The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment is an educational charity which exists to improve the quality of people’s lives by teaching and practising timeless and ecological ways of planning, designing and building.

We believe that if we can understand and apply time-tested principles, building once more in a sustainable way, we will reap improvements in public health, in livelier and safer streets and in a more affordable lifestyle for families and individuals. The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment believes that building in a sustainable way will reap benefits for communities and result in neighbourhoods that accrue higher value over time.
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South Hams District Council. 100022628.2009
The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment (PFBE) is an education charity that exists to improve the quality of people’s lives through timeless ways of ecological building, designing and planning. Its mission over the last 10 years has been to inform a variety of built environment projects at varying scales, with a view to delivering exemplary projects. PFBE’s principal method of engagement is through its Enquiry by Design (EbD) planning tool, which delivers form based Masterplans, design codes and pattern books through professional and community collaboration and engagement.

PFBE’s initial involvement at South Hams District Council (SHDC) came via Totnes Town Council, which was looking to explore the PFBE’s facilitating of an EbD to produce a Masterplan for Totnes. It became apparent from these discussions that work in Totnes would need to fit within the broader planning framework being undertaken for the Local Development Framework (LDF) process by SHDC. The South Hams LDF Core Strategy (2006) proposes the geographic distribution of housing and employment land to be delivered through the LDF process. Factors to be taken into account in allocating specific development sites include their availability, sustainability, serviceability and deliverability.

In determining the distribution and allocation of sites for development the overriding challenge for SHDC is to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is identified to meet the broad settlement allocations of the adopted LDF Core Strategy to 2016 and district targets set out in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026. Government policy in PPS3 (Housing) also calls for local authorities to identify and allocate at least five years of developable land for new housing growth and to provide for housing for a further 10 to 15 years on specific sites where possible. These housing numbers came from the Government, as set out in the RSS. These numbers were not derived by PFBE or SHDC. PFBE, with stakeholders simply assessed land allocations from a traditional urbanism and sustainability, and not an economic, perspective.

With this requirement in mind, PFBE felt that it could add value to the South Hams LDF by adding a design dimension to the site allocation process. This was felt to be particularly important since South Hams is one of the country’s most beautiful rural landscapes with towns and villages of immense character and value. It was felt the assessment process would be strengthened by applying the EbD process to enhance community involvement through facilitated workshops. This level of public involvement is not required by government at the site identification stage of the LDF process, but it was felt by both SHDC and PFBE that it would add rigour to the process with added consideration given to settlement structure, place-making and community views. It was also recognised that the project would be complex and challenging because of the number and variety of communities which would be involved. The project would be pioneering and required a willingness from SHDC and PFBE to take measured risks in order to raise the quality of outputs from the whole process.

Without doubt, the project tested the robustness of PFBE’s EbD process and also the resolve of SHDC to carry out meaningful and inclusive long term visioning for its towns and villages. By opting to include the EbD as part of its LDF process, the Council embarked upon an unprecedented process which had not been deployed at this scale of strategic rural planning in the UK. By taking this approach SHDC has embraced the core principles of best practice and innovation in order to derive best value outcomes for its communities and their towns and villages.
1.0 Process and Product

1.1 DRA Process

In making provision for new development in South Hams district, enough suitable land must be identified to meet the targets set out in the adopted LDF Core Strategy to 2016 and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026 and beyond. The Core Strategy also prioritises the provision of affordable housing, with a strategic target that 50% of new homes (from all sources) should be affordable. The relevant Core Strategy housing requirements to 2016 are set out in Table 1.

1.1.1 South Hams LDF Core Strategy

The adopted Core Strategy’s strategic objectives include:

- **SO1** - Ensure that the current and future housing needs of the community are met.
- **SO2** - Provide affordable housing to meet local needs.
- **SO3** - Secure high quality, locally distinctive, sustainable housing developments.
- **SO4** - Promote mixed use, mixed type and mixed tenure schemes.
- **SO5** - Provide housing at the highest densities suitable for the site.
- **SO7** - Regenerate the district’s towns, villages and hinterlands, using previously developed land and existing buildings as appropriate.
- **SO10** - Improve the district’s economic infrastructure.
- **SO16** - Support the role of market towns, especially the town centres, and other local centres.
- **SO17** - Retain existing and promote new local services, facilities and amenities.
- **SO20** - Conserve and enhance the historic, architectural and archaeological character and features of the district.
- **SO23** - Promote development which will help to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels and the emission of greenhouse gases.

The South Hams LDF Core Strategy requires that sites be allocated for 6,000 new dwellings and about 62 hectares of employment land in the period up to 2016.

Sherford new community requires 4000 dwellings and 18 hectares of employment at the edge of Plymouth, with 500 dwellings and 24 hectares of employment elsewhere on the Plymouth fringe.

The remaining 1,500 new homes and 20 hectares of employment are distributed across South Hams as shown in Table 1. It is these local allocations (not the Sherford proposal or other Plymouth fringe areas) which this report has dealt with.

The Core Strategy also contains a 50% strategic target for affordable housing across South Hams.

SHDC established three panels and procedures to identify and assess potential development sites in the towns and villages. These were:

- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)
- Sustainability Threshold Assessment (STA)
- Strategic Infrastructure Delivery planning (SID)

As required by government guidance, SHLAA identifies potential housing sites, assesses their availability and estimates when they are likely to be developed, to help ensure that there is sufficient land available to meet housing needs. STA assesses the suitability of sites for sustainable development, and SID informs the programming of necessary support infrastructure.
### 1.1.2 Design Review Assessment

Following PFBE's recommendations, SHDC commissioned additional work to raise the significance of design and placemaking in the process and to further enhance the robustness of the plans to withstand examination. The procedure recommended by PFBE was a Design Review Assessment (DRA). It was recognised that the DRA process would involve some significant challenges, particularly its application to a multitude of differing sites and situations across an entire district. This is where the EbD process came to the fore, enabling community involvement to provide the local knowledge needed for the process and providing a robust and consistent evidence base for the plans.

Figure 3 shows the DRA process alongside other assessment procedures. Some of those other procedures, such as the STA, had taken some design criteria into account, but not as their principal consideration. The DRA on the other hand, as the name implies, is founded primarily upon design criteria rather than market demand, policy or ease of delivery. In order to address the requirements of the adopted Core Strategy, the DRA does aim to identify sufficient development capacity whilst having regard to constraints such as topography and flood plains, but it remains firmly and primarily based upon the principles of good town making or place making.

### 1.1.3 LDF Legacy

The Local Development Framework's Core Strategy Strategic Objectives in relation to housing are SO1 - SO5, as specified on page 4:

As indicated, the Core Strategy's housing requirements to 2016 is for 4,000 dwellings at the Sherford new community, 500 elsewhere in the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PPUA) and 1,500 in the remainder (the majority) of the district. The DRA process focuses only on the requirement for these 1,500 dwellings.

The 1,500 dwellings requirement conforms to provisions of the Devon Structure Plan to 2016, although it errs towards the upper end of the development requirement. This aims to address the need for affordable housing in the district and is coupled with the 50% strategic target for affordable housing in the Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy divides 1,500 dwellings and 20 hectares of employment between 4 Area Centres (900), 4 Local Centres (200) and villages (400).
Area Centres are settlements that function as focal points for the sustainable provision of local housing and employment opportunities, education facilities and other local services. They are accessible to the communities they serve and are serviced by public transport and the strategic road network. Dartmouth (6,000 people), Ivybridge (12,500), Kingsbridge (5,800) and Totnes (8,000) function at this level.

Local Centres are settlements that provide a lesser range and level of facilities and services than Area Centres – nevertheless they have an important role in providing some services and facilities to their rural hinterland. The Core Strategy identifies Chillington/Stokenham, Modbury, Salcombe and Yealmpton at this level.

Whereas ‘area centres’ and ‘local centres’ have housing allocations specific to their size and function (ref level 3), villages have a global allocation (400 dwellings) to be shared between them all. Area centres also have individual employment allocations (17 hectares) whereas local centres and villages share a 3 ha allocation.

The Council has also adopted an Affordable Housing Development Plan Document (DPD) which contains policies designed to support the 50% strategic target for affordable housing in the Core Strategy. It sets affordable housing targets of 50% on the Plymouth fringe, 55% in area and local centres, and 60% in villages.

The Council is presently working to advance Site Allocations DPDs for South Hams towns and villages. The Core Strategy lists 52 villages for consideration for development. Some of these are better served with facilities than others, and prompted by comments in the Core Strategy Inspector’s Report, the Council identified 16 villages (those which have both a shop and a primary school) to be initially considered for potential development. During May and June 2009 the Council consulted about potential development sites, with details of the STA work included, and on the initial list of 16 villages for consideration.

The DRA process began at the same time as this and EbD workshops were held in June 2009. These were timed to help support the overall process.

### 1.1.3 DRA Approach to Site Selection

The DRA process follows on from previous assessment procedures by putting the identified sites through four levels of refinement (ref Fig 2). It begins by using the SHLAA and STA outputs, tests these and any other potential sites against a list of design criteria and finishes by subjecting the best performing sites to a capacity assessment by applying a density estimation. As indicated, the aim of the DRA process is effectively to provide an assessment layer that is design focused. Potential sites are subjected to good town making or place making principles to ensure that they are not only appropriate for that settlement’s growth, but also appropriate for its context. This is particularly important for the smaller settlements where growth could have a greater impact. Accordingly, the process rests principally upon design based criteria, supplementing the earlier SHLAA and STA evaluation criteria.

#### Level 1 – SHLAA and STA Sites

With various growth options having already been considered for South Hams (ref Appendices), from continued growth of existing settlements through small infill or larger greenfield sites to complete new settlements (the Sherford new community proposal), the SHLAA and STA processes effectively considered everything between these two extremes.

They aimed to look at all available sites, with the SHLAA involving 10 steps, and the STA process with 6 categories with 26 evaluation criteria. The resulting traffic light system of each process provided an initial prioritisation of sites. This was reviewed by the PFBE and it was decided that the following sites be accepted to go through to the next level:

#### Level 2 – Place Making Principles

The next DRA level took the Level 1 sites and applied good place making principles to identify which were the most appropriate for the next stages of growth for each settlement. These good place making principles can be summed up as those used in traditional urbanism and expressed in the Congress for New Urbanism’s Charter (February 2001) They apply to the different scales of development, but in this instance have been applied at settlement and neighbourhood scales.

At town scale development should:
1. favour infill and /or be:  
2. contiguous to urban boundaries  
3. integrated with the existing urban pattern  
4. respect historical patterns & boundaries  
5. include mixed uses and types  
6. allow transport alternative

At neighbourhood scale development should:
7. be compact  
8. be within walking distance of amenities  
9. have a range of housing types  
10. benefit from movement corridors  
11. benefit from existing centres  
12. accommodate densities and land uses  
13. focus on institutional & commercial activity  
14. be sympathetic to existing neighbourhoods  
15. be accessible to amenity space

Such principles are generic and will vary according to local circumstances. Some of the above criteria applied in smaller villages requires careful professional judgment.

The 15 criteria have been summarised into nine principles - form, access and use. The next level of sites include the following:

#### Level 2:

**FORM**
1. Are infill or contiguous
2. Do not encourage coalescence
3. Integrate with existing development patterns
4. Do allow permeability connectivity

**ACCESS**
5. Have at least one frontage onto or accessible to a public highway
6. Within reasonable walking distance of amenities*

**USE**
7. *Are accessible to public transport**
8. Are able to contain a range of housing
9. Support wider positive benefits/uses
10. approx 10 minutes
11. bus or rail within walking distance
This layer will generally deliver more sites than required to meet projected growth levels. The next step, therefore, aims to ‘prioritise’ sites based on anticipated development requirements.

**Level 3 – Discounting Sites**

As indicated previously, the DRA process focuses on the LDF Core Strategy’s 1,500 dwellings requirement for the Area Centres (900), Local Centres (200) and villages (400). The requirements for each of the Area and Local Centres are shown in Table 3 for 2016 and 2026 based on a simple estimation of 40 dwellings per hectare plus infrastructure and open space against their respective allocations.

Although the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is not yet approved there is also the need to look towards the horizon for the South West of 2026 and beyond. Although the RSS will only give a global (district wide) figure for South Hams, its provisions are likely to require at least a continuation of currently planned growth rates and probably their acceleration. The DRA at this level (as shown in Table 3) has, therefore, worked towards a figure of 1.3 x 2016 to provide for the likely 2026 development requirements. The RSS does not give settlement specific provisions, and it cannot be safely assumed that exactly the same patterns of need or demand will prevail from 2016 to 2026. However, it is considered reasonable and helpful to project the Core Strategy provisions to 2026 using this guideline.

With regards the villages, however, the approach is entirely different. The DRA starts with a list of 16 villages (those which have both a shop and a primary school) which the Council identified for first consideration for development, but without specific hectareage allocations for each village. This area in each village was as a result of assessing what was available in each village following local consultations. However, this does not mean that the remaining villages in the district have no growth potential.

In addition to the hectares for housing for the settlements indicated, the Core Strategy also dealt with the provision of employment land, requiring 20 hectares to be provided in South Hams outside the PPUA. This was divided between each settlement with the majority going to the Area Centres.

**Level 3 Assessment**

Level 3 assessment of the villages differs slightly from that of the towns. The Core Strategy gives the villages a global allocation as opposed to a specific allocation like the towns. The specific allocation also placed a target area to be identified for each of the towns, but this was not possible for the villages. Therefore each village was assessed on its ability to take additional growth based on consideration of the village form, shape and most ideal growth options. This gave an indication of what capacity could be considered in each settlement, which varied considerably between villages and emphasised the importance of obtaining local community views.

**Level 4 – Final Review**

The final level of assessment is a two-part process which takes place post the EbD:

1. The first is a capacity assessment for the 2016 sites based upon a simple density application to each site – 25-75 units/ha depending upon location and context. This will be represented in the recommendation tables as an area.
2. A design led assessment or appraisal allows more thorough evaluation of a site’s development potential, which is all the more important on larger sites. With the recommendations to have design guidance for 2016 sites, the concepts developed will be used to consider housing numbers. Intuitively this guidance/capacity review will consider that “new development is of high quality and locally distinctive...and that site layouts and buildings must promote sustainable developments and aim to reduce the impact on the environments” (para 4.22 - Core Strategy 2006).

**Village Level 3 Assessment**

Village Level 3 assessment of the villages differs slightly from that of the towns. The Core Strategy gives the villages a global allocation as opposed to a specific allocation like the towns. The specific allocation also placed a target area to be identified for each of the towns, but this was not possible for the villages. Therefore each village was assessed on its ability to take additional growth based on consideration of the village form, shape and most ideal growth options. This gave an indication of what capacity could be considered in each settlement, which varied considerably between villages and emphasised the importance of obtaining local community views.

**Level 3 – Discounting Sites**

As indicated previously, the DRA process focuses on the LDF Core Strategy’s 1,500 dwellings requirement for the Area Centres (900), Local Centres (200) and villages (400). The requirements for each of the Area and Local Centres are shown in Table 3 for 2016 and 2026 based on a simple estimation of 40 dwellings per hectare plus infrastructure and open space against their respective allocations.

Although the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is not yet approved there is also the need to look towards the horizon for the South West of 2026 and beyond. Although the RSS will only give a global (district wide) figure for South Hams, its provisions are likely to require at least a continuation of currently planned growth rates and probably their acceleration. The DRA at this level (as shown in Table 3) has, therefore, worked towards a figure of 1.3 x 2016 to provide for the likely 2026 development requirements. The RSS does not give settlement specific provisions, and it cannot be safely assumed that exactly the same patterns of need or demand will prevail from 2016 to 2026. However, it is considered reasonable and helpful to project the Core Strategy provisions to 2026 using this guideline.

With regards the villages, however, the approach is entirely different. The DRA starts with a list of 16 villages (those which have both a shop and a primary school) which the Council identified for first consideration for development, but without specific hectareage allocations for each village. This area in each village was as a result of assessing what was available in each village following local consultations. However, this does not mean that the remaining villages in the district have no growth potential.

In addition to the hectares for housing for the settlements indicated, the Core Strategy also dealt with the provision of employment land, requiring 20 hectares to be provided in South Hams outside the PPUA. This was divided between each settlement with the majority going to the Area Centres.

**Town Level 3**

1. Aim to fulfil development to 2026
2. Identify development areas to at least deliver 2026 capacity
3. Local community views

**Village Level 3**

1. Conform with the village form
2. Local community views
3. Identify development areas to assess capacity

Town Level 3 Assessment

The Core Strategy’s specific development allocations to 2016 for each town have been extrapolated to 2026 as a guideline for Level 3 of the DRA. This helps to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to meet the 2016 target. However, if that target could not be met then the process would return to Level 2 to include previously discounted sites.

1.4 DRA Process

The DRA was applied in two stages:

1. Firstly it was applied by the PFBE, with internal workshops with South Hams Forward Planning Team. This enabled refinement of the process and the basis for a first run of the process to be presented to the EbD attendees as a starting point for discussion and review.
2. The EbD process was carried out over eight days between 9th and 18th June 2009. This latter part of the process was most important in enabling the process to be ratified and refined by the local community most affected by its results.

In order to manage the programme, the workshops were divided into eight days, visiting each of the four area centres in turn followed by a day dealing with the related hinterland area. For example, Totnes was dealt with on one day and its hinterland villages (Dartington, Harbertonford, Marldon and Stoke Gabriel) were dealt with the following day, Dartmouth was followed by Blackawton, Kingswear and Stoke Fleming and so on for Ilfracombe and Kingsbridge. The daily agenda remained the same for every venue to ensure consistency across the district. Each day started by setting out the day’s aims and objectives followed by presentations of why we were carrying out this exercise and how the DRA process works. The conclusion reached by the PFBE on the settlement of the day was then presented. This was then followed by a series of workshops through the course of the remainder of the day to ratify or amend the PFBE’s conclusions as seen fit by those community members attending. The days were usually designed around Parish/Town Representatives.
### DAILY WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Welcome: community opening presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15</td>
<td>Presentation by Lee Bray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Presentation by Jason Syers/Lita Khazaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Presentation by Jeremy Caulton/Peter Quintanilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>Presentation of the town/village (Peter Quintanilla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Review Drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENQUIRY BY DESIGN SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>9th June: Totnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>10th June: Totnes Hinterland -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbertonford, Dartington, Marldon, Stoke Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>11th June: Dartmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>12th June: Dartmouth Hinterland -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackawton, Kingswear, Stoke Fleming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td>15th June: Ivybridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 6</td>
<td>16th June: Ivybridge Hinterland -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brixton, Holbeton, Modbury, Newton Ferrers, Ugborough, Wembury, Yealmpton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>17th June: Kingsbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 8</td>
<td>18th June: Kingsbridge Hinterland -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aveton Gifford, Chillington / Stokenham, Loddiswell, Marlborough, Salcombe, Thurlestone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 - Core Strategy Requirements to 2016

* The Adopted Core Strategy for South Hams specifies 30-40 dwellings per hectare (dph) in rural areas and up to 75 dph in built-up areas. The hectares shown in this table is a crude estimation based upon 40 dph x CS2 policy + 20% infrastructure and open space.

#### Grade Settlement up to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>up to 2016 homes</th>
<th>hectares*</th>
<th>employment (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AreaCentres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6ha</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivybridge</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3ha</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsbridge</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6ha</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>12ha</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LocalCentres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chil/Stokenham</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5ha</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modbury</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5ha</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salcombe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5ha</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yealmpton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5ha</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>% of 400</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aveton Gifford</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackawton</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartington</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbertonford</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbeton</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingswear</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddiswell</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marldon</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Ferrers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Fleming</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Gabriel</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurlestone</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembury</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Villages identified during workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>unknown</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avonwick</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diptford</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermington</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Alvington</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 DRA Product

The eight day EbD for the 29 towns and villages delivered much debate and discussion with numerous plans and issues raised. This raw data has been recorded and can be found in the separate appendices document accompanying this report. This subsection, however, summarises that data in a simple form enabling at a glance the outcome of the event. The PFBE provided its recommendations (see Section 2 of this report) based upon this data and a further review of the assessment criteria.

The aim of each workshop day was to arrive at consensus on the sites previously identified by the PFBE. It was stressed on the day of each workshop during the introductory presentations, that the sites brought to the workshops were identified by the PFBE, using the DRA assessment process previously indicated, but required consensus from the consultees before they could be put forward as recommended sites to the Council. The consequence of this was that each workshop debated all the sites, identified new sites and then attempted to reach consensus. Local knowledge enabled such discussions to discuss and highlight problems within the settlement not known to the PFBE team. There was a target aimed for with regards the hectareage required to meet housing numbers. The discussions attempted to meet these, but in many instances either fell short in terms of area or in fact exceeded that required. This was particularly so with the villages.

The main issues discussed through the eight days were the need and quantum of development, delivery, programme, affordable housing and windfall sites. In general, most workshops reached agreement on the total requirement. Clearly this was not always the case for any number of reasons such as difficult access, ownership and the wish for no further development. However, insofar as the housing allocation for South Hams District is concerned, the DRA reached a consensus through the EbD in achieving the anticipated numbers for growth in what most consultees and the PFBE would consider the most appropriate locations across the district.

That said it must be emphasised that during the process only the sites put forward could be assessed, the majority of which were put forward by the owners themselves (in some instances local residents). In the normal course of events these may not have been what PFBE would normally identify as ideal for settlement growth. Hence the final selection identified at the workshops and reviewed by PFBE (Section 2.3) were considered the best options for growth from those sites that were available. It must be stressed that those put forward by owners can be withdrawn from this process. Neither PFBE or SHDC have control over this and in such instances these sites will inevitably not be developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Workshop Day</th>
<th>Settlement Category as per Joint Core Strategy</th>
<th>Total No. of workshop attendees</th>
<th>No. of organisations involved</th>
<th>No. of people involved in discussions</th>
<th>No. of Sites discussed in workshop</th>
<th>Joint Core Strategy requirement - housing up to 2016 (ha)</th>
<th>Joint Core Strategy requirement - employment up to 2016 (ha)</th>
<th>2016-2026 housing (ha)</th>
<th>2016-2026 employment (ha)</th>
<th>Total Sites Aimed for (ha)</th>
<th>Total sites found (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Day 1 - 9th June</td>
<td>Totnes Area centre</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>±43.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Day 2 - 10th June</td>
<td>Avonwick Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cornworthy Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dartington Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±4.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diptford Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Habertonford Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marldon Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±4.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stoke Gabriel Village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±8.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Day 3 - 11th June</td>
<td>Dartmouth Area centre</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>±36.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Day 4 - 12th June</td>
<td>Blackawton Village</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kingswear Village</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stoke Fleming Village</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±5.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Day 5 - 15th June</td>
<td>Ivybridge Area centre</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>±37.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Day 6 - 16th June</td>
<td>Modbury Local centre</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>±5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yealmpton Local centre</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>±4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brixton Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±4.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ermington Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Holbeton Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Newton Ferrers Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ugborough Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wembury Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Day 7 - 17th June</td>
<td>Kingsbridge Area centre</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±30.57 ±32.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Day 8 - 18th June</td>
<td>Chillington / Stokenham Local centre</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>±7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Salcombe Local centre</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>±3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Aveton Gifford Village</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Loddiswell Village</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±4.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Marldon Village</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±5.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Thurlstone Village</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>West Alvington Village</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Main Issues

- Windfall sites, Borough Park, Dairy Crest Site
- Site visibility, topographical constraints
- AONB, access issues to site
- Landowners, primary school, Totnes, coalescence
- Prominence of site, village envelope
- Access to sites, old mill site, flood risk
- Commuter traffic, need for growth, centre, ownership
- Flooding, ex planning consent, north-east growth

- Growth, Townstal, land assembly, Masterplan

- Access to village, relocate school, new sites
- Topography, limited sites, peripheral sites
- New sites, western growth

- Town centre, eastern growth, new junction, sports area

- Need for growth, infill preference, new sites, gateways
- Limit sprawl, confine to envelope, eastern growth
- AONB, Sherford, limited options
- No shop, business park, infill sites
- Ownership of site, close to centre
- Access, growth away from centre
- North growth around school, affordable housing
- Village centre, topography, access limits

- NE growth areas, town centre issues, Masterplan

- Coalescence, emphasis on Stokenham, permissions
- Access, edge vs centre, affordable housing, holiday homes
- Ownership, school and shop, flooding
- North growth, affordable housing, HGVs, school move
- Centre vs edge, remote sites, connectivity
- Ownership, northern edge
- Lost pub and shop, decline school, wants growth

---

**Table 3 - Summary of DRA process**

**Note 1:**

The column ‘2016-2026 housing’ = 1.5 x Joint Core Strategy housing requirement ‘up to 2016’

The column ‘2016-2026 employment’ = 1.5 x Joint Core Strategy employment requirement ‘up to 2016’

**Note 2:**

The Joint Core Strategy requires that 400 ha of land are found for housing and employment within the villages collectively rather than stipulate a specific ha to be found in each individual village.
2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Recurring Issues

Following the eight day EbD workshops (ref Appendices on DRA outcomes) the results have been assessed and consolidated into a series of recommendations which include design guidance for sites to 2016. This section of the report elaborates on these recommendations and guidance and expands upon some of the common themes and recurring issues encountered throughout the workshops, responding to these issues.

2.1.1 The Right Growth

Allocating sites for housing in South Hams within the prescribed assessment criteria presented many challenges, which might be seen as lying at diametrically opposing ends of the planning and design process.

Site identification through government’s SHLAA process assesses the availability of housing land over 5, 10 and 15 year periods, with a focus on assuring a 5 year supply. It does not fully factor in which sites will be delivered first, or which sites may be interdependent on one another for future development. It primarily identifies which sites could be delivered within a short time frame irrespective of their location. This may tend to favour sites in single ownership, or sites unencumbered by contamination or infrastructure considerations, thus favouring edge of town greenfield sites rather than town centre infill or brownfield sites, which have considerably longer delivery periods and cannot be guaranteed in the short-term. Such an approach tends to promote sprawling disconnected development with mono uses and, whilst it may satisfy short-term needs, in the longer term it fragments communities and the quality of their built environment.

The corollary of this is that PFBE, using principles of traditional urban design through the DRA, chooses to prioritise infill, brownfield and town centre sites before greenfield sites. However, it is recognised that inner settlement sites are often affected by multiple ownership/occupation or may be statute bound, like for example, public parkland. Such sites would be unlikely to come forward for development prior to 2016, hence there is a need to include sites which are capable of earlier delivery (refer to Level 3 in the DRA).

DRA has attempted to balance good placemaking principles with identification of appropriate greenfield sites to enable early growth and meet the Core Strategy’s 2016 requirements. Where in combination, the extent of greenfield sites is so great as to have a potentially significant and detrimental impact on the settlement in question, Masterplans are recommended to control the design and quality of development (ref Section 3.3). Elsewhere it is recommended that district wide design guidance should be produced to ensure quality.

2.1.2 Village DRA assessment

The DRA identified two recurring issues in terms of village assessment.

1. Village form: The process of site identification and capacity assessment for each village, and
2. Village identification: The possibility of twinning villages to accommodate growth whilst remaining consistent with the process of allocation.

**Village Form**: The DRA process specifically split Level 3 to look at towns and villages differently. This enabled a ‘unique’ approach to each village through the assessment of identified sites against the village form, applying place making design principles at the village scale. In addition, the sites were assessed in terms of meeting the PFBE’s design principles.

**Village Identification**: The Council identified 16 villages for initial consideration for growth based upon the presence of key facilities, a school and shop. This built on the Core Strategy Inspector’s Report which commented upon the importance of aligning growth with the availability of local services in each village. During the course of the EbD workshops, attendees’ requests, additional villages were included for consideration. In all 5 additional villages were included into the process and 4 were allocated additional housing. These were Avonwick, Diptford, Errington and West Alvington. Cornworthy was also raised and considered but no site was recommended for allocation. The case for additional growth in these villages was supported by the work carried out at the EbD workshops. This showed that some villages were in such close proximity to one another that they shared facilities. In some cases the level of provision of other local facilities was above average and a suitable site was available. Some other villages were close enough to an area or local centres to benefit from their support. In each instance it was felt appropriate that an allocation was recommended in these villages.

2.1.3 Ensuring Consistency & Quality

As was expected during the EbD there were a number of issues raised by participants for further consideration. Perhaps the most frequently asked question was how the quality of future development can be ensured so that it reflects local architectural styles and building typologies. There were also concerns that new development should reflect the character of the place where it occurs.

These issues are about promoting good design and could be addressed in a number of ways. These include supplementary planning documents such as urban design frameworks,
such allocations are not discretely identified, but advocate
Although the Core Strategy requires an allocation of employment in hectares, PFBE would advocate such allocations are not discretely identified, but are part and parcel of the total allocation of new development. This is likely to occur more readily within the envelopes of current settlements, particularly within town centres, but we would counsel against large employment uses on the edge of settlements in order to avoid mono-use developments and raise quality of life.

2.1.5 Windfall sites
The SHLAA, STA or DRA cannot foresee all sites which might come forward. The unidentified sites are known as windfall sites.
Windfall sites across South Hams District are generally not large. Their impacts will be more localised. By their nature, these sites will often be within existing urban areas, and probably on brownfield land. Such sites are likely to make only marginal demands on the infrastructure systems, largely using existing facilities.
However, in South Hams, particularly in Totnes, there are also several larger brownfield sites which are likely to come forward before the Site Allocation DPDs are adopted. It was a point of debate at the EbDs whether such sites should count against the Core Strategy allocations.

2.1.6 2026 sites
The principal sites to be identified through this process are those known to be able to deliver the CS2 policy with regards housing to 2016. As previously indicated, the 2026 sites are essentially seen as the second phase of growth, but at this point in time are not attributed to a specific housing target. The DRA process suggested for the exercise that the 2016 allocation be increased by a factor of 1.5 to ensure there was enough land available for the post 2016 growth. As a result these sites are potentially more than is required for this ‘next phase’ of growth but as yet this remains speculation, hence the fact the some are shown with an undefined or ‘jagged’ edge in the DRA plans. It is therefore recommended that these sites are further reviewed once the 2026 allocation is known and proposals for the 2016 site have been further developed. The 2026 sites remain at this early stage as only potential second phase growth sites to be further reviewed.

2.1.7 Further clarification
It was stressed throughout the process, that the final selection of sites should be subject to ‘final review’ including a site visit to clarify any potential outstanding issues or problems. This step is included in the DRA to help ensure the needed delivery of sites because with over 500 sites originally identified in SHLAA and STA it was not possible to review each site in detail at the outset. The concluding result of the DRA reduced the number of sites to approximately 150, which will now be re-assessed to determine their ability to deliver the 2016 targets and emerging 2026 requirements. The 2016 site recommendations also include sketch design guidance as a precursor to district wide guidance and detailed Masterplans.

2.1.8 Delivery
The EbD for South Hams produced some interesting insights into the way in which the district has evolved and grown over the last 40 or 50 years. Certainly, there are many commonalities, as housing has been built across the district to provide a similar sub-urban typology. The effect of this has been a ‘warping’ of each settlement’s physical appearance, to a lesser or greater degree. Ivybridge is, arguably, the town most affected by this sub-urbanisation by incorporating urban design and place making principles at site allocation stage through the National Planning Policy Framework and SHLAA.

Traditionally, most urban development was created on the premise of walkability with areas containing a mixture of uses, local social and commercial facilities, a well distributed pattern of schools, hospitals, parks, all within reach of public transport. The neighbourhood was the primary building block of development, with a range of facilities within a walkable radius that allowed individuals to go about their daily business by walking or cycling and to travel over longer distances by means of public transport. This form of urbanism characterises much of the older parts of the towns in South Hams, such as the centres of Totnes, Kingsbridge and Dartmouth, although some of the newer parts have developed in a monoculture form resulting in a zoned approach that encourages greater car use.

Although the government’s SHLAA guidance and PPS3 are clear that any allowance for windfall sites should not be counted towards the first five or ten year periods of the plan since such sites will give little certainty to communities and infrastructure providers about where development will occur. A significant windfall allowance for large sites would make it difficult to properly plan infrastructure needed to support new development.

Government guidance does allow for the inclusion of a windfall allowance, where it can be justified. However, in view of the high levels of need for affordable housing in South Hams, it seems inappropriate to reduce the scope to address those needs by making any such allowance.
The larger brownfield sites known to be likely to come forward are not strictly windfalls in any case, and it is recommended that because of their scale and the need to plan for and programme support infrastructure, such sites should feature as proposals in the Site Allocations DPDs.
isolation, they will be an insufficient set of tools for delivering the required growth across South Hams beyond 2016. Moreover, design guidance and Masterplans are vulnerable to non delivery, irrespective of adoption, if there is insufficient commitment or robustness of process in place with which to deliver their key outputs.

At the start of this report PFBE highlighted that its DRA process selected town centre, brownfield and infill sites as the normative. It is recognised however that such sites are generally difficult to deliver for reasons of multiple ownerships, current lease or occupation arrangements. In most cases these sites have been earmarked for allocation to 2026 and beyond, but if this is to happen, a proactive approach to site assembly and development delivery must be adopted. Such a delivery mechanism will necessarily need to include a variety of partners and is relevant to all of the four main towns in South Hams and, possibly, also to Salcombe.

These inner town sites will require site assembly and high levels of commitment if they are to be developed, particularly within the timescales required. A joint partnership between public and private sector will be required to facilitate, coordinate and manage development within the towns. This will also need to include close collaboration between SHDC, Devon County Council, local town councils and other key partners, with clear roles and responsibilities set and agreed. Such a partnership should be established with a view to creating a mechanism that can directly influence and facilitate development and regeneration within the towns throughout the life of the Masterplan.

South Hams is a sophisticated and complex rural district with a high degree of physical and economic distinction between the towns. Whilst such a partnership could be established district wide, it is recommended each town should have its own ‘Development Partnership’. This will ensure that the correct level of focus is maintained, but more importantly it will generate a wider confidence that such a mechanism exists to assemble land and facilitate the delivery of the Masterplan objectives for the town. This will also help to create a strong sense of market confidence, an essential prerequisite in development and regeneration providing developers with the certainty of vision and a common set of objectives.

It should be noted that the creation of these Partnership vehicles should be seen as providing a new mechanism which is completely absent from the existing system. The Development Partnership would take responsibility for the day management of development and regeneration priorities in the town. Its membership would be multi disciplinary and comprise core membership as a minimum of senior district council planner, local district, county and/or town councillor/s, independent Chair, private sector interests and community member/s. This may typically be represented by the following structure, although this model is an example and can be adjusted to reflect more accurately local circumstances.

Figure 5 - Diagram illustrating the delivery structure mechanism; Opposite page - View of Kingsbridge
2.2 Design Principles

The DRA process tests the 2016 sites to ensure that future development in these locations will conform to the principles of placemaking and quality design. With these sites having the potential to be developed between now and 2016, it was felt appropriate to include high level design guidance in this report. This high level design guidance advises how new development should be considered in terms of its urban structure, urban grain, mix, density, height and its relation to context. This design guidance should be used by designers in the development of subsequent Masterplans and designs for each of these recommended sites. This should ensure that quality levels expected will be met, and that the South Hams character is maintained.

This guidance is provided in three parts. The first part is a set of overarching design principles (objectives), which would underpin any new development in the District. The second part is a series of design related assessment principles that could be used to check proposals coming forward. The third is the embodiment of these principles in sketch form for each 2016 site. These are not proposals for each site and can be interpreted in a number of ways, as Figure 6 indicates. These will follow each plan recommending the sites for development towards the end of this section of the report. (See Paragraph 2.3 below)

2.2.1 Overarching Design Principles

Any new development within South Hams should comply with the following principle objectives:

1. New urban form should provide exceptional connectivity and permeability. New development must integrate well with the host community providing fair access to local facilities and neighbourhoods

2. The plan for such development should be legible, well structured and well defined. It should relate successfully to existing features and landmarks, be expressed in a robust form and show a clear distinction between public and private space

3. There should be a genuine mix of uses where appropriate and higher density development in appropriate locations

4. There should be variety of buildings, streets, gardens and other spaces to ensure a diversity of household/family types and sizes from all social, economic and ethnic backgrounds

5. Design and construction standards are to be of high quality in order to ensure that built form endures for generations

6. Environmental imperatives in development must reflect a whole life approach, and must not be seen as a constraint but as an opportunity to add differentiation, quality and value. (An example of this is the use of the South Hams' topography)

7. Development should be attractive and encapsulate local distinctiveness and help to contribute to a sense of community where values and experiences can be shared

8. Buildings and places should be designed to adapt to changing social, technological and economic conditions

The following are key to putting these high level principles into practice:

- Views, in particular strategic views towards new developments, must be considered so as not to dramatically change or impact on the current skyline or form of the settlement. This is particularly important where views are across water onto the water bodies such as Kingsbridge or Salcombe

- Connecting homes to facilities and amenities by providing a choice of routes for pedestrians in the form of permeable movement networks (streets, paths and public spaces). Connected networks can also accommodate future changes

- Integrating public spaces into this permeable movement network to serve as a focus for local residents, and to act as spaces for interaction. These spaces should be well overlooked and active

- Using built form to distinguish between public and private space. The extent to which buildings make this distinction will depend on required levels of security and penetration into the blocks and/or buildings. Making clear distinctions between public and private realms gives residents the opportunity to choose between activity and privacy

- Using the flexibility of the perimeter block form to absorb different building types and uses. This is particularly useful in integrating different housing tenures while maintaining separate entrances to separate buildings. This flexibility also encourages a variety of architectural treatments, and ideally a range of expressions

- Adjusting the height to width proportions of the street or public space ‘canyon’, to reinforce its enclosure and legibility. The
higher the buildings in relation to the width of the space (or street), the more potential there is for the space to be actively overlooked and safe. These proportions can be manipulated, for example with buildings setbacks at high levels (to reduce the perception of height) or tree planting (to reduce the perceived width of a street).

2.2.2 Assessment Criteria

Using the above, each new development will be reviewed using the following Building for Life assessment criteria (CABE and the Home Builders Federation, 2005):

Environment and community
- Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafes and, if so, contribute in any way?
- Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community, particularly with regards housing types?
- Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the local community?
- Does the development have easy access to public transport?
- Does the development have any features that reduce its environmental impact?

Character
- Does the design impact on local or strategic views?
- Is the design specific to the area, the settlement and the scheme?
- Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?
- Does the scheme borrow from local character?
- Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?
- Are streets / roads defined by a well-structured building layout?
- streets, parking and pedestrianisation
- Does the building layout take priority over the streets and car parking, so that the highways do not dominate?
- Is the car parking well integrated and situated so it supports the street scene?
- Are the streets pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly?
- Does the scheme integrate with existing streets, paths and surrounding development?
- Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?

Design and construction
- Is public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?
- Do the buildings exhibit an architectural quality consistent with that of South Hams?
- Do internal spaces and layout allow for adaptation, conversion or extension?
- Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhance its performance, quality and attractiveness?
- Do buildings or spaces outperform statutory minima, such as building regulations?

In addition to these design principles, each site also has site specific guidance, as stipulated in Section 2.3. This guidance, supported by sketches, includes urban structure, urban grain, landscape, density and mix, height and massing. This will help to achieve the qualities that give form to traditional urbanism.
2.3 PFBE recommended growth sites and design guidance

Overview

The following pages show the PFBE’s recommended sites required in each town and village to meet the necessary housing numbers for growth in the District to 2016 and 2026 and beyond. For each settlement there is a growth plan and a supporting table in addition to some site specific information raised at the EBD workshops. Each plan is then followed by design guidance sketches for the 2016 sites. The following explains in more detail:

1. Plans
Each plan shows the actual sites the PFBE recommend for development up to 2016 and 2026. Each site is numbered referencing it to the data in the adjoining tables. Each is also colour coded for 2016 and 2026 and beyond. It should be noted that these sites are recommended on the basis of availability (ref Section 1.2) and their potential to contribute to the traditional growth patterns, rather than economic drivers. In addition, there are potential ‘new’ sites or areas which were identified during the EBD. These sites still need to be assessed for availability and sustainability to determine their suitability. If acceptable, they could be included into the recommended sites, but as yet it remains unknown as to whether they could be delivered by 2016 or 2026.

In some instances only parts of sites (either 2016 or 2026) are recommended for development due to constraints such as flood plain, topography, access or design rationale. These are shown as having an ‘undefined edge’, indicated with a jagged border. The extent of development on these sites would need clarification and refinement during the design process.

In addition to the recommended sites, all the original SHLAA and STA sites remain in outline on the plans. The settlement development boundaries are also shown in red (as indicated in the Local Plan). Finally, one of the recurring issues raised during the course of the workshops was the need to consider some areas collectively, ideally through a Masterplan or strategy. Where these areas occur, the collections of affected sites and/or areas are shown within a blue frame.

2. Tables
Each site is categorised as a 2016, 2026 or EbD site. Each is referenced with its own unique SHLAA or STA reference number (apart from the EBD sites). The area column indicated with the title ‘Dev. Ha’ for development hectares provides the total area of the site. In some areas only a portion of the site may be used for 2016 or 2026 as for reasons given above, hence the areas shown in the last column of the table may not always equate to the total sites area. These ‘part-site-areas’ are approximate and are necessary in order to be able to estimate housing numbers.

3. Design Guidance
In addition to the generic principles previously noted, (see Paragraph 2.2 above) each of the site recommendation plans in this section shows a sketch which is the embodiment of the design principles for the 2016 sites. It must be stressed that these sketches must be seen as indicative graphic representations of the design guidance and are NOT completed designs for these sites. These sketches are merely a tool to explain the PFBE’s urbanist principles through sketch form. In addition to the sketches each set of sites has a series of design principles considering context, layout, mix and density and height. It must be stressed that this is guidance. Specifics within these principles such as densities where actual dwellings per hectare are identified are still guidance as this must relate to context and do not include for open space and infrastructure requirements. Designers considering these sites would, in addition to taking into account this guidance, be influenced by context, topography and ecology, as well as the developers brief. It is recommended that they open discussions with SHDC, particularly the larger sites prior to starting their design process.
**Issues raised at the workshop**

- The historic core presents few opportunities for new development.
- Townstal needs a focus and centre to complement Dartmouth’s historic centre.
- Current development in Townstal is sprawling in character.
- New growth at Townstal will require a masterplan.
- New secondary school provision (under BSF programme) and the new hospital.
- Identify new park and ride site.

**Recommendations**

- Major new development/growth require comprehensive masterplans.
- Site 5 and 6 are partially used as an industrial estate, the other half is vacant.

**Access**

Access is an issue to HGVs. Redevelopment of these sites should try to retain compatible employment, and create a new centre for this portion of the neighbourhood. Design and delivery should be staged to permit relocation of businesses.

- Sites 8 and 15 are part of the Royal Navy Academy estates, thus deliverability needs to be confirmed.

**2016 housing unit numbers**

- Core Strategy recommendation = 200
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 200-300
- Includes employment land = 2 ha

---

**Dartmouth**

**Area centre**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_15_08_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_15_09_08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land at Great Cotton Farm</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SH_15_10_08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Collingwood Road State Boat Store</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SH_15_11_08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Little Cotton Caravan Park</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016 Total** ±6.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_15_12_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long Cross, Milton Lane</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_15_13_08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Football Ground, Norton</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_15_14_08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Collingwood Road State Boat Store</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_15_15_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land between Ridge Hill and College Way</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SH_15_16_08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Land off Rock Park</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SH_15_17_08</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Depot, Mayors Avenue</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SH_15_18_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rosehill Villa, Southford Road</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SH_15_19_08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Little Cotton Caravan Park</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SH_15_20_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Milton, Milton Farm, Milton Lane</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SH_15_21_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dartmouth Community College</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>±3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SH_15_22_08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Playing Field, Norton</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>±3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SH_15_23_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tennis Court, off Rock Park</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SH_15_24_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land southeast of Norton Park Farm</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>±3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SH_15_25_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land West of Admiral Court</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>±0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2026 Total** ±25.75 ±32.65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SH_15_01_08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>South of 15_04_08 Reservoir</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SH_15_02_08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>North of 15_12_08 Land southeast of Coombe</td>
<td>±2.17</td>
<td>±2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SH_15_03_08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hospital Site</td>
<td>±0.02</td>
<td>±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SH_15_04_08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>East of 15_08_08 Leisure Centre / Liddl</td>
<td>±1.33</td>
<td>±1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SH_15_05_08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>North of 15_20_08 The Guild Hall</td>
<td>±0.69</td>
<td>±0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New land Total** ±4.34
Key:
- Orange: Proposed 2016 sites
- Beige: Proposed 2026 sites
- Blue: EbD identified sites
- Red: Undefined edge
- Purple: Development Boundary
- Grey: SHLAA & STA sites
- Blue/White: Recommended Masterplan

Map showing proposed sites and boundaries.
Dartmouth 2016

Site 3, 4, and 11

Context
- Trees along Townstal Road to be retained.
- Existing farm buildings to be incorporated into the design.
- View entering Townstal from the west to be considered.
- Existing roads off Townstal Road to be incorporated into design.
- Design to reflect current field boundaries where possible.
- Consider Sainsburys as the part of a new centre.
- Consider new site for park and ride.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter blocks circa 60/80 x 110/150.
- Blocks to be a combination of end on and facing to Townstal Road.
- Existing junctions to be retained along with new junctions.
- Back lane access acceptable to on-plot parking.
- On street parking acceptable on roads off Townstal Road.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths, particularly at block ends.
- Fronts to address roads.
- Open space to be fronted by residential.
- Incorporate cycle and pedestrian routes, particularly to centre.
- Existing trees to be retained wherever possible.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back along Townstal Road with front gardens.
- Other frontages can be variable.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semi and terraced to be dominant.
- Employment & apartments accepted in/near neighbourhood centre.
- Neighbourhood centre focused on area opposite Sainsbury’s.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- Ideal mix to be ground floor employment/retail/leisure, floors over residential.
- Large parking areas for non residential to behind frontage.
- Mono uses will be discouraged.
- Alternative corner uses within the development will be encouraged.
- Social infrastructure (health and education) must be considered.
Density and Height
- The transect should apply to Townstal Road.
- Higher densities at the centre opposite Sainsbury.
- Higher densities & heights along Townstal Road in blocks 3 and 11.
- Residential buildings to be minimum 2 storeys.
- Townstal Road in blocks 3 and 11 will increase 3-4 storeys.
- Densities to be based on local context – circa 30-35ha.
- Increase densities around neighbourhood centre.

Site 5
Context
- Consider connecting Victory Road to Collingwood Road.
- Consider a new neighbourhood centre.
- Existing context to define block and plots depths.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form to relate to current layouts.
- Plots sizes to be mixed, particularly at block ends.
- Back new plots onto existing along Britannia Ave.
- New road junction to align with existing junctions.
- Landscaping screening to be considered along Collingwood Road.
- New layout to ensure high level of permeability.
- Incorporate cycle and pedestrian routes.
- Parking on or off-plot.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semi and terraced housing to dominate.
- Employment and apartments accepted in or near the centre.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- The emphasis on mix to occur opposite along Collingwood Road.
- Ideal mix: ground floor employment/retail/leisure, floors over residential.
- Large parking areas for non-residential to behind frontage.
- Social infrastructure needs (institutional) must be considered.

Density and Height
- Higher densities and heights acceptable along Collingwood Road.
- Residential buildings to be minimum 2 storeys.
- Densities to be based on local context – circa 30-35ha.

(These densities cannot be applied to gross 2016 site areas as open space / amenity space and physical infrastructure requirements must also be included within these areas).
**Ivybridge Area Centre**

### Issues raised at the workshop
- New growth patterns to balance out the conventional 1960’s development.
- Consider a new neighbourhood centre to the east of town.
- Consider a series of masterplans to integrate new growth, a town centre restructuring and a sports and recreational ‘zone’ to the south of the town.
- Local community aspiration for a new junction off the A38.

### Recommendations
- Sites 3 and 4 need to be treated as a second phase in 2016, with Sites 1 and 2 to infill first.
- Site 8 could be a catalyst for town centre regeneration due to its size and location.
- Sites 7, 8 and 10 will improve the town centre by increasing the centre’s population.
- Sites 3, 4, 5 (part), 6 and 9 can be brought forward as part of the 2026 requirements.
- Sites 10 and 11 need to go through SHLAA and STA assessment.

### 2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy recommendation = 100
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 200-250
- Includes employment land = 5 ha

### Sites and land summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_57_10_08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Park and Ride Site, Exeter Road</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_57_06_08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exeter Road, west of Park and Ride</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_57_07_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rutt Lane</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_57_13_08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Land to west of Palace Lane</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SH_57_08_08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exeter Road, north of rugby ground</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SH_57_09_08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RUFC Ground and Land east of Godwell Lane</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SH_27_05_08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Blachford Road</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>±1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SH_27_09_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glanville’s Mill and Fore Street</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>±3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SH_57_14_08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Land south of Torhill Farm</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016 Total** ±16.55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Land to south and west of Highland</td>
<td>±1.68</td>
<td>±1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Recreation Ground, Exeter Road</td>
<td>±0.34</td>
<td>±0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New land Total** ±2.02
Ivybridge 2016

Site 1, 2 and 5

Context
- Consider linking to residential area to the west of Site 1 and 2.
- Consider location of MSCP relative to station and access points.
- Design to reflect current boundaries where possible.
- Align and connect routes with existing roads.
- Consider views along Exeter Road into Site 5.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter blocks circa 60/80 x 110/150.
- Blocks structure reflects connections to adjoining residential area.
- Back lane access acceptable for on-plot parking.
- No on street parking on Exeter Road.
- On street parking acceptable on other roads.
- Plots sizes to be mixed, particularly at block ends.
- MSCP adjoining station.
- Incorporate cycle and pedestrian routes.
- Any trees of a reasonable size within the plan area to be retained.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address roads and overlook fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and terraced housing to dominate.
- Employment and higher densities around MSCP.
- Neighbourhood centre focused on area of entrance to site on Exeter Road.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.
- Higher densities and heights acceptable around MSCP.
- Residential buildings to be minimum 2 storeys.
- Increase 3-4 storeys at neighbourhood centre and around MSCP.
- Densities to based on local context – circa 30-35ha.
Mix
• Mixed use predominantly around MSCP and along the ‘boulevard’.
• Ideal mix to be ground floor employment/retail/leisure, floors over residential.
• Alternative corner uses within the development will be encouraged.
• Social infrastructure requirements (health and education) must be considered.
• Ensure higher proportion of employment around station area.
• Consider neighbourhood centre off Exeter Road at ‘entrance’.
• Large parking areas for non residential to be behind frontage.

Density and Height
• Higher densities and heights acceptable around MSCP.
• Residential buildings to be minimum 2 storeys.
• Increase 3-4 storeys at neighbourhood centre and around MSCP.
• Densities to be based on local context – circa 30-35ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).
Kingsbridge
Area Centre

Issues raised at the workshop
- There are concerns about deliverability of infill sites (multiple ownerships).
- Adjoining sites must be amalgamated in order to bring forward a holistic Masterplan.
- Leigh Cross employment site is mono-use and too far from the town.
- Concern at development to the northwest - large scale.

Recommendations
- Sites 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 should have a direct connection to Fore St, being within four minutes.
- Sites 6, 14, and 21, whilst being mixed use, should focus on light industry.
- Sites 11, 12, 13 and 22 should form part of a Masterplan with a focus on tourism and water based activities.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy recommendation = 200
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 200-250
- Includes employment land = 5 ha
Kingsbridge 2016

Site 2, 4 and 5

Context
- Access to local roads to improve permeability essential.
- Consider incorporation or relocation of allotments.
- Consider long views from the east towards the site.
- Design to reflect current field boundaries where possible.
- Topography to influence design, particularly with regards to DDA.
- Sectional designs essential to consider views over neighbouring properties.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Access to Plymouth Road to be considered.
- Connections to Trebble Park and Hurrell Road essential.
- Investigate connections to St Edmunds Road.
- Perimeter blocks circa 60/80 x 110/150 preferred.
- New routes to align & connect with those indicated above.
- Back lane access acceptable to garages.
- On street parking acceptable on all roads.
- Plots sizes to be mixed, particularly at block ends.
- Edge of development to front fields.
- Incorporate cycle and pedestrian routes.
- Trees to be retained wherever possible.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address roads and overlook fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and terraced housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.
Mix
• Consider potential mixed use centre (retail unit/pub).
• Consider social infrastructure requirements.
• Alternative corner uses within the development will be encouraged.
• Possible neighbourhood centre along Hurrell Road.

Density and Height
• Residential buildings to be minimum 2 storeys.
• Densities to be based on local context – circa 30-35ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).

NOTE:
Vehicular access and links are essential for this urban extension. If any one of the identified access points or linkages cannot be accommodated, then the growth proposals of Kingsbridge must be reassessed.
Issues raised at the workshop

- Coalescence with Dartington prevented.
- Higher density developments near the town centre are limited.
- It was agreed the Baltic Wharf O.P.A. would be included amongst the windfall sites.
- A request was made for a clearly defined development boundary to the town.

Recommendations

- Safeguard natural boundaries to the town, i.e. ridgelines.
- Consider masterplanning part of the town.
- Consider the visual impact and/or topographical information for Sites 8, 9, 11 and 15, 16, 17.
- Review flooding issues on Sites 1, 2, 12 and 13.
- Should Site 10 come forward, the town square function must be retained.

- Site 16 considered if the existing school is relocated through a land swap agreement.
- A long term masterplan needs to be undertaken on Sites 14 and 19. Employment, housing and recreation should be integrated to create a compact design.
- Sites 4, 5, 6 fall within Dartington Parish, but should be included in Totnes’s growth.
- Site 15 should be considered in the longer term and only as part of a masterplanning exercise for the employment land north east of the town centre.

2016 housing unit numbers

- Core Strategy recommendation = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 400-450 (inc. 200 for Site 3)
- Includes employment land = 5 ha

---

**Totnes Area Centre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_56_14_08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kevic Lower School, Ashburton Road</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_56_16_08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dairy Crest Site</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>±1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_56_04_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baltic Wharf St Peter’s Quay</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_14_18_08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Land opposite Puddaven House, Dartington</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SH_56_13_04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lane End Field, Dartington</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SH_14_19_08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dartington Lane Plantation, Dartington</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SH_56_12_08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sheepfield</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016 Total** ±13.45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SH_56_01_08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bourton Lane</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>±1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SH_56_02_08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bridgetown Riverside</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>±4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SH_56_06_08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Market Square</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SH_14_20_08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Copland Lane</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>±0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SH_56_03_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Steamer Quay</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SH_56_18_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smuggles Inn, Steamer Quay</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SH_56_17_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Borough Park</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SH_56_10_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Follaton House, Totnes</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>±2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SH_56_09_08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Follaton Bungalows, Totnes</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SH_56_08_08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Broomborough, Totnes</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>±3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2026 Total** ±19.95
Totnes 2016

Site 1, 2 and 7

Context
- Views into site from Ashburton Road to be considered.
- Consider backing housing along Swallowfields Road.
- New roads to connect through to Swallowfields and Weirfields Roads.
- Consider views along Ashburton Road.
- Long views across the Dart towards the site must be considered.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Primary school to be located central to site 1 off Ashburton Road.
- Perimeter blocks circa 60/80 x 110/150 preferred.
- Block structure determined by primary school and access.
- Primary school to be overlooked by residential.
- Two new junctions off Ashburton anticipated.
- Weirfields to connect through to Swallowfields Road.
- Retain opens space at entrance to Radnor Terrace on Site 2.
- Off plot parking acceptable except along Ashburton Road, Barracks Hill.
- On plot parking for Site 7.
- Plots sizes to be mixed, particularly at block ends.
- Incorporate cycle and pedestrian routes.
- Existing trees to be retained wherever possible.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address roads and overlook fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and terraced housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.
- Higher densities along northern eastern edge overlooking the Dart.
- Potential neighbourhood centre within site.
- Employment and apartments accepted on Site 2 and Site 7.

Mix
- Mix use/employment - occur primarily on Sites 2 some on Site 7 & within 1.
- Ideal mix - ground floor employment/retail/leisure, floors over residential.
- Parking for non residential uses not to be along road frontages.
- Social infrastructure requirements (education) must be considered.

Density and Height
- Higher densities and heights acceptable in site 2 and the corner of Site 7.
- Apartment block typologies will be accepted overlooking the Dart.
- Residential buildings - minimum 2 storeys (excludes higher density areas)
- Heights on Site 2 and 7 should be 3-4, and 4-5 will be accepted in Site 2.
- Increase densities around neighbourhood centre.
- Densities to based on local context – circa 30-35ha.
Sites 4, 5 and 6

Context
- Consider long views along Ashburton Road to sites.
- Consider existing pedestrian links.
- Consider typologies along Dartington Lane.
- Consider mixed use employment along Ashburton Road.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter blocks circa 60/80 x 110/150 preferred.
- Multiple points of access off Ashburton Road.
- Retain green links through site.
- Fronts to address roads.
- No culs de sac.
- Existing trees to be retained.
- Off plot parking acceptable except along Ashburton Road, and Dartington Lane.
- Plots sizes to be mixed, particularly at block ends.
- Consider pedestrian and cycle links across site.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address roads and overlook fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing to dominate.
- Detached housing acceptable along Dartington Lane.
- Terraced housing acceptable.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.
- Higher densities along northern edge.
- Potential neighbourhood centre off Ashburton Road.

Mix
- Consider using mixed use B1/A2/A3 at Ashburton and Dartington junction.

Density and Height
- Higher densities and heights acceptable along northern edge.
- Residential buildings - minimum 2 storeys (excludes higher density areas)
- Heights along Ashburton can be increased to 2.5-3.
- Average densities based on local context – circa 30-35ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).

NOTE: Multiple access points from Ashburton Road essential. Carefully review Site 6 with the aim of preserving woodland majority.
Totnes 2016

Site 3

Context
• Consider alternative points of access for pedestrians.
• Consider waterfront pedestrian route connecting to Fore Street (town centre).
• Consider new access off St Peters Quay to screen and back development onto Area A.
• Consider new development benefiting from views across River Dart.
• Consider distant views back to Site from area B.
• Consider improving the waterfront.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
• Block structure layout to take advantage of the views.
• Perimeter blocks/pavilion structures acceptable.
• Blocks at the entrance to ensure an active street down to core of site.
• Incorporate pedestrian/cycle routes.
• Consider the creation of new basin along the waterfront.
• All frontages onto public real to be predominantly active.
• Servicing to quayside developments must not impact.
• Parking both on and off plot acceptable.
• Existing trees to be retained where possible.
• Access off St Peters Quay – Moat Hill.

Layout - Urban Grain
• Mixed use/apartment buildings along quayside
• Fronts to address road and public realm
• Consider multiple focal points - central square; marina.
• Address focal pints with mixed use/ employment/ leisure uses.
• Consider some terraced housing along spine road.
• Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
• Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.
Mix
- Active mixed use/employment to face onto focal points.
- Quayside to have mixed use ground floor with residential over.
- Social infrastructure requirements (health and education) must be considered.
- Higher proportion employment around focal points.

Density and Height
- Higher densities and heights acceptable along waterfront.
- Apartment block typologies will be accepted along waterfront.
- Residential buildings - minimum 2 storeys (excludes higher density areas).
- Heights on waterfront and focal points could be up to 4 floors.
- Densities to based on local context – circa 30-35 ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).
**Chillington & Stokenham**

**Issues raised at the workshop**
- Chillington has a series of sites which have been brought forward and already have planning permission. Residents oppose further growth of Chillington.
- Both settlements stressed their opposition to coalescence.
- An existing OPA exists for 44 units for Site 8.

**Recommendations**
- Sites 1 and 2 need to be designed addressing the village’s rural character.
- Site 2 would become a gateway into the village and 'complete' the south west quarter at the main crossroads.

**2016 housing unit numbers**
- Core Strategy recommendation = 50
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 50-60 (includes 40 from Site 8)
- Includes employment land = 0.75 ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_53_23_08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Between Carehouse Cross &amp; Stokenham Cross</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_53_14_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Carehouse Cross, Stokenham (2026)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Northwest of SH_53_23_08</td>
<td>±0.16</td>
<td>±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Northeast of SH_53_23_08</td>
<td>±0.24</td>
<td>±0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>South of SH_53_23_08</td>
<td>±0.94</td>
<td>±0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>West of SH_53_14_08</td>
<td>±0.21</td>
<td>±0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>East of SH_53_14_08</td>
<td>±0.24</td>
<td>±0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New land Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chillington and Stokenham 2016

Site 2 and 8

Context
- Consider views entering Stokenham.
- Consider views towards across fields to Chillington.
- Consider views along the A379 to Site 2.
- Consider the backs of houses along the A379 at Site 8.
- Retain mature trees on Site 8.

Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form.
- Layout design to follow field / ownership boundaries.
- Plots sizes to be mixed, particularly at block ends.
- Access direct onto plots from the peripheral roads.
- Back lane access acceptable if garages are considered mid block.
- On-plot parking only.
- Connect Orchard and Shorneywell across Site 8.
- Consider phasing in design of Site 2.

Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semi and detached housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- Consider mixed use (A2/A3) at the intersection on Site 2.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30/ha.
Issues raised at the workshop

- Some residents expressed a strong opposition to development, whilst some identified possible new sites.
- A lack of infill sites was identified, thus greenfield sites had to be considered.

Recommendations

- Sites 1, 3 and 5 are closest to village centre.
- Site 1 design to improve A379.
- Development to improve junction at Palm Cross Green.
- Site 1 needs to integrate employment and/or community uses.
- Site 4 to be SHLAA and STA assessed-difficult access.

2016 housing unit numbers

- Core Strategy recommendation = 50
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 40-45
- Includes employment land = 0.75 ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_35_01_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fields west of Palm Cross Green</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>±1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_35_13_08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Land to west of Old Vicarage</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>±0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_35_09_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field adjoining Modbury car park, south of Poundwell street</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>±1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total ±1.71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land to East of Primary School</td>
<td>±1.02</td>
<td>±1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land at Coppers Corner</td>
<td>±0.48</td>
<td>±0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land west of Barracks road</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land east of Poundwell Street</td>
<td>±0.02</td>
<td>±0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New land Total ±1.66
**Modbury 2016**

**Site 1**

**Context**
- Consider strategic views from Ridge Road back to site.
- Consider access into site off Green Lane.
- Consider potential access to Barracks Road.
- Consider pedestrian access to Palm Cross intersection.
- Consider the backs of houses along Barracks Road.
- Consider context of existing mixed use at head of Green Lane.
- Retain mature trees on site.

**Layout – Urban Structure / Access**
- Block depth to be kept to a minimum.
- Perimeter block form only.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Fronts to address Green Lane and the fields at the rear.
- Direct plot access from Green Lane.
- Pedestrian access through the Barracks Lane.
- Investigate pedestrian links with village centre.
- Parking on-plot only.

**Layout – Urban Grain**
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semi and detached housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

**Mix**
- Consider community use / employment at eastern end of Green Lane.

**Density and Height**
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30/ha.

**NOTE:**
*Green Lane is a key component in delivering this proposal. Option to be reviewed if Green Lane unusable.*
Issues raised at the workshop
• Due to a high percentage of second home ownership, most residents cannot afford to live near the centre and waterfront.
• Sites closer to the centre should be designed to incorporate employment, car parking and dwellings.
• Attendees requested an in-depth study of the boundaries and new sites.
• There are access issues with many sites.

Recommendations
• Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 should be considered in conjunction with a town centre assessment/review.

2016 housing unit numbers
• Core Strategy recommendation = 50
• Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 40-55
• Includes employment land = 0.75 ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_41_04_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shadycombe</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>±1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_41_06_08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Former Gas site, Gould Road</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_41_08_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gould Road Car Park</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total ±2.90

2026 Total ±1.42

Site No | SHLAA | STA | Site Name                | Tot. Ha | Dev. Ha |
|--------|-------|-----|--------------------------|---------|---------|

4     | NEW   | -   | Site east of 41_05_08    | 0.50    | 0.50    |

New land Total 0.50
Salcombe 2016

Site 1

Context
- Consider Sites 2 and 4 to improve access.
- Consider access to Gould Road and Island Street.
- Pedestrian connections through to Shadycombe Road is desirable.
- Consider impact on area A.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Consider views out over Batson Creek.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form only.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Block widths determined by context.
- Access off Shadycombe Road desirable.
- Connect through to Gould and Island Roads if possible.
- Investigate pedestrian links with village centre.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address road and overlook fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing to dominate.
- Terraced housing acceptable.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- Consider mixed use along Croft Road – A3 possibly using the views.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30/ha.

NOTE: This is a sensitive location overlooking the harbour. It requires a quality scheme. The developer should work closely with the planning authority and local community. Access is an important factor in delivering this location. If any other factors cannot be met, this proposal should be revised.
Issues raised at the workshop
- Identifying sites best suited to support Fore Street retail proved challenging.
- Chosen sites will need to contribute to redefining the village envelope.

Recommendations
- Site 1 is the preferred site, due to its proximity to the centre. (The site does, however, have issues in terms of access).
- Site 1 is large enough to be phased.
- The allotments must be relocated as part of the 2016 development.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy recommendation = 50
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 45-50

### Table: Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_62_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land to north and east of Milizac Close</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>±1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.65</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_62_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land to north and east of Milizac Close</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>±3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2026 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.90</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yealmpton 2016

Site 1

Context
- Consider high point of site with regards layout.
- Consider impact on area A.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Design to incorporate relocation of allotments.
- Design to consider existing field boundaries.
- Consider views along Underhay on entry to the village.
- Consider visual link with the school opposite.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form – two plots back from Underhay Road.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Access directly off Underhay Road desirable.
- Align new central access road with school opposite.
- Back access lane acceptable for on-plot parking if access not accepted off Underhay.
- New access lane from west across site to Underhay Road.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address road and overlook fields where appropriate.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- Consider B1/A2/A3 use to village end of site.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys
- Densities should be comparable to context – 30/ha.

(Note: To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).

NOTE:
Proposal reliant upon the relocation of allotments. Proposal to be reviewed if this is not possible.
Issues raised at the workshop
- Flooding issues need to be mitigated, due to the village’s valley location.
- A cooperative has been created to retain and run the local shop.
- The sites identified must be sensitively considered due to context.

Recommendations
- Site 1 has good access and is close to the heart of the village.
- The design of Site 1 must consider the local context particularly Court Barton Farm and St Andrew’s Church.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 25-30 (lower density applied due to context)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_02_01_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land south of Court Barton, Aveton Gifford</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total ±1.39

Total ±1.39
Aveton Gifford 2016

Site 1

Context
- Carefully consider & retain St Andrews Church context.
- Carefully consider and retain Court Barton Farm context.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Retain garden areas in front of Court Barton Farm.
- Access off Church Lane needs careful consideration.
- Design to consider existing field boundaries.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Courtyard form considered.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Single point access off Church Lane.
- Consider alternative or secondary access off Bakers Hill.
- Investigate pedestrian links with village centre.
- Parking off and on-plot.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Set back with front gardens to dominate.
- No front gardens acceptable.
- Fronts to address roads and where appropriate face over fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Cottages/semis and detached.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Density due to location – 20-25ha.

NOTE:
Sensitive location requiring a quality scheme. Developer to work closely with planning authority and local community. Lower density applied due to context. Style and materials to reflect local distinctiveness. If any of these factors cannot be satisfied then this proposal should be reviewed.
Issues raised at the workshop
- The village was not part of the original allocation list as it does not have a school.
- To ensure consistency, consideration was given to twinning Avonwick with Diptford as the latter has a school.

Recommendations
- Recommendation was given to extend the village envelope.
- Site 1 was preferred because of its ease of delivery.
- Site 2 was introduced during the EbD process by consultees.
- This site needs to go through the SHLAA and STA processes to determine deliverability and sustainability.
- The recommended allocation is based on the village requirements and sites; it is not pre-determined.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 15-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_38_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land West of Avonwick, Avonwick</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>±0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016 Total</strong></td>
<td>±0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_38_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land West of Avonwick, Avonwick</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>±0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2026 Total</strong></td>
<td>±0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>±1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land to West of Aune Close</td>
<td>±0.51</td>
<td>±0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New land Total</strong></td>
<td>±0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avonwick 2016

Site 1

Context
- Adjoining areas A and B to be considered.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Consider views on entering village.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Single point access off Aune Close.
- Parking on-plot.
- Back lane access acceptable.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address roads and fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30ha.
Blackawton Village

**Issues raised at the workshop**
- Access to village is via narrow rural lanes and is restricted.
- Well attended primary school.
- The possibility of relocating the school within the village was raised.
- The recommended allocation is based on the village requirements and sites.

**Recommendations**
- Sites north of the village could be planned and designed together.
- Sites 4, 5 & 6 were proposed in the EbD. Development on these sites would help form a contiguous edge to the town envelope.

- These sites would have to be taken through the SHLAA and STA processes.
- Site 6 was suggested by the community as the best site for the relocation of the school.

**2016 housing unit numbers**
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 8-10

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_06_03_08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land south of Cheavestone Lea, Blackawton</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_06_02_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Town Farm, Blackawton</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>±2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Primary School Playing fields</td>
<td>±0.42</td>
<td>±0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Field East of Tumbling fields</td>
<td>±0.23</td>
<td>±0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Site north of Main Street, Blackawton Trench</td>
<td>±0.77</td>
<td>±0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New land Total** ±1.42

---

[Diagram showing map of Blackawton Village with proposed sites labeled and a key to the map legend.]
Blackawton 2016

Site 1

Context
- Adjoining areas A and B to be considered.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Consider access across site frontage between Millcombe and Back Lane.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Frontage onto new access lane.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Rear access to properties.
- Parking on-plot only.
- Access off either Back Lane or Millcombe.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and terrace cottages.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30ha.

NOTE:
Sensitive location requiring a quality scheme. Developer to work closely with planning authority and local community. Lower density applied due to context. Style and materials to reflect local distinctiveness. If any of these factors cannot be satisfied then this proposal should be reviewed.
Issues raised at the workshop
- Due to its proximity to Sherford, Brixton residents question the need for the village to accommodate additional growth.
- There was concern that Brixton might lose its character should growth take place.
- The sites south of A379 are in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Recommendations
- Site 1 developed can define an entrance to the village and complete urban structure on both sides of A379.
- Site 2 and 3 both have been identified as potential sites for 2026. However access and connectivity challenges must be resolved to bring these sites forward.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 40-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_07_03_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land east of Winstone Lane</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>±1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_07_11_08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land to east of Venn Farm</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_07_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land north of Venn Farm</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>±1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total ±1.67
2026 Total ±3.01
Total ±4.68
Brixton 2016

Site 1

Context
• Adjoining areas A and B to be considered.
• Retain mature trees on site.
• Align new road with existing where possible.
• Consider views along the A379 on entering the village.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
• Perimeter block form considered.
• Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
• Single point access off A 379 to connect through to Winstone Lane.
• Parking on-plot – no parking on Winstone or A379.
• Back lane access acceptable.
• Fronts address roads and overlooking field.

Layout - Urban Grain
• Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
• Typologies are based upon local context.
• Semis and detached housing to dominate.
• Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
• Consider A2 or A3 on the corner.

Density and Height
• Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
• Densities should be comparable to village edge context – 25-30ha.
Issues raised at the workshop
- The village was not part of the original allocation list as it did not have a village shop or school.

Recommendations
- Site 1 and 2 were introduced during the EbD process.
- These sites need to be taken through the STA and SHLAA process.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>East of Hothill Lane</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land Sout East o Church</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cornworthy 2016

No 2016 sites allocated in this village.

Right - View of Cornworthy
Issues raised at the workshop
- Ensure there is no coalescence with Totnes.
- Sites agreed with reservations, are greenfield yet central to village.

Recommendations
- The school and nursery will move to north of the village. This will open up Site 3.
- Site 3 could enhance the village centre.
- Site 1 and 2 should be designed together.
- Sites 1 and 2 should be considered as both delivering 2016 growth.
- Site 3 and 4 were introduced during the EbD (available after school relocation).
- Site 3 should be given special consideration, as it is prone to flooding.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 30-40
Dartington 2016

Site 1

Context
- Consider entrance into Dartington – mixed use gateway.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Consider Webbers Yard opposite.
- Relate to Mill Road entrance opposite.
- Consider playing fields.
- Consider views on entering Dartington.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Layout to address / overlook playing fields.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Align access with Mill Road.
- Parking on-plot only.
- Rear access to plots facing playing fields.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Back to back development.
- Frontage onto A385 and playing fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- Consider B1/A2/A3 use gateway off A385.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be generally 2 storeys.
- Potential 3 storey fronting playing fields.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 30ha.

NOTE:
Sensitive location requiring a quality scheme. Developer to work closely with planning authority and local community. Lower density applied due to context. Style and materials to reflect local distinctiveness. If any of these factors cannot be satisfied then this proposal should be reviewed.
Diptford

Issues raised at the workshop
- Diptford not part of the original allocation list, as it did not have a village shop.
- Diptford could be ‘twinned’ with Avonwick as they share facilities and amenities.
- The recommended allocation is based on the village requirements and sites.

Recommendations
- Development to consider context opposite.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 8-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_17_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wheat Park, Diptford</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total 1.58 Ha

Total ±0.61 Ha
Diptford 2016

Site 1

Context

- Adjoining areas A and B to be considered.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Access directly off lane as opposite.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access

- Fronts to address road.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Plot depths determined by adjoining development.
- Parking on-plot only.
- Rear lane access acceptable.

Layout - Urban Grain

- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing to dominate.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height

- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30ha.
**Ermington**

**Village**

**Issues raised at the workshop**
- Ermington was not part of the original allocation list as it recently lost its local shop.
- The village has a small business park and a fully subscribed primary school.

**Recommendations**
- Site 1 bridges the gap between the employment and residential land.
- The bottom part of this site is subject to flooding and is, therefore, not included in the developable area.
- The site should be designed to maximise connectivity to the business park and the village centre.

- Site 2 fronts the entrance to the village and will help to slow traffic coming in and from the village centre.

**2016 housing unit numbers**
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 25-30

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_21_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land West of New Mills Employment Estate</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>±0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016 Total</strong></td>
<td>±0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_21_02_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land at Parsonage Farm</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>±0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2026 Total</strong></td>
<td>±1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>±2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Ermington 2016

Site 1

Context
- Consider established trees along Church Road.
- Consider site sloping away from road.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Houses designed to benefit from slope.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Plots to have dedicated access lane.
- Dedicated lane accessed off Church Road.
- Two points of access off Church Road.
- Parking on or off-plot.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to face lane and fields.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing dominant.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to context –30ha.
Harbertonford Village

**Issues raised at the workshop**
- Discussions were held regarding the topographical constraints of this village.
- Access to sites needs to be considered.

**Recommendations**
- Site 1, 2 and 3 are considered due to proximity to the village centre.
- Site 4 must be taken through the STA and SHLAA process.
- The design of connections is fundamental in bringing forward sites 2, 3 and 4.

**2016 housing unit numbers**
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 10-15

**Table: Sites and Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_23_03_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harbertonford Mills</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_23_02_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land opposite Harbourne Filling Station</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_23_01_08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Harbourne Filling Station</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Total</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Land east of A381, south of river</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>±1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land west of Site 1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026 Total</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land west of Site 1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026 Total</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New land Total** 1.64

**Key**
- Proposed 2016 sites
- Proposed 2026 sites
- EbD identified sites
- Undefined edge
- Development Boundary
- SHLAA & STA sites

**Diagram:** Map indicating proposed sites and development areas.
Harbertonford 2016

Site 1

Context
- Retain existing buildings.
- Retain mature trees on site.
- Consider extending and converting existing building.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Apartment conversions.
- Dedicated access off Woodland Road.
- Parking on-plot.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Existing buildings refurbished and extended.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Determined by existing buildings.

NOTE:
This is a proposition dependent entirely on the site constraints and opportunities, specifically with the conversions and extensions of the existing buildings. Should this not be possible for whatever reason, this proposal should be reviewed.
Holbeton

Village

Issues raised at the workshop
- Holbeton is accessed only by narrow rural lanes and retains a strong local character.
- The village has a well attended primary school, shop and pub.

Recommendations
- Site 1 will need to be designed paying attention to topographical constraints.
- The availability of the site needs to be confirmed.

2026 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_25_02_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land north of Churchill</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>±1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2026 Total ±1.19
Total ±1.19

Key
- Proposed 2016 sites
- Proposed 2026 sites
- EbD identified sites
- Undefined edge
- Development Boundary
- SHLAA & STA sites
Holbeton 2016

No 2016 sites allocated in this village.
Issues raised at the workshop
- Future development in Kingwear is limited by topographical constraints.
- It was agreed new housing is needed.
- The recommended allocation is based on the village requirements and sites.

Recommendations
- Site 1 is the preferred site for development due to its proximity to the village centre.
- Development is limited to the edges of the site due to topographical constraints.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 10-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_30_04_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land north of Higher Contour Road</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>±0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>South of 30_04_08 south of Higher Rd &amp; East of Upper Wood Lane</td>
<td>±0.55</td>
<td>±0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>±0.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>±0.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New land Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>±0.55</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kingswear 2016

Site 1

Context
• Consider Brixham Road frontage.
• Consider access off Brixham Road.
• Mature trees to be retained wherever possible.
• Houses designed to benefit from slope.
• Consider long views to site from across valley.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
• Access direct off Brixham Road.
• Access off dedicated lane like Waterhead Close.
• Parking on or off plot.
• Plot depths dependent upon topography.

Layout - Urban Grain
• Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
• Typologies are based upon local context.
• Terraced housing to dominate.
• Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
• Residential buildings to be max 3 storeys.
• Densities should be comparable to context – 30-35ha.

NOTE:
Sensitive location requiring a quality scheme. Developer to work closely with planning authority and local community. Lower density applied due to context. Style and materials to reflect local distinctiveness. If any of these factors cannot be satisfied then this proposal should be reviewed.
Loddiswell

Issues raised at the workshop
- The location of Loddiswell’s primary school and separate playing fields do not suit the needs of the village.
- A strategy has been devised by residents to enable holistic growth of the village and the relocation of the school.
- Design and phasing of the sites could provide housing to help fund the relocation of the school.

Recommendations
- Sites 1 and 2 have been recommended to accommodate growth for Loddiswell.
- A portion of the 2026 Sites 1 and 2 will be used for the new school.

- Site 3 could be used for 2026 allocation if Sites 1 and 2 are deliverable.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 25-30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_32_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land north of Loddiswell, behind cemetery</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_32_05_08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land at Ham Butts</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total 1.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_32_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land north of Loddiswell, behind cemetery</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_32_05_08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land at Ham Butts</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_32_02_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>School Playing Fields</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2026 Total 3.65

Total 4.93
Loddiswell 2016

Sites 1 and 2

Context
- Consider topography with site at valley head.
- Consider changes in level between existing back gardens and site.
- Interface with existing village edge (A) important.
- Consider balance of site for relocated school.
- Consider views towards site along lanes.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Cul de sac acceptable if design requires.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Access of local lanes and South Brent Road.
- Parking on-plot.
- Retain site for school.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to face over fields – future school site.
- Backs onto existing village edge.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to rural village edge context – 25-30ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).
Malborough Village

Issues raised at the workshop
- Entrance into the village should be addressed.
- The current entrance into the village should be improved.
- Through traffic to Salcombe on Collaton Road is currently an issue.
- Site numbers and sizes raised concerns.

Recommendations
- Sites 1, 2, and 3 should be designed so that they create an entrance to the village and slow traffic.
- Site 4 was identified by residents.
- Site 4 must be taken through the STA and SHLAA process.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 25-30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_33_13_08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Land to the east of Mayfield</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_33_09_08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land north of Townsend Cross</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_33_12_08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Land to the east of Alston Gate</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total ±1.39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Total</td>
<td>±1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New land Total ±2.37
Malborough 2016

Sites 1 and 2

Context
- Consider plots facing onto main A Route.
- Consider existing houses and garage as context.
- Consider A381 barrier to consider to village centre.
- Review long views down A381 to Site 2.
- Review views to site 1 on entering village.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Access lane off Salcombe and A381 peripheral to development.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Some plots to have direct access off A381.
- Parking on-plot.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to address fields and A381.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to rural village edge context – 25 - 30ha.

NOTE:
Sites 1, 2 and 3 will only succeed with improved pedestrian access across the A381 to Malborough village centre. Allocation of sites to be reconsidered should this not be possible.
Issues raised at the workshop
- The village has grown to the south because of its proximity to the regional centre of Torbay.
- The village centre has lost its identity and much of its commerce.
- Site 1 is owned by the National Trust.

Recommendations
- Site 1 deliverability must be reviewed due to ownership.
- Sites 1 will help to revitalise the historic village centre.
- Site 2 could deliver the number of dwellings for 2016.
- Site 2 could contribute to creating a new neighbourhood centre.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 30-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_34_12_08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Land to north and west of Love Lane</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_34_03_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Westerland Green</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>±0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_34_10_08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marldon Christmas Tree Farm</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>±0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_34_01_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land at Five Lanes</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>±1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Land south of Neller Copse</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>±0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±3.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New land Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marldon 2016

Sites 1 and 2

Context
- Consider Site 1 owned by National Trust.
- Site 1 to relate to cottages opposite on Love Lane.
- Site 2 to relate to Moorview and Totnes Roads.
- Trees to be retained wherever possible.
- Consider views entering into village along Love Lane.
- Consider views entering village along Totnes Road.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Site 1 village edge extension – fronts onto Love Lane
- Access direct off Love Lane; or,
- Consider access lane off Love Lane as opposite.
- Plot depth comparable to existing.
- Site 2 perimeter block form considered.
- Access off Totnes and Moorview.
- Back to back development.
- Fronts to address roads and fields.
- Direct on plot access off Moorview.
- Parking on-plot for Site 2.
- Depth of plots determined by existing plots.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Site 1 terraces / cottages.
- Site 2 semis and detached housing.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Mix
- Consider potential A3 / A2 use at village entrance (Site 2)

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max. 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to rural village edge context – 20-25 ha.
Newton Ferrers

Village

Issues raised at the workshop

- There are severe traffic issues in the village centre.
- Few of the sites were considered favourable.
- Difficulty arose from agreeing sites nearest the centre.

Recommendations

- Site 1 should be part of the 2016 allocation.
- Site 1 must be designed jointly with Site 2.
- Connectivity issues must be considered when designing Sites 1 and 2.

2016 housing unit numbers

- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 25-30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_37_05_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Briar Hill camp site</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_37_13_08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land N.E of Briar Hill Campsite, Newton Ferrers</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Site West of Parsonage Road</td>
<td>±0.37</td>
<td>±0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1.99

New land Total: ±0.37
Newton Ferrers 2016

Site 1

Context
- Use existing caravan site as part of site.
- Access off Court Road / Parsonage Road junction.
- Consider adjoining sites at A.
- Trees to be retained wherever possible.
- Context determines shape and size of development.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Access off Parsonage/Court Road.
- Plot depth comparable to existing.
- Temporary cul de sac development first phase.
- Consider future access back to Parsonage Road.
- Parking on or off-plot.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Consider screen tree planting.
- Investigate pedestrian links with village centre.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing.
- Materials to be based on traditional local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to village edge context – 25-30ha.

NOTE
This is a complex site to deliver in terms of access and impact upon adjoining properties. If Site 2 cannot be delivered by 2026 this proportion should be reviewed.
### Issues raised at the workshop

- The village has grown to the north east, away from the centre.
- A new development has recently been completed to the south of the centre.
- Several new sites were identified.

### Recommendations

- Site 1 development would increase density around the school and the village centre.
- Site 3 should be included in the 2026 allocation, to further support the school.
- Sites 2, 3 and 5 were EbD sites.
- Site 2 to be considered with Site 1 for 2016.
- These must undergo the SHLAA and STA processes to ensure inclusion.

### 2016 housing unit numbers

- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 35-40

#### Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Total Ha</th>
<th>Developed Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_51_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land opp Primary School, School Road, Stoke Fleming</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land East of Village Hall</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2026 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land to south of Primary School</td>
<td>±0.71</td>
<td>±0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land to west of Venn Lane, opposite Bay View Close</td>
<td>±1.56</td>
<td>±1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land to east of Dartmouth Hill</td>
<td>±0.73</td>
<td>±0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New land Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stoke Fleming 2016

Site 1

Context
- Consider access off School Road.
- Trees to be retained wherever possible.
- Consider views on entry to village along School Road.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form for Site 1.
- Two points of access off School Road for Site 1.
- Parking on or off-plot for Site 1.
- Access for site 2 directly off School Road or rear access.
- Parking on-plot for Site 2.
- Fronts address School Road for both sites.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Plots depths for Site 2 determined by field boundary.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Typologies are based upon local context.
- Terraced, semis and detached housing applicable to both sites.
- Materials to be based on local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to village edge context – 25-30ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).
Stoke Gabriel

Village

Issues raised at the workshop
- The community identified the need for more affordable housing.
- The recommended allocation is based on the village requirements and sites.

Recommendations
- Site 1 is located close to the village centre; consider flooding issues.
- Sites 3, 4 and 5 could be considered for future growth.
- Design of these sites will alter the village envelope.
- These sites need to go through the SHLAA and STA processes.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 45-50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_52_03_08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land adj to Coombe Shute</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_52_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Field off Rowes Farm, Ash Road</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>±0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_52_04_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field off Paignton Road</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_52_06_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land north of Broad Path</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>±1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SH_52_07_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stoke Gabriel Nursery, Paignton Road</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>±1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Land to rear of Dart View Cattery</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 2016** 12.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH_52_01_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Field off Rowes Farm, Ash Road</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>±0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH_52_04_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field off Paignton Road</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH_52_06_08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land north of Broad Path</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>±1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SH_52_07_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stoke Gabriel Nursery, Paignton Road</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>±1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 2026** 15.70

Total 7.88

New land Total 0.42
Stoke Gabriel 2016
Sites 1 and 2

Context
- Site 1 to reflect importance of location.
- Site 2 context determines shape and size of development.
- Trees to be retained wherever possible.
- Consider views across Mill Pool to Site 1.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Site 1 address Mill Pool.
- Rear access off Lower Broad Path.
- Plot depth comparable to existing.
- Parking on plot or private road.
- Site 2 access off Ash Road.
- Parking on plot.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Fronts to address road or fields at rear.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Site 1 typology determined by context.
- Semis and detached housing.
- Buildings address Mill Pool.
- Site 2 typology determined by context.
- Semis and detached housing.
- Materials to be based on local vernacular.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to village edge context – 25-30ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).
Issues raised at the workshop

- There is a high level of second home ownership.
- Past growth has created a linear village – future growth could exacerbate this.
- The only site identified through the SHLAA process has planning permission and is partially developed.

Recommendations

- If developed, Site 1 will create an entrance to the village and traffic will be slowed.
- This site could include a gateway mixed use development.

2026 housing unit numbers

- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 35-40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_55_03_08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land east of Seaview Road, Thurlestone</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2016 Total</th>
<th>1.65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thurlestone 2016

Site 1

Context
- Site to reflect gateway to Thurlestone.
- Trees to be retained wherever possible.
- Consider context to determine extent of development.
- Consider views along Eddystone Road on entering village.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Align outer access road with Court Road.
- Limit extent with northern edge of adjoining development.
- Plots to address Eddystone Road or surrounding fields.
- Plot sizes to have mixed widths.
- Perimeter block development.
- Mid block lane to access rear plots acceptable.
- Parking on plot.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Typology to be determined by edge of village context.
- Semis and detached housing.
- Materials to be based on local vernacular.

Mix
- Consider potential A3 / A2 (pub?) use at village entrance.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to village edge context – 25-30ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).
Issues raised at the workshop

- Residents would like to have more affordable housing in the village to encourage young people to stay in the village.
- Ugborough is a well developed village, so any new development would redefine the village envelope.
- New development could improve the integration of the school into the village.

Recommendations

- Only Site 1 was identified as a growth opportunity.
- Access is an issue for Site 1, which has to be resolved.
- Be aware of the school playing field in the top portion of Site 1.

2016 housing unit numbers

- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 0

Table: Proposed 2016 sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_57_11_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land east of Primary School, Ugborough</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>±0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2026 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>±0.89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>±0.89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ugborough 2016

No 2016 sites allocated in this village.

Right - View of Ugborough Square
Residents showed concern regarding the capacity of the village to take more growth. Due to the lack of alternative routes, all traffic currently passes through the village centre.

**Recommendations**
- Site 1 offers the only possibility for the sustainable growth of Wembury.
- Any new housing will help to support the neighbourhood facilities in the area.

**2016 housing unit numbers**
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 25-40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_58_09_08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land south of Knighton Road, east of Business Centre, Wembury</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wembury 2016

Site 1

Context

- Site determined by field boundary.
- Consider views along Wembury Road towards site.
- Tress to be retained wherever possible.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access

- Perimeter block form considered.
- Plot lengths determined by field width.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Access off Knighton and Wembury.
- Perimeter lane access.
- Frontages to address roads and / or fields.

Layout - Urban Grain

- Typology determined by context
- Semis and detached housing
- Materials to be based on local traditional vernacular

Mix

- Consider potential A3 / A2 use at entrance to village

Density and Height

- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Densities should be comparable to village edge context – 30-35ha
West Alvington
Village

Issues raised at the workshop
- West Alvington residents are concerned about coalescence with Kingsbridge.
- West Alvington has lost its pub and shop and the primary school enrolment has dropped significantly.
- Residents wish to see additional housing in the village.

Recommendations
- Site 1 encloses the village envelope and creates a new western boundary to the green gap between West Alvington and Kingsbridge.

2016 housing unit numbers
- Core Strategy village total = 400
- Units shown in 2016 design guidance sketch = 40-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteNo.</th>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Tot. Ha</th>
<th>Dev. Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SH_l9_04_08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site behind Ring 'O' Bells, West Alvington</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Total 1.71

Total 1.71
West Alvington 2016

Site 1

Context
- Consider as gateway into village from Kingsbridge.
- Use existing context to structure plan.
- Consider impact on adjoining development.
- Consider views into village along A381.

Layout - Urban Structure / Access
- Perimeter block form considered.
- Plots sizes to be mixed widths.
- Access off A381 to connect through to Longfields.
- Parking on or off plot acceptable.
- Investigate pedestrian links with village centre.

Layout - Urban Grain
- Buildings to be set back with front gardens.
- Fronts to face over fields.
- Backs onto existing village edge.
- Typologies to be based upon local context.
- Semis and detached housing dominant.
- Materials to be based on local traditional vernacular.

Mix
- Consider employment site at entrance off A381.
- Potential A3 / A2 use.

Density and Height
- Residential buildings to be max 2 storeys.
- Height along A381 if employment – 3 floors.
- Densities should be comparable to context – 25-30ha.

(To obtain a housing quantum estimation, these density guides should not merely be applied to gross 2016 site areas as shown in the preceding table, as social and physical infrastructure requirements should be removed first).

NOTE:
If the above principles cannot be met due to the sensitive location of the site, then this proposal and village requirements must be reviewed.
2.4 Summary of 2016 housing numbers

This table summarises the results of the DRA with regard to housing numbers resulting from the sketch exercises carried out for the 2016 sites. The figures indicated in the column headed ‘design led range’ are those estimated on the basis of the design guidance sketches. These are NOT definitive but represent a more informed estimate than would result if a standard density were to be applied to the sites. They provide guidance as to what the identified 2016 sites could deliver if masterplanned, applying the design principles indicated.

An analysis of this table suggests that the 2016 sites identified have the ability to meet the core strategy target of 1500 houses (refer to Figure 2). The low estimation through the DRA process as indicated in Table 4 opposite, was circa 1500 with a high estimation of circa 1800.

Five additional villages were identified during the workshops, which delivered a further circa 80-100 units in addition to the above.

DRA has enabled all the local centres to meet the core strategy requirements apart from Modbury. The structure of the town is such that it was felt many of the sites identified are inappropriate for development. The only possible areas, apart from some small brownfield sites within the town envelope, were two areas to the west and the small site adjacent to the southern car park. However, even these two sites would need to be carefully designed so as not to dramatically change the town structure and impact on neighbouring properties.

For the area centres, DRA has shown that all, apart from Totnes, were capable of taking greater numbers than recommended in the core strategy. Indeed, in some cases a greater scale of development would result in better design and placemaking. Kingsbridge, Dartmouth and Ivybridge could each accommodate significant ‘urban extensions’ which, with the possible exception of Dartmouth, would not have a negative impact on the town structure and form. In Dartmouth the majority of growth is related to Townstal with the aim of creating a new community hub to complement the old town.

For area centres, DRA has shown that all, apart from Totnes, were capable of taking greater numbers than recommended in the core strategy. Indeed, in some cases a greater scale of development would result in better design and placemaking. Kingsbridge, Dartmouth and Ivybridge could each accommodate significant ‘urban extensions’ which, with the possible exception of Dartmouth, would not have a negative impact on the town structure and form. In Dartmouth the majority of growth is related to Townstal with the aim of creating a new community hub to complement the old town.

### Table 4 - Schedule of Core Strategy requirements & actual numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Core strategy numbers</th>
<th>Design led range</th>
<th>Employment land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivybridge</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsbridge</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400-450</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chil/Stokenham</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modbury</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salcombe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yealmpton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aveton Gifford</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackawton</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dartington</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbertonford</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holbeton</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingswear</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loddiswell</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malborough</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marldon</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newton Ferrers</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoke Fleming</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoke Gabriel</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurlestone</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ugborough</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wembury</td>
<td>%400</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1543-1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villages identified during workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88-107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avonwick</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornworthy</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diptford</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ermington</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Alvington</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88-107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3

3.0 Next Steps

3.1 EbD Sites

Under the recommendations of this report (Section 2), the PFBE suggests that two pieces of work are carried out to ensure consistency & quality across the district with new development (Section 2.1.3). These are suggested as the most important next steps in this process.

In addition to the 2016 and 2026 sites, many of the towns and villages identified for growth had ‘EbD sites’ identified during the course of the workshops. These sites were either offered up by owners who had missed the opportunity to do so during the call for sites at the outset of the SHLAA process, or were recommended by community representatives. Either way these sites now have to be assessed by the local authority through the SHLAA and STA processes. Once this is completed, they will be either recommended for inclusion as a 2016 or 2026 site, or will be withdrawn.

3.2 District Wide Design Guidance

There is a clear aspiration across the district, from both the community and local councils, that the character of new development should respect and blend with the traditional character common across the South Hams district. If this is to be effectively achieved over the long term a coherent and consistent approach must be adopted to provide the planners with the necessary tools to facilitate the delivery of a quality of development that reflects local desires and needs.

This has been partly achieved with design guidance based on generic traditional urbanist principles and sketch designs for the 2016 sites recommended in this report. However, it is important to reiterate that the concept sketches provided are merely a graphical representation of the recommended principles and NOT a proposal. They show possible access points, pedestrian connections, potential block layouts and indicative plots. They also show potential higher density areas and mixed used locations. These are not Masterplans and a competent designer taking local context, topography plus their brief into account may produce a different plan, BUT the principles of permeability, simple block definition and structure will and should remain. This early guidance, although supported by generic principles and assessment criteria, only refers in any detail to the 2016 sites. The 2026 sites and the major growth areas of some towns like Kingsbridge would require further guidance to ensure the desired quality.

Future development in South Hams must respect the context, quality and character of the place as an essential prerequisite of the development process. Understanding the importance of local distinctiveness across the district and the role played by its towns and villages, is something developers and some agencies will, perhaps, need to relearn when determining new development. The South Hams district is arguably one of the UK’s most outstanding areas of natural beauty with the built environment having formed a seamless bond with the rolling landscape. Unfortunately, the skill and careful planning of building within such a landscape has been notably lost in recent times. Most post war housing development is mediocre and most of the main towns are showing considerable signs of structural fragmentation as they begin to sprawl through sub-urban housing development.

The design and context of all new development should, therefore, evolve from this special local character. This means:
- Reinforcing positive design characteristics of an area
- Respecting scale, street patterns, landscape, local materials, colour palettes and style and detailing of surrounding areas
- Managing differences in building heights
- Including public areas that draw people together and create a sense of place
- Routes which make a positive contribution to the quality of life
- Avoiding a wide variety of building styles and/or mixture of materials
- Creating and maintaining good quality views and vistas
- Forming harmonious composition with surrounding buildings or landscape features

These principles should be embedded within an adopted design guidance document for the district that builds on a character assessment of South Hams district and on its building and spatial typologies.

3.3 Guiding Growth: Masterplans

The Enquiry by Design opened up considerable debate and discussion around the future of towns and rural settlements across South Hams. Whilst much of the discussion was centred around growth numbers and affordable housing, there was considerable consensus around the need to masterplan in detail development patterns for the four main towns of Totnes, Dartmouth, Kingsbridge and Ivybridge.

All four towns are under pressure to accommodate new growth to 2016 and beyond. Some of this growth is already underway in places like Totnes and Dartmouth, where it is noticeably impacting on the quality of the built environment. Ivybridge and Kingsbridge are also experiencing demand for development opportunities, which, because of their respective topographical and broader infrastructure constraints, means careful consideration needs to be given to long term, physical and economic growth and how this might impact on existing neighbourhood and town centres.

1 - Ivybridge Masterplan

During the Ivybridge workshop much discussion took place around the preferred locations for growth. Whilst there is an aspiration by the Town Council and community for further growth at Ivybridge, there is a recognition that further development can also bring problems, not least that of traffic and infrastructure provision.

Ivybridge has absorbed substantial growth during the last 40 years. However, much if not all of this development has been incremental and unplanned strategically and has failed to take account of neighbourhood evolution using the context of the town centre as a starting point. Housing estates in Ivybridge are composed almost entirely of cul-de-sac layouts with no integration between neighbourhoods or into their local context. As a direct consequence there is a general lack of local services within an acceptable walkable catchment. This encourages most people to get around Ivybridge by car and because there is only limited choice for shopping in the town centre, once in the car, most people are likely to continue their journey to Totnes or Plymouth. This has clearly impacted on economic growth and investment in the town centre in recent years.

Ivybridge is constrained in its pattern of growth to the north by the railway and to the south by the A38. This has significantly affected the town’s evolution, effectively ‘squeezing’ development between these two barriers and forcing development east and west. Any future proliferation of development at Ivybridge in this way, without a coherent plan being in place, will further exacerbate the problems of traffic and centrally located facilities.

SHLAA has identified a considerable short-term land bank to 2016 and beyond. It is clear that an already less than perfect growth pattern exists for Ivybridge, but it must accommodate growth in both the long and short term. In this way any new growth must look to ‘retro fit’ and address some of the highlighted weaknesses of the town.

In this regard sufficient land has been identified along the eastern edge of Ivybridge as being the preferred location to accommodate future growth requirements to 2016 and beyond. A new Masterplan should explore the potential to create a new neighbourhood centre with provision for local services.

The area identified for growth is substantial and any consideration of this area through a Masterplan should ideally take a town wide view as to what impact this growth may have on Ivybridge. One suggestion from the workshops was the development of a sports ‘zone’ south of the A38 and the town centre releasing the rugby club land for development and contributing towards this eastern growth. There was also a wish to see a new junction on the A38 aligning with the eastern extension of the town.

2 - Dartmouth Masterplan

The historic town of Dartmouth is located along the banks of the River Dart at the head of the estuary leading into the English Channel and overlooked on all sides by green rolling landscape. The history of the town along with its location has resulted in a dense fine grain town centre with winding streets and alleys. Due to high percentage of second home ownership, most residents can now not afford to live near the centre and waterfront. This has led to incremental growth along the main route into the town resulting in the growth of the adjoining village of Townstal.

This is now generating demand for new local services in Townstal, such as shopping, hospital and schooling. More recent development at the top of Townstal Road on entering Townstal is leading to a fragmentation of the urban grain and a poor sense of arrival into Dartmouth. As is common across South Hams in the recent past, this rapid growth on the fringe of Dartmouth at Townstal has produced sub-urban housing with poor links back to the historic centre. Townstal does not reflect the high quality built fabric and rich urban grain found in Dartmouth and is more typical of the post war sub-urban sprawl found in Totnes, Ivybridge and Kingsbridge.

Nevertheless, with this growth and the more recent creation of the beginnings of a neighbourhood centre, the EbD workshop identified land around the western edge of Townstal as the most likely expansion point to Dartmouth. However, the release of land here is likely to be ad hoc in the short-term, which in itself is a reason to produce and adopt a coherent Masterplan.

There is an opportunity at Dartmouth to plan for a vibrant new neighbourhood centre that will create a new sense of arrival into the town. The EbD workshop explored a range of options as to how far towards Venn Lane development might happen. Whilst none of these was conclusive, a Masterplan should explore how the boundaries...
between Dartmouth and Stoke Fleming could be treated guarding against coalescence.

3 - Kingsbridge Masterplan

The workshop at Kingsbridge explored a large number of sites for potential allocation. The key constraints were sites being too difficult to develop due to steep or complex topography and town centre sites not capable of early assembly or delivery due to multiple ownerships.

Kingsbridge has typically started to grow away from its historic centre, particularly to the south. This has resulted in the town form fragmenting as it expands away from the centre. The workshop tried to rectify this by accepting steep sites as possible opportunities for growth, but these were further constrained by access and narrow lanes. The result was a strategy for the town that would follow two routes — firstly a town centre Masterplan or plans to consider how the centre could accommodate more employment and higher density residential without destroying its original character and, secondly, to consider the western growth of the town onto land that was both available and suitable.

A Masterplan is, therefore, required to assess how development might be structured and phased along the western edge of Kingsbridge. The guidance offered in this report does suggest a way in which this may occur, but apart from these principles and constraining the plan to the north western quarter of the town, ideally a town wide strategy should be considered which may result in a series of linked Masterplans.

During the workshop there was also a tendency to relocate commercial and other uses to large single use sites out of town. A Masterplan should explore how mixed-use development, including the provision of new homes be incorporated into the development of new neighbourhoods along the western growth area of the town.

4 - Totnes Masterplan

The future pattern of growth in Totnes is likely to be complex and challenging and will require a thorough and coherent approach in bringing about delivery of growth and regeneration. The town has some notable constraints due to the River Dart and the surrounding topography. Nevertheless, sufficient land for housing and employment uses has been identified to 2016 as part of the EbD exercise. The grouping of sites, plus the fact that there were limited opportunities near the town centre, suggested a Masterplan for the area surrounding the railway station including a longer term view of Borough Park and the employment area along Babbage Road. In addition, the area would extend out to the north west of the town incorporating the Meadowsine sites, KEVICC, and the Dairy Crest site. Development planned for KEVICC upper school site allied to these available and deliverable sites, means that development is likely to happen between now and 2016.

Above - Totnes feedback discussions regarding site allocation and masterplans, Opposite page -