverell (proposed as SP4 within the plan) and OTIV4, Blundells School (proposed as TIV16 within the plan) are proposed for allocation in response to the housing implications of allocating the strategic scale employment site at Junction 27 of the M5 motorway. The option to include Junction 27 presents a significant positive impact on promoting economic growth and employment. Controls are set in policy to ensure aspects such as retail development is supported, necessary infrastructure is delivered and housing need is met. As such overall it is considered to result in a positive impact on the plan.

Wynnards Mead, Tiverton (contingency site) is proposed for deletion due to new evidence provided in relation to issues around flooding and the historic environment. School Close, Bampton (proposed as BA4 within the plan) has been included, which was previously omitted in error. HE1 Deport, Hemyock is proposed for deletion due to an issue of its deliverability within the plan period. OUF3 Land West of Uffculme is also included as an allocation following a 2016 appeal decision (APP/Y1138/W/15/3025120), allowing outline planning permission for a site of 3.49ha with 60 dwellings. Also the full allocation of 9.2ha, 22,000sqm of commercial floorspace is proposed at Willand Industrial Estate given that the Council's original reasons for not allocating the full site have been addressed as the remainder of the site is now deliverable.

In general, the emerging Local Plan Review has been found to have a wide range of positive and significant positive effects on the objectives both cumulatively and through individual policies, although a number of potentially adverse impacts still remain. Recommendations made in previous iterations of the SA report and this updated SA report as well as controls through policy has provided mitigation for potential adverse effects. Of the main changes proposed in this iteration of the SA, the main negative impact on the Local

			<p><u>Plan Review as a whole is the deletion of a contingency site (Wynnards Mead, Tiverton). The deletion of this policy reduces the flexibility of the Plan as a whole given the role of contingency sites in ensuring housing delivery during the Plan period. However on balance the sustainability issues of the site outweigh the benefit of the inclusion of the contingency site. Two other contingency sites in the plan remain and therefore flexibility still remains in the Plan. The other changes to the Plan are considered largely beneficial with the new information and therefore amount to an overall positive effect.”</u></p>
SA19	396	n/a	<p>Delete Annex 4 as follows:</p> <p>“Annex 4 – Revised Sustainability Appraisal of Plan</p> <p>The development of the Local Plan Review has been an on-going and iterative process with key pieces of evidence influencing the selection and rejection of options. Through the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Consultation (2015) a number of alternatives were proposed, along with the presentation of new information. As a result a number of modifications to the proposed policies and supporting text of the plan are proposed. The full details of these proposed alternatives and new information are provided in annex 2 and 3. Annex 2 also sets out the reasons for selecting/rejecting the alternatives proposed. This annex summarises the main changes to the Local Plan Review following the appraisal of alternatives set out in annex 2, and assesses the overall sustainability of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Strategic Policies</p> <p>Policy S2: Amount and Distribution of development</p> <p>An alternative to amend the dwelling target to 7,860 to meet the objectively assessed housing need (OAN) with the additional housing requirements of Junction 27 is preferred due to new information presented in the finalised Strategic Housing Market Area report which became available during the consultation on the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (2015) and following the Council decision on 22nd September 2016 to propose to allocate land at Junction 27 for a strategic scale employment site. Similarly the higher commercial growth scenario including the Junction 27 option is proposed as a modification to the plan.</p> <p>Policy S3: Meeting housing needs</p> <p>Updates to the policy are proposed given the change to the OAN suggested in policy S2.</p>

			<p>Policy S4: Ensuring housing delivery</p> <p>Updates to the policy are proposed given the change to the OAN suggested in policy S2.</p> <p>Policy S5: Public open space</p> <p>A change to the wording is proposed to clarify that the policy refers to the parish boundaries of the settlements noted.</p> <p>Policy S12: Crediton</p> <p>An additional criterion is proposed in the policy which is as follows ‘community and education facilities and other infrastructure to support the development proposed’ to reflect the need for a new primary school in Crediton.</p> <p>Policy S14: Countryside</p> <p>The removal of reference to the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation in this policy is proposed to ensure the Plan is in conformity with national policy in which the ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ (2015) which requires that new sites for travellers should be very strictly limited in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan.</p> <p>Site Allocations</p> <p>Tiverton</p> <p>TIV1-TIV5 Eastern Urban Extension</p> <p>The policy is proposed to be amended to consider a housing range of 1580-1830 which reflects the permissions granted on area A and the potential for increased density in area B.</p> <p>TIV14 Wynnards Mead</p> <p>The policy is proposed to be deleted to reflect new information regarding the historic environment and flood risk.</p> <p>OTIV4 Blundells School (Proposed for allocation TIV16)</p> <p>This site is proposed to be allocated following the Council decision on the 22nd September to allocate land at Blundells School for residential development. New information provided includes the support of developing the site from the Environment Agency which has resulted in this proposed policy scoring more positively than the option considered in the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission consultation (2015).</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Cullompton</p> <p>CU1-CU6 North West Cullompton</p> <p>Contributions from development to the Town Centre relief road and Junction 28 are proposed as modifications to the policy. In-line with the adopted North West Cullompton masterplan a change to the total commercial floorspace is proposed. The re-allocation of land to the south west of the site is also proposed.</p> <p>CU7-CU12 East Cullompton</p> <p>An additional criterion is proposed to ensure the setting of listed buildings adjoining the site is respected.</p> <p>CU19 Town Centre Relief Road</p> <p>Two additional criteria are proposed to ensure the protection of the setting of listed buildings and conservation area, and the provision of archaeological investigation and mitigation.</p> <p>CU20 Cullompton Infrastructure</p> <p>An additional criterion to state 'provision of works to reduce flood risk' has proposed as a modification to the plan.</p> <p>Crediton</p> <p>CRE2 Red Hill Cross, Exhibition Road</p> <p>Additional supporting text is proposed to reflect the recommendation in the HEA to provide appropriate mitigation for Shobrooke Park to the east.</p> <p>CRE3 Cromwells Meadow</p> <p>Additional supporting text is proposed to reflect the recommendation in the HEA to provide appropriate mitigation for Shobrooke Park to the east. An additional criterion is also proposed to ensure archaeological investigation and mitigation.</p> <p>CRE4 Woods Group</p> <p>Additional supporting text is recommended which identifies non-listed heritages within the site.</p> <p>CRE5 Pedlerspool</p> <p>Amendment to the policy is made which includes the</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>provision of a new school but removes the extra care scheme element in the policy.</p> <p>CRE7 Stonewall Lane</p> <p>A change to the supporting text of the Plan is recommended to ensure that adequate landscaping is provided to protect the heritage assets associated with the adjoining Creedy Park.</p> <p>CRE10 Land south of A377</p> <p>A change to the policy is proposed to include a small area to the south of the allocation up to the edge of the swale, covered by recent consent sought by Mole Avon. Although the scoring is lower for the pre-mitigation score of objective c) mitigating the effects of climate change, it is considered appropriate and reasonable to allocate the original site area which has outline consent. Detailed design to mitigate flood risk will be considered at the reserved matters planning application stage. Mitigation through sensitive design with appropriate choice of materials and landscaping is also recommended for inclusion within the policy. An amendment to the supporting text is further proposed to make reference to the latest flood data and implications from redevelopment with mitigation measures such as layout, site and flood levels.</p> <p>CRE11 Crediton Infrastructure</p> <p>The following criterion is proposed for inclusion 'provision of works to reduce flood risk'.</p> <p>Junction 27</p> <p>Junction 27, M5 Motorway</p> <p>An additional policy is proposed to reflect the Council decision on 22nd September 2016 to allocate land for tourism, leisure and retail at Junction 27 of the M5 motorway. Changes to the policy are reflected in the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Rural Areas</p> <p>School Close, Bampton</p> <p>An allocation for 0.54(ha) 26 dwellings is proposed as a modification to the Plan. The site is currently allocated and was omitted in error as some of the site has been built out. For consistency, similar to other sites in the plan, the remaining area of the allocation which has not yet been built is proposed to remain as an allocation in the Plan.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>CH1 Barton, Chawleigh</p> <p>An additional criterion to state ‘design solutions which respects the setting of the conservation area and listed building’ is proposed. An amendment to the supporting text is also proposed to ensure appropriate landscaping to mitigate any potential impact on the conservation area and listed buildings.</p> <p>CF1 Barnhill Close, Cheriton Fitzpaine</p> <p>An additional criterion to minimise the impact on the conservation area and listed building is proposed.</p> <p>HA1 Land adjacent Fishers Way, Halberton</p> <p>An amendment to policy HA1 is proposed to delete reference to the need to ‘archaeological investigations and appropriate mitigation measures’ given the new information provided by the Devon County Council Archaeology Team that the proposed allocation will not impact on any known heritage assets and state that they would not need to be consulted should an application come forward. The addition of a criterion to ensure mitigation through appropriate design, materials and landscaping is proposed to protect the setting of Halberton conservation area is also proposed.</p> <p>HE1 Depot, Hemyock</p> <p>This site is proposed for deletion given the representations made during the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (2015) consultation raises an issue with the deliverability of the site during the plan period and is therefore no longer considered a reasonable alternative. The site will have a limited impact on the Local Plan as a whole given its size of 10 dwellings and may still come forward as a windfall site as it falls within the settlement limit.</p> <p>NE1 Court Orchard, Newton St Cyres</p> <p>A change to the policy and supporting text is proposed to ensure design which respects the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>OSP1 Higher Town, Sampford Peverell (Proposed for allocation SP2)</p> <p>This site is proposed to be allocated following the Council decision on the 22nd September to allocate land at Higher Town for residential development. Since the proposed submission SA there has been confirmation that access is</p>
--	--	--	--

achievable and therefore the uncertainty has been removed.

OUF3 Land west of Uffculme (Proposed for allocation UF1)

A change to the plan is proposed to allocate this site given a 2016 appeal decision (APP/Y1138/W/15/3025120) allowing outline planning permission for a site of 3.49ha with 60 dwellings. Conclusions in the inspectors report have fed into the sustainability appraisal in which objectives b) built and historic environment and h) ensuring community health and wellbeing score more positively.

WI2 Willand Industrial Estate

The full allocation of 9.2ha, 22,000sqm of commercial floorspace is proposed to be allocated given that the Council's original reasons for not allocating the full site have been addressed as the remainder of the site is now deliverable.

Managing Development

DM28 Other protected sites

The inclusion of reference to compensatory measures is proposed as a change to the policy to raise that in some cases where mitigation measures are not possible then compensatory measures may be appropriate.

Secondary/Cumulative/Synergistic impacts

Tiverton

Additional detail has been provided in the supporting text of S10 to reflect the cumulative traffic impacts on Junction 27 to be considered.

Cullompton

Additional criterion and supporting text has been included under a number of Cullompton allocation policies to reflect the cumulative impact on the road network.

Crediton

Additional text is provided in CRE7 to recognise the need for a Transport Assessment that will comprehensively assess the transport issues related to the development of the site, taking into account the potential cumulative impact of nearby allocations.

J27 Commercial Development

Additional evidence since the previous SA was commissioned specifically to examine the potential related housing implications of the proposed strategic scale employment site at Junction 27 on the M5 motorway. The results suggest a need of an additional 260 dwellings within Mid Devon District Council over the plan period. A Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Mid Devon Local Plan Review including Junction 27 has been undertaken which concludes that the J27 site allocation, alone or in combination with the Local Plan proposals, will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Culm Grasslands SAC.

Overall Sustainability of the Local Plan Review

In this latest update to the SA, changes to the Plan are proposed to take into account comments from representations, additional reasonable alternatives considered and new information presented including the latest national policy changes. Updates from the latest appeal decisions and planning applications have also been taken to account to ensure policies proposed are as up-to-date as possible.

Of the changes, the majority propose minor alterations to the proposed policies or supporting text. The main amendments to the Plan include the proposed allocation of land at Junction 27 of the M5 motorway and associated housing and an amended housing total to reflect the most recent evidence on the housing needs in the area. OSP1, Sampford Peverell (proposed as SP4 within the plan) and OTIV4, Blundells School (proposed as TIV16 within the plan) are proposed for allocation in response to the housing implications of allocating the strategic scale employment site at Junction 27 of the M5 motorway. The option to include Junction 27 presents a significant positive impact on promoting economic growth and employment. Controls are set in policy to ensure aspects such as retail development is supported, necessary infrastructure is delivered and housing need is met. As such overall it is considered to result in a positive impact on the plan.

Wynnards Mead, Tiverton (contingency site) is proposed for deletion due to new evidence provided in relation to issues around flooding and the historic environment. School Close, Bampton (proposed as BA4 within the plan) has been included, which was previously omitted in error. HE1 Deport, Hemyock is proposed for deletion due to an issue of its deliverability within the plan period. OUF3 Land West of Uffculme is also included as an allocation following a 2016 appeal decision (APP/Y1138/W/15/3025120), allowing outline planning permission for a site of 3.49ha with 60 dwellings.

			<p>Also the full allocation of 9.2ha, 22,000sqm of commercial floorspace is proposed at Willand Industrial Estate given that the Council's original reasons for not allocating the full site have been addressed as the remainder of the site is now deliverable.</p> <p>In general, the emerging Local Plan Review has been found to have a wide range of positive and significant positive effects on the objectives both cumulatively and through individual policies, although a number of potentially adverse impacts still remain. Recommendations made in previous iterations of the SA report and this updated SA report as well as controls through policy has provided mitigation for potential adverse effects. Of the main changes proposed in this iteration of the SA, the main negative impact on the Local Plan Review as a whole is the deletion of a contingency site (Wynnards Mead, Tiverton). The deletion of this policy reduces the flexibility of the Plan as a whole given the role of contingency sites in ensuring housing delivery during the Plan period. However on balance the sustainability issues of the site outweigh the benefit of the inclusion of the contingency site. Two other contingency sites in the plan remain and therefore flexibility still remains in the Plan. The other changes to the Plan are considered largely beneficial with the new information and therefore amount to an overall positive effect.</p>
General updates to the SA			
SA20	n/a	n/a	<p>Amend paragraph and page numbers in the SA report, including cross references and contents tables to reflect the amendments made to the SA Update 2017.</p> <p>Make any necessary grammatical corrections.</p>