

BISHOPSTEIGNTON PARISH COUNCIL

Teignbridge Draft Local Plan 2020-2040 (Part 2): Creating Quality Places – Site Options Consultation Response

Our Contact Details

Name:	Kim Ford
Company:	Bishopsteignton Parish Council
Address:	Community Centre, Shute Hill, Bishopsteignton
Postcode:	TQ14 9QL
Email Address:	clerk@bishopsteignton-pc.gov.uk
Phone Number:	07483149812

2. Please tick YES if you wish to be notified on the progress of the Local Plan Review and included in future consultations

YES



NO

Chapter 2: Development Strategy

Pages 12 to 21 inclusive

Bishopsteignton Parish Council wish to raise the following comments and queries in response to the content of Chapter 2:

- Please provide evidence which indicates more homes make for more affordable options in the future.
- It is suggested throughout that a provision of more suitable infrastructure will be subject to new housing but improvements to existing infrastructure is already required before further development; existing is inadequate for the current housing stock even before more is created – always playing catch-up.
- The current national statutory ratio for the provision of affordable housing is considered too low. Can this be increased and how will delivery of the correct number be ensured?
- A Commitment to Infrastructure: What will be the strategy and consultation process for the implementation of any infrastructure provision or improvements, which BPC consider critical to provide in advance of further development. What is proposed for the following:
 - Ensure sufficient local school capacity & sustainable transport to secondary schools.
 - Ensure sufficient capacity at the local doctor surgery and health & social care provision locally.
 - Improvements to the road network within the village and through the parish.
 - The provision of additional parking, not just at the new properties. For all types of vehicles, including EV charging points.
 - The infrastructure to support sustainable energy generation and usage.
 - The provision of a safe and well-connected network for pedestrians and cyclists; to, from, and within the village.
 - Broadband: the provision of reliable digital connectivity at an acceptable speed.
 - Improvements to existing drainage systems particularly regarding sewage disposal.
- Perhaps an infrastructure statement and commitment to contribute to the supply of sufficient

infrastructure in the area being developed should be a requirement of all future planning applications. As an extension of the current CIL regulations and could be administrated by TDC which should have an overview budget of what infrastructure is required in the district.

- If infrastructure can be improved, which is considered essential already, regardless of future development, how will this be control without a detrimental impact on the character of the village?
- Will any consideration be given to the number of properties which are vacant? How do these impact in the housing requirement figures?

Furthermore, it is expected that any development in the district throughout the 20 year lifespan of this plan will be conducted in accordance with the latest, most relevant version of the Devon Carbon Plan and the Teignbridge District Council declaration of Climate & Ecological Emergency. This pledge was signed to show a commitment to supporting a raft of measures and initiatives to prioritise decarbonisation and to provide the resources and funding necessary to speed up the transition to a low-carbon and resilient economy and society.

Chapter 8.1: Housing Site Options for Villages

Bishopsteignton - Pages 118 to 124

The plan states that sites have been chosen following rigorous assessment however the list provided which explains what makes a site 'physically capable' does not include movement of traffic or highway safety. The Parish Council wish to hear further detail and evidence of such rigorous assessment as unfortunately it is understood that nothing more than desktop exercises has been conducted.

It is unclear how the number of new homes in Bishopsteignton, being 150, was reached; a list of criteria has been provided but these are not measurable, given value or weighting. There is concern and disappointment that this amount has been steered by the status of 'Main Village' which was used to categorise Bishopsteignton in the draft Local Plan Review 2020-2040 Part 1. A categorisation which BPC objected to as part of its response to the consultation in July 2020 and nothing has changed to alter than opinion.

Further evidence is needed to show how the proposed number of new homes could be supported without hugely significant changes to infrastructure; much of which is already required and long overdue. These changes are needed to support the existing level of housing, without a further 150 being added to the village, with the consequent additional services that those would require. Although, changes to infrastructure will not always be improvement; how can such dramatic changes be implemented without a detrimental impact on the character of the village.

With a lack of employment in the parish the inhabitants of these 150 homes will have no other option but to travel to places of work. This will increase the requirement for parking provision, the weight of traffic in and around the village causing congestion, and a significant increase of carbon emissions from the additional burning of fossil fuels which is more likely than electric vehicles. The TDC Climate & Ecological Emergency declaration pledges for the district to be carbon neutral by 2025, so how will this be possible?

The quality of any design related to any additional village housing, although yet to be proposed, should reflect the character of our village. Although diluted by some inappropriate designs permitted historically by Teignbridge planners, the character of our village, in massing terms as well as dwelling design (including materials) should be maintained and reinforced. Any new development should include a focus on the juxtaposition of dwellings to reflect the organic arrangements within the original settlement, developed as it evolved (without planners), and relevant to buildings and roads: it should avoid the rigid straight line and conventional right-angle which is the hallmark of so much dull and unimaginative estate housing.

BISHOPSTEIGNTON PARISH COUNCIL

In the unfortunate allocation of new housing to this village, examples of good practice from the development in Shaldon, known as Shoreside, and HRH Poundsbury, should be considered in terms of layout and materials.

The introduction heavily focusses on school capacity which is stated can 'accommodate the level of development proposed'. However, consultation with executive officers at the school indicate that whilst there is currently a very small number of vacancies, it is certainly not enough to make the proposals viable. It seems futile to predict so far into the future, for when the additional spaces will be required to meet the needs of families living in the proposed developments. 150 families with an average of even 1 child per family would require completely new schooling facilities.

Why is it considered that 'Allotments not required' at all four sites? The current allotment provision is an active part of the Bishopsteignton community with a constant waiting list. It should be considered essential to provide more space to encourage similar community engagement work, promoting sustainability and health & wellbeing.

As mentioned, Bishopsteignton has a Neighbourhood Development Plan which took several years to complete and was approved by a referendum with a majority of 87.3%. Whilst the target to review this plan is imminent and from the review some minor amendments might be necessary the parish council would see no reason to depart from the plan and its principles and policies.

The road structure through the village is completely alien to increased traffic, has little parking already causing problems to residents and the junctions with the A381 is overloaded. Particularly the junction with Forder Lane which 3 of the 4 proposed developments would be using, if permitted. Any future development should trigger off a roundabout or lights neither of which would be beneficial to that main road that already carries severe traffic, particularly in summer months, with back-ups from Teignmouth to Bishopsteignton on a regular basis. Highways design also has a regrettable 'one size fits all' approach in terms of road width, visibility splays, and suchlike which should be challenged for its relevance to a historic village such as ours.

Three of the four proposed sites lie within the Undeveloped Coast, a current local plan policy built to preserve the integrity of the estuary for the benefit of residence and visitors. Nothing has changed to suggest that policy should now be breached.

Each site comes with a risk of flooding despite the statement of 'No flooding issues' in the plan's assessment. As a result of the village's topography and underground waterways, any development (regardless of size) or the removal of natural features such as hedges and trees, could result in increased incidents of flash flooding. The impact of climate change is certain to exacerbate the problem.

1. Land South of Forder Lane –

Bishopsteignton Parish Council and residents strongly object to any development at this site...

...the result of which, at this greenfield site, would be visually detrimental within the rural landscape, particularly on approach to the village from the west, completely altering the character and charm of the village. For a similar deterioration of an approach to a town/village please look no further than the development of Penn's Mount; from grassy knoll to high-density residential housing. The proposed mitigation of this is especially discouraging; a 3m high wall would project entirely the wrong impression of the village.

There appears to have been no attempt made to address the need for suitably safe pedestrian access to the village centre. The Local Plan says there will be spaces available at the school, but families will need to reach it safely on foot; currently no safe access exists. Residents are more likely to avoid using the

BISHOPSTEIGNTON PARISH COUNCIL

village facilities and head toward Kingsteignton /Newton Abbot in vehicles, creating a greater carbon footprint and resulting in a lack of community inclusiveness and participation. BNDP policy BSF1 supports the retention of existing facilities such as the shop, post office and pubs.

The indicative number of homes is unrealistic. Even at the lower number proposed, the current infrastructure would be completely inadequate and there is no definitive proposal for providing such infrastructure. Developers will need to maximise profits from each site, affecting the ratio for the provision of affordable homes. It is believed expensive design and mitigation will be required to create suitably safe vehicular and pedestrian access, if indeed it can be achieved at all, as well as to accomplish

the correct management of the important ecological constraints of the biodiverse wildlife habitats in the established hedgerows and trees including the continued protection of the species mentioned under Sensitivities: Ecology (top of page 119). This level of commitment would be counter-productive for any developer looking to maximise its profits.

It is believed savings would be made at the expense of the provision of affordable housing and green space, or the proposed thick belt of woodland used to screen the development. Altogether rendering this site as unviable for developers as it is unwelcomed for the residents of Bishopsteignton.

2. Bishops Coombe –

This site is considered unacceptable for development being greenfield and designated undeveloped coast.

Its direct proximity to the existing settlement limit is why Bishops Coombe has previously been considered as an **exception** site for the parish however it is now believed development here would be detrimental due to the biodiverse ecology of the site, the opinion of parishioners and potential impact to existing dwellings.

Despite the strong objection from the Parish Council and many residents, this proposed development, if considered further, it is essential that any housing is affordable, 100% with no incorporated market value housing, and at the level of 19, the lower level proposed, not more than this.

3. Bakers Yard –

A site which features in the BNDP 2013-2033 and is ready for development if carried out in a sympathetic way; being partially visible on approach into the village.

The development of this site for homes only would be contrary to BNDP policy BSE1, as is mentioned under Sensitivities: Other (page 122).

However, it is strongly felt by the current Parish Council that this policy, which stipulates any 'redevelopment of Bakers Yard to provide for employment use', should be retracted as it has been proven that live/work units are not desirable therefore making development of this the site financially unviable for potential developers. A fact demonstrated by the attempts made by landowners and their agents to secure planning permission and a sale. With an amendment to the BNDP policy, which could be created and incorporated during a future review of the plan, and with appropriate and necessary improvements to infrastructure, the right design of low-density residential properties, and a safe pedestrian access to the centre of the village, it is the opinion of Bishopsteignton Parish Council that this would be the only suitable site for development within the parish.

4. High Elms –

The undeveloped part of this site lies outside of the village settlement limit therefore Bishopsteignton Parish Council consider development here as unacceptable. In addition, due to its location at the foot of an extremely steep hill, this site is inappropriate for development.

One of the main issues at this site is the inevitable increase of traffic on Radway Street and on approach to Radway Street from either direction. Additional regular vehicles using this route, including ingress/egress between the road and any development/property should be discouraged. The location already suffers with narrow and single-track sections, exacerbated in periods of heavy traffic, or if traffic incidents occur, on the A380, A381 and B3192; when all road users are looking for an alternative route, the village can be brought to a standstill.

Climate Change is causing unpredictable and extreme weather conditions and any development of this site could seriously exacerbate the problem of flooding. Serious concerns have been raised about the viability of building here due to its gradient. The existing drainage problems and run-off from the natural reservoir above Radway Farm would potentially both be worsened by the introduction of buildings, hard surfacing and tarmac driveways preventing natural land drainage which allows water run off to occur at a controlled, reduced pace.

Chapter 9: Employment Site Options

Pages 190 to 208

Bishopsteignton Parish Council understands the need to provide site suitable to encourage business development and provide employment. It strongly believes these should be situated on existing brownfield sites; that greenfield should not be used for this purpose considering the inevitable detrimental effect to wildlife.

Having reviewed this chapter and with this in mind, the preferred sites would be:

East of Liverton Business Park
Kingskerswell Road, Decoy
West Exe Business Park, Peamore
Langdon Business Park, Dawlish.

Support will not be given to any other suggested site options due to unsuitability and the negative impact development would bring.

When sites are secured, it is hoped a great deal of thought will be given to sustainable travel solutions including safe pedestrian and cycle routes.

Chapter 11: Low Carbon

Pages 212 to 216

Having reviewed this chapter, Bishopsteignton Parish Council wish to make the following observations:

- Good to be looking at the future but heavily reliant on more people switching to EV
- There is no tangible goal being set so it is hard to see what is being aimed for. Policies, not deliverable/measurable.

BISHOPSTEIGNTON PARISH COUNCIL

- No talk of biomass, ground generation or requirements for charging points at new buildings.
- No collaboration with suppliers to consider substations.
- The plan suggests that space required for solar farms will be found but no plan for transferring that responsibly sourced energy to the villages for use by residents.
- There is nothing to suggest that TDC are considering the necessary lifestyle changes that are required by residents to aid in carbon reductions. i.e household car reduction. How will this be encouraged?
- Need to address the physical blockage/barriers for people to be convinced by EV
- It is not acceptable to assume and rely on a natural transition to EV. Or that this alone is the sole contributing factor for reduction in carbon emissions.
- TDC need to become more descriptive and prescriptive with new build homes.
- Need to look for external funding, larger corporations willing to collaborate with communities to support necessary infrastructure for EV and distribution of energy. Should this concept be driven from below, by the community itself?
- More detail on how charging points will be introduced and supported.
- Retrofitting energy-efficiency measures into our existing and older buildings. BPC feel it is extremely important that the carbon reduction in the running of older houses will be and should be key to the overall county reduction given the number of old currently more inefficient properties there are in this county.
- Clarity on new builds needed as no detail on how they will support EV and other methods to reduce carbon emissions
- Policies need to be enforceable and enforced by TDC. Ensure that developers are held accountable if suitable solutions are not included in new developments.
- 'Lack of How' - local ambition & determination needed, not just to wait for a top-down approach, but communities will need guidance and support.
- Changes to planning policies to allow retrofit within the Conservation Area; enabling efforts such as solar panels, charging points, etc.
- More emphasis on reducing number of vehicles, not just replace fossil fuel with same number of EV. Support for the community to enable changing lifestyles. Improve networks for pedestrian & cycle, public transport & shared transport schemes.
- No consideration for tidal/coastal power generation (whilst mindful of Undeveloped Coast policy).
- Nothing ground-breaking, innovative, inventive. Be bolder and more determined.

Chapter 12: Secondary School Options for Newton Abbot

Pages 217 to 221

Having reviewed the options, Bishopsteignton Parish Council feel the only suitable and therefore preferable sites are:

- West of Kingskerswell Road
- East of Kingkerswell Road
- Newton Abbot Leisure Centre

These sites are preferred due to their location meaning easy access, thereby reducing the need for transport for attendees, however it is noted there will be impact to some wildlife habitats and disruption due to relocation of existing employment sites and leisure facilities.

The Parish Council will always favour sites which are near to the centre of population and offer minimal impact of wildlife.

When sites are secured, it is hoped a great deal of thought will be given to sustainable travel solutions including safe pedestrian and cycle routes.