

East Devon District Council

# **University of Exeter Science Park Supplementary Planning Document**

## **Issues and Options**

### **Report of Consultation Responses Received and Preferred Options for the SPD**

**Atkins Limited  
The Octagon  
Pynes Hill Court  
Rydon Lane  
Exeter  
EX2 5SP**

June 2007

Tel: 01392 352900  
Fax: 01392 352999



## **Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Issue 1. Development at Redhayes</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Issue 2. Role of the Science Park</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Issue 3. Science Park Ancillary Development</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Issue 4. Exemplar Sustainability Performance</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Issue 5. South West Quadrant Development Options</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Issue 6. Masterplan Development Options</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Issue 7. Phasing Direction</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Issue 8. Development Layout</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Issue 9. Parking Options</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Issue 10. Access – Tithebarn Lane, Blackhorse Lane, Langaton Lane</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Issue 11. Landscape Options</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Issue 12. Strategic Landscape Approach</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Issue 13. Ridgeline Development</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Issue 14. Detailed Landscape Design Themes</b>	<b>18</b>

## **Appendix 1**

**Tabulated schedule of responses**

## **Introduction**

- 0.1 This paper summarises the consultation responses received to the Issues and Options report prepared as a precursor to the University of Exeter Science Park Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 0.2 It briefly reviews the issues raised in the report, reviews the thrust of the responses received, and identifies the proposed Preferred Options that will be put forward in detail within the draft SPD.

## Issue 1. Development at Redhayes

- 1.1. The concept of a science park at Exeter forms part of the statutory adopted Devon Structure Plan; the proposal is set out in Policy ST19. This policy was accompanied by a significant body of work commissioned by Exeter City Council, the University and the South West Regional Development Agency into demand for a science park in the Exeter area.
- 1.2. Various studies identified Redhayes as the optimum location at Exeter in marketing terms and as a result of previous work the Issues and Options were focused on the Redhayes location. However, in considering Issues and Options it is necessary to evaluate a 'do-nothing' option for the study area and therefore to consider whether the site is appropriate. As a result, comments were invited on that issue as part of the overall context for the SPD Vision.
- 1.3. A summary of the responses to this issue is set out below.

### ISSUE 1. Development at Redhayes

- a) *Do you agree that the Redhayes site is appropriate for Science Park development on the east side of Exeter? Or*
- b) *If 'no' to the above, then is there another location in the local area that you believe is more appropriate?*
- c) *No opinion*

*Please explain your answer if (a) or (b)?*

### Summary

- *A total of 27 representatives responded to the issue of whether development at Redhayes was appropriate.*
- *A total of 13 respondents agreed that Redhayes was the most appropriate place for the Science Park. 12 respondents felt that another location would be more appropriate.*
- *Those in favour of Redhayes suggested that a science park was more favourable than either residential or commercial development. Apart from the options of Skypark or Newcourt, other respondents suggested that the development should be kept within the grounds of the University.*
- *The Highways Agency supported in principle the location of the proposed Science Park but noted the need for the scheme to align with the Phase II Access Strategy for East of Exeter development. This imposes an upper limit of 26,000m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area until proposed improvements to Junction 29 of the M5 are in place.*

- 1.4. The Preferred Option is that the Redhayes location will form the basis of the SPD, and will be the location where the Science Park is delivered. The SPD will provide more detail than contained in the Issues and Options report showing how the Redhayes location was selected, and the reasons why other sites were not pursued beyond a preliminary feasibility and site selection stage.
- 1.5. The SPD will define the proposed position of the Science Park at the Redhayes location and will illustrate the development boundaries and define the land area proposed for development as the Science Park.

## **Issue 2. Role of the Science Park**

- 2.1 A key objective of the University of Exeter Science Park is to provide for the creation and growth of new local businesses based in research and innovation activity at Exeter University, and in the existing economy of Devon and adjoining areas. However, there is also the opportunity to encourage existing and growing firms in the field of science research and development from elsewhere in the UK and even overseas where this may benefit the local economy and employment.
- 2.2 East Devon District Council, as planning authority, proposes that the University of Exeter Science Park must follow a strict definition of science park, as per the Structure Plan requirement, in that it must have close links with the University – reflected in its name, and will focus on science and research based companies. The proposal is that the development would provide facilities that can foster the creation and growth of new businesses with appropriate ancillary facilities.
- 2.3 The responses relating the issue of the role of the Science Park are summarised below.

### **ISSUE 2. Role of the Science Park**

- a) ***Do you agree with the definition of the core functions of the University of Exeter Science Park outlined above? Or***
- b) ***If not please state why. Or***
- c) ***No opinion***

### **Summary**

- *A total of 28 representations were made to the issue of the role of the Science Park.*
- *20 respondents agreed with the definition of the core functions of the University as set out in the text. 4 disagreed with the definition.*
- *Those who disagreed pointed out that Exeter University already has an innovation centre and that if the Science Park is to work closely with the University it should be co-located. Another point raised suggested that the low density layout in a parkland setting was not a sustainable approach.*

- 2.4 The Preferred Option is that the University of Exeter Science Park should follow a focused science park model and should not seek to provide conventional business park accommodation (but see Preferred Option in respect of Issue 3). This is because it is considered important not to dilute the science park concept – which is specifically needed to support business growth spinning out of university research – and because good quality business park facilities will be available elsewhere locally, notably at Skypark.
- 2.5 Exeter City Council agreed that the science park activities needed to be carefully defined in planning terms, and suggested the following text to be incorporated in the SPD:

***Buildings on the site shall only be utilised for the following uses within the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2006:***

- 1      *Class B1(b) research and development of products and processes.***

***Or***

***Class B 1(a) Offices or B1(c) light industry where:***

***The local planning authority is satisfied that there is a genuine need for the primary activity to be located on the science park due to the specific nature of the activities undertaken or research related interactions with local universities, major employers in the region or other occupiers of the science park.***

- 2      *Classes A Retail, D1 Non-Residential Institutions and D2 Assembly and Leisure provided that they are ancillary to the primary use of the site as a science park.***

### **Issue 3. Science Park Ancillary Development**

- 3.1 An issue to consider in the way the Science Park is developed is the type of ancillary facilities that will be provided. Most successful science parks include a range of ancillary facilities which support core activities. Key examples are facilities which enable and encourage networking between company managements, and premises that ensure the Science Park offers a good working environment that can attract and retain the high calibre staff needed by the occupying businesses.
- 3.2 An option would be to consider, as part of the Science Park, a hub of support facilities, which could also complement the nearby Skypark business park development. One example might be a hotel which could serve visitors to both the Science Park and Skypark, particularly in the context of the airport, which is seen as a key advantage to the University of Science Park at Redhayes.
- 3.3 The range of responses to the issue of ancillary development are set out below.

### **ISSUE 3. Science Park Ancillary Development**

- a) Do you agree that ancillary facilities should be provided as part of the Science Park development?; or**
- b) Do you think that only core Science Park employment uses should be allowed? or**
- c) Do you think that a more flexible approach should be adopted that could allow a range of ancillary and complementary facilities and uses, including those that could have a significant commercial value such as a hotel? or**
- d) No opinion**

**Please explain the reason for your answer.**

#### **Summary**

- A total of 29 responses were received on the issue of ancillary development at the science park.
- 10 respondents believed that ancillary facilities should be provided as part of the Science Park development whilst 5 respondents thought that only core Science Park employment uses should be allowed.
- 5 respondents opted for a more flexible approach including the possibility of including facilities of commercial value. The Highways Agency favoured ancillary uses to support the core activities at the Science Park, but opposed uses which would attract significant numbers of visitors, thus having an adverse impact on the trunk road network.
- Exeter City Council was concerned at the inclusion of a hotel in the scheme, but reserved its position pending the outcome of a hotel provision study to be undertaken for Exeter and its hinterland. Natural England did not agree that a hotel was a suitable use.

3.4 The Preferred Option is to adhere to a focused science park definition, as per Issue 2, but to recognise the need for certain ancillary facilities to support the functioning of the overall facility. There will need to be a degree of flexibility in the approach, and the provision of ancillary facilities will respond to demand, but it is proposed that they may include interaction space, café(s)/canteen, crèche. It is anticipated that there could be the need for a local hotel as a result of business trips to the science park, including from overseas.

3.5 However, provision of a hotel as part of the development would also be a useful commercial benefit to the scheme. This is primarily in terms of creating a presence and level of activity at the location in the early part of the science park's life, and in evening/weekend periods, which could assist significantly with the profile and marketing of the facility. The proposed hotel provision study will inform any decisions on this issue.

## Issue 4. Exemplar Sustainability Performance

- 4.1 The East Devon Local Plan contains policies which require the use of sustainable materials and design in new development, and the development of the University of Exeter Science Park provides an opportunity to create an exemplar site in terms of sustainable masterplanning, building materials and technology. These could include siting and design of buildings to maximise natural lighting and ventilation, minimising use of unsustainable materials such as concrete and plastics, and maximising opportunities for water and other resource recycling. Low/zero carbon emissions and the use of a proportion of renewable energy will be policy objectives for all of the East of Exeter new development.
- 4.2 High standards of sustainable design are important in the context of the emphasis placed on businesses and development to achieve better environmental performance. Thus, the development itself could form a test bed for new approaches, and could foster research in the field of sustainable construction and building engineering. In addition, technically innovative businesses frequently wish to align themselves with highly sustainable accommodation and there is a commercial imperative in achieving good environmental performance.

### ISSUE 4. Exemplar Sustainability Performance

- a) *Should the University of Exeter Science Park be developed to the highest environmental standards possible; or*
- b) *Do you think that normal requirements for environmental performance would be adequate ? or*
- c) *Do you think that the environmental performance of the buildings and development are not important? Or*
- d) *No opinion.*

*Please explain the reason for your answer.*

### Summary

- *A total of 27 respondents made representations on Issue 4. 26 agreed that the Science Park should be developed to the highest environmental standards possible. 1 respondent held no opinion.*
- *The overall conclusion on this issue suggested that the highest possible standards were to be expected and that the Science Park should be a show case for high quality, sustainable development.*

- 4.3 The Preferred Option is that the SPD will seek the highest standards of sustainable design for the science park. This will extend from site planning and design (e.g. passive solar design) through to the design briefing for

- buildings themselves, taking account of both construction and operational performance.
- 4.4 There is an opportunity to integrate sustainable design into the areas of research that will be undertaken at the science park, for example as part of research into managing and responding to climate change. Therefore the buildings themselves could form part of the research resource, as well as providing an exemplar for the performance of new development.
- 4.5 The SPD will require a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) as the basis for achieving optimum sustainable performance during construction activities at the site, which will take place over an extended period. This will address aspects such as environmental protection, waste minimisation, sustainability measures such as sourcing of materials and use of locally derived products and services.
- 4.6 Specific standards will be proposed in the SPD, and will reflect the objectives of East Devon DC for other key developments, notably the New Community, as underpinned by recent guidance such as PPS22: Renewable Energy and its Companion Guide and the emerging South West Sustainability Checklist for Developments. The Preferred Option is to achieve BREEAM Excellent or Very Good ratings for all substantive buildings developed at the site.
- 4.7 The overall thrust of the SPD will be commitment to achieving a cutting edge standard of sustainable building and site design/operation.

## **Issue 5. South West Quadrant Development Options**

- 5.1 This part of the Issues and Options report considered a range of ideas for possible approaches to science park development at Redhayes. These ideas cover site masterplanning, the phasing of development, car parking strategy and landscape design suggestions. Clearly, there are many possible variations on how the site could be developed for a science park, but presented in the Issues and Options document were what are considered to be key options for the main principles available, taking account of the site characteristics outlined in earlier chapters.
- 5.2 Issue 5 considered specifically the option of siting built development in the south west quadrant of the site, and Issue 6 considered a range of spatial options for the remainder of the site.

### **ISSUE 5. South West Quadrant Development Options**

- a) *If a Science Park is developed at Redhayes do you consider that the south west quadrant of the study area should be kept free from development except for necessary highway infrastructure? or*
- b) *Do you think that development would be appropriate in this area?*
- c) *If 'yes' to question (b), do you think that this part of the site could accommodate intensive development set in a new landscape or should be limited to low density development set into the established parkland landscape? or*
- d) *No opinion.*

## **Summary**

- *26 respondents made representations on the south west quadrant development options. 14 people agreed that the south west part of the site should be kept free from buildings. 6 respondents believed that development in this area would be appropriate.*
- *The various responses regarding development of this area of the site ranged from no development at all so as to protect the conservation value of the quadrant, to intensive development and allocation of another area for conservation purposes.*
- *The possibility that this area could be used for improvements to junction 29 of the M5 was raised and some responses suggested that this cancelled out its value to wildlife and conservation.*

- 5.3 The south west quadrant of the study area is recognised as being sensitive due to its parkland character and prominence in views from users of the M5 northbound and the A30. Until designs for the improvement to Junction 29 of the M5 are completed it is difficult to reach a definite conclusion on whether development would be appropriate within this area and, if so, what form that might take.
- 5.4 The Preferred Option is that the SPD will require any trees not affected by the J29 improvement to be retained within the parkland area; these trees are, in any event covered by a Tree Preservation Order. It is proposed that development will not be precluded in this part of the site, but if buildings are proposed in this part of the site they should be low rise, subservient to the parkland setting and designed to minimise their visual impact.
- 5.5 This area of the site has the potential to offer a recreational resource to users of the Science Park and to the public, however, it should be borne in mind that the recreational potential is tempered by the M5 and A30 roads on two frontages, and by the Junction 29 improvement that will require potentially significant land take.
- 5.6 The permanent access to the Science Park from the M5 Junction 29 improvement will be required through this area and will require sensitive design in order to minimise the effects of land take and severance.

## **Issue 6. Masterplan Development Options**

- 6.1 Under Issue 6, Development Option 2 proposed an extensive form of development potentially extending over the north east, north west and south east quadrants of the study area. Option 3 focused development only in the north west and south east quadrants, and Option 4 proposed a more intensive pattern of focusing development in a central zone but taking in parts of all three quadrants referred to.

## **ISSUE 6. Masterplan Development Options**

- a) Which of the three Development Options excluding the south western quadrant do you consider best addresses a requirement for Science Park development at Redhayes? Or**
- b) Do you think that a different strategy should be considered? If so, please describe. Or**
- c) No opinion.**

### **Summary**

- *26 representations were made to this issue. Of all the various options, option 3 appeared to be the most favourable with 7 respondents suggesting it best addressed the requirement for Science Park development. Option 3 (with alternative) was favoured by 4 respondents.*
- *A different strategy was put forward by Stagecoach involving low density in the south west quadrant, medium density to the ridgeline and higher density to the south east and north west.*

6.2 The Preferred Option is a development strategy that reflects Option 3, whereby the Science Park initial phase of development is in the south eastern quadrant of the site and expansion is in a northerly and north westerly direction. However, Option 4 will also be reflected which is to achieve a focus for the overall development within the central part of the study area as opposed to extending unchecked to the boundaries.

6.3 The SPD will provide guidance on development densities to reflect this control, and will respond to concerns held by a number of respondents that poorly managed low density development would not be a sustainable use of the land.

## **Issue 7. Phasing Direction**

7.1 The development options considered at Issues 5 and 6 illustrated possible end states for the extent of development at the Science Park, potentially not reached for 15-20 years. In reality, development is likely to take place gradually over a period of time, with initial implementation of key buildings such as an incubation centre, conference facility and initial infrastructure in the form of access. Subsequent growth will then take place either in pre-programmed phases in response to funding, or in response to demand, for example as existing accommodation is filled.

7.2 The three phasing options shown were: a central point on the ridge, with a radial pattern of growth; a south easterly start point with growth to the north and west; and the same start point with growth in a north westerly direction.

### **ISSUE 7. Phasing Direction**

- a) Which of the three options showing the Phasing of Development at the site do you consider preferable? Or**
- b) Do you think that a different strategy should be considered? If so, please describe. Or**
- c) No opinion.?**

#### **Summary**

- A total of 24 responses were received on the issue of the phasing of development for the Science Park. Option 3 proved to be most favourable with 8 respondents in total choosing this option.
- Stagecoach suggested that no development should take place before any infrastructure was in place. One other respondent echoed this concern stating that improvements to Junction 29 should take place first along with determining the access to the site.

7.3 The Preferred Option is to commence development in the south eastern quadrant near to the frontage to the A30. Growth is then planned to extend in a north westerly direction. This pattern may be modified if development within the south west quadrant were allowed. The SPD will confirm the proposed approach.

## **Issue 8. Development Layout**

8.1 The way that the Science Park is laid out in terms of the way that access roads run through the development, and the way buildings relate to roads and open spaces, will be important to its character. The options discussed in the issues and options report consider three basic options which illustrated how different approaches might work. Option 1 showed a grid layout; Option 2 a layout following the contours of the study area; and Option 3 a free form layout that allowed both roads and contours to be used.

8.2 The responses to these various options is summarised below.

### **ISSUE 8. Development Layout**

- a) Which of the three options showing the Form of Development at the site do you consider preferable? Or**
- b) Do you think that a different strategy should be considered? If so, please describe. Or**
- c) No opinion**

### **Summary**

- *A total of 25 respondents made representations relating to the issue of the development layout. Option 2 was favoured by 6 respondents and Option 3 by 5 respondents.*
- *11 respondents thought that a different strategy should be considered although this was based primarily on concerns that layout and phasing options did not coincide with each other and therefore no alternatives were suggested.*

8.3 The Preferred option will be to adopt a mix of the free form and grid layouts but also having regard to the landform at the site. This combination approach is considered to be the best response to the site characteristics and development needs. Rigid adherence to one particular model will not deliver the best form of development required.

## **Issue 9. Parking Options**

9.1 Parking options for the University of Exeter Science Park will be informed by local and national transport policy and sustainable travel policies as well as the requirement for a strong sustainability element within the Science Park SPD itself. They will also be informed by preferred options in respect of masterplanning and phasing.

9.2 Two different approaches to parking within the Science Park were shown. Option 1 was to integrate car parking throughout the site so that individual buildings would be served by adjacent car parking. Option 2 was to have a large car park area (which might or might not link with a park and ride facility) that would serve the entire development area. The responses to the parking options are summarised below.

### **ISSUE 9. Parking Options**

- a) Which of the two Parking Options do you consider preferable? Or**
- b) Do you think that a different strategy should be considered? If so please explain. Or**
- c) No opinion**

### **Summary**

- *24 representations were made on the issue of parking within the Science Park. 5 respondents favoured Option 1 and 7 respondents Option 2..*
- *10 respondents felt a different strategy should be considered. Stagecoach felt that car parking should be minimal with a high quality bus service. The Highways Agency favoured a Park and Ride facility at the site.*
- *Other respondents who commented on the possibility of a park and ride scheme generally felt it was inappropriate and unnecessary.*

- 9.3 The consultation responses broadly favoured an approach that distributed car parking through the site so that each building had some provision. However, important feedback was received on the importance of public transport links into the site to reduce the need to travel to the Science Park by car, and concerns that parking provision should be designed to encourage alternative modes of travel while also strictly avoiding any risk of parking on nearby minor roads or in adjoining residential areas.
- 9.4 As with certain other of the design and development issues, the proposed Preferred Option is a combination approach responding to practical needs, user requirements and good practice sustainable design. It is proposed that there will be provision for visitor and disabled car parking near to buildings, but the majority of car parking will be provided in a number of small car parks within the site, which will be provided in a phased way as the development progresses.
- 9.5 Compatibility both with the public transport facilities available at the time of initial development, and planned for the longer term, will be of key importance. The proposed overall intent will be to provide minimum standards of car parking in order to encourage alternative modes of travel.

## **Issue 10. Access – Tithebarn Lane, Blackhorse Lane, Langaton Lane**

- 10.1 A consequence of developing a science park at Redhayes is the need to consider the future of the minor roads that currently pass through the study area. The issues are whether these routes could or should have a role in the Science Park development, and whether these lanes should retain their existing through-route functions providing an alternative route to Pinhoe and into Exeter, particularly from the Blackhorse direction.
- 10.2 No design options are proposed for these roads, but Issue 10 asked what preferences consultees may have.

**ISSUE 10. Access – Tithebarn Lane, Blackhorse Lane, Langaton Lane**

- a) **Would you wish to see any of the existing through-routes retained? Or**
- b) **Would you wish to see any of these roads terminating for vehicular traffic at the Science Park, becoming cul-de-sacs except for pedestrians and cyclists? Or**
- c) **Do you have a different suggestion, if so please explain. Or**
- d) **No opinion**

**Summary**

- *28 respondents made representations on the issue of access to the site. The majority of respondents wished to see existing through routes terminating for vehicular traffic at the Science Park.*
- *6 respondents wished to see the existing through routes retained and 2 respondents had a different suggestion including closing Blackhorse Lane beyond the bungalows on that lane and closing Langerton Lane to larger vehicles at the junction with Tithebarn Lane.*

- 10.3 The majority of respondents suggesting closure of the through routes would wish to see this happen irrespective of any development at Redhayes on account of the increasing rat running along these roads and the adverse effect this having on quality of life for residents. Those wishing to see the roads retained were concerned to keep access open to Pinhoe where there are a range of goods and services including church and doctors used by residents at Blackhorse and Sowton Village.
- 10.4 Integration of the minor roads with the Science Park presents a significant challenge if additional traffic on those roads is to be avoided and if traffic within the Science Park is to be managed effectively. For this reason, coupled with local support for closure of Blackhorse Lane, the proposed Preferred Option is to consider closure of Blackhorse Lane/Langaton Lane in the medium to longer term when growth of the Science Park requires land to the north of Blackhorse Lane. This would be likely to involve closure to vehicular traffic at a point just west of the existing housing on Blackhorse Lane, with provision for access-only to the Sunnyside Kennels. Access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders would be retained, together with access arrangements for agricultural vehicles where necessary.
- 10.5 Any such proposed closure would be the subject of a detailed study of the impacts on users, and public consultation. Proposed closure would also automatically be subject to a Public Inquiry in the event of any objections being received.

## Issue 11. Landscape Options

11.1 The attractiveness and visual prominence of the parkland area together with its higher biodiversity interest and protected trees mean that this area can form the basis of a landscape for the Science Park development and it is proposed that the landscape structure of the parkland area would be retained, subject to impacts arising from the M5 Junction 29 improvement. The illustrated options in the report covered different degrees of retention of the existing landscape structure at the site as follows:

- Option 1 existing parkland area retained but no significant enhancement. Elsewhere within the development area skyline trees would be retained, and other vegetation could be lost for development, with a new landscape structure imposed;
- Option 2 existing parkland managed and maintained and the former garden areas restored. New tree planting to provide for continuity of the parkland character, including enhancement of the corridor along the driveway. Across the remainder of the site other vegetation could be lost for development, with a new structure imposed;
- Option 3 – as for Option 2 but retention of the existing landscape structure would be extended to hedgerows and hedgerow trees to either side of existing roads across the remainder of the site;
- Option 4 – as for Option 3 but provides for additional advance structure planting to provide site structure and contoured screening in advance of phased growth at the site.

11.2 The responses to the various options are summarised below.

### ISSUE 11. Landscape Options

- a) *Which of the Landscape Options do you consider preferable? Or*
- b) *Do you think that a different strategy should be considered? If so please explain. Or*
- c) *No opinion.*

### Summary

- 25 respondents made representations on the issue of landscape options. 11 respondents felt Option 4 to be most favourable and 2 respondents Option 3.
- 11 respondents felt that a different strategy should be considered. Suggestions included providing a focal point such as a 'village green', retention where possible of all existing hedgerows, minimal landscaping to reinforce the parkland setting, and preserving a wildlife corridor to the east of the site in order to maintain northerly views from residences on Blackhorse Lane.
- The Environment Agency favoured retention and management of the most valuable features in landscape and biodiversity terms, and a strategy that

*incorporates a parkland planting theme including specimen trees. Natural England also favoured Option 3 or 4 as these retain the existing landscape structure of the site and associated landscape corridors.*

- *The principal landowner expressed concern that the assessment was driven by snapshot views from the Motorway and that an assessment based on “assets and constraints” should be carried out.*

11.3 The Preferred Option is based on Option 4, which is to retain and enhance the parkland landscape in the context of the M5 Junction 29 works, and across the remainder of the site to retain the existing landscape structure where appropriate and to reinforce that as part of the new landscape structure. It is also proposed to implement advance landscape structure planting at an early stage of implementation in order to reinforce the fairly weak structure that exists over much of the site.

11.4 The approach to the parkland area does not necessarily preclude development in that part of the site as per the Preferred Option at Issue 5.

## **Issue 12. Strategic Landscape Approach**

12.1 In addition to the basic landscape strategy options for the site there are a number of other key considerations that cannot be illustrated easily but which will help define the approach to landscape design at the site.

12.2 The guiding vision for the design character overall, and the landscape setting of the development is that it should follow a campus style of development with high quality buildings set within a strong designed landscape, as is the case at the existing University of Exeter campus.

12.3 The main responses are summarised below.

### **ISSUE 12. Strategic Landscape Approach**

- a) *In considering how prominent the development should be in the local and wider landscape would you favour a ‘landscape-led’ or ‘buildings-led’ approach to site masterplanning and design? Or*
- b) *Do you think that a different strategy should be considered? If so please explain; or*
- c) *No opinion.*

### **Summary**

- *26 respondents made representations on the strategic landscape approach. 23 of the respondents favoured the landscape led approach whilst 2 favoured the combined approach.*

- *The Environment Agency pointed out the possibility of combining exciting architecture with landscaping whilst at the same time enhancing and maintaining the existing features of the site.*
- *The principal landowner suggested that the “landscape led” or “buildings led” approach was too simplistic and that SPD should seek to establish broad ground rules.*
- *A number of concerns were raised that a ‘campus’ style development would be low density and therefore not represent a sustainable use of the land.*

12.4 The Preferred Option is to build on that for Issue 11 above, in order to create a robust landscape structure capable of absorbing, and providing the setting for, a range of building types. The strategy is to build upon the existing landscape features and character of the south western part of the study area, and to expand that across the site. Elsewhere on the site the existing landscape structure is weak and therefore it offers limited value as the basis for a new landscape, other than in terms of its historic interest in identifying the pattern of roads and hedgerows.

12.5 It is agreed that a ‘landscape-led’ or ‘buildings-led’ approach is too simplistic, although these were useful concepts in discussing possible approaches. The reality will be an intention to create a high quality setting and overall landscape character, broadly reflecting the character of the existing University campus. It will therefore be neither buildings nor landscape-led. Building densities will vary across the site and the landscape strategy will need to be able to accommodate higher built densities than found at the University campus in Exeter.

## **Issue 13. Ridgeline Development**

13.1 Partly linked to Issue 12 is the key issue of whether development such as a ‘flagship’ building or major piece of public art could be positioned on the ridgeline at Redhayes, or whether the objective should be to seek to minimise any building on the ridge. This is important to the overall approach to site design and development since a high quality building or public art structure could help to market the Science Park and reinforce the prestige nature of the scheme, and this needs to be balanced against the landscape and visual effect that would result.

13.2 The responses to this issue are summarised below.

### **ISSUE 13. Ridgeline Development**

- a) Do you think high quality development could extend onto the ridge? Or**
- b) Do you think that the ridge should be kept free of development where possible? If so please explain; or**
- c) No opinion.**

### **Summary**

- *A total of 27 respondents commented on this issue. 2 respondents thought that high quality development could extend onto the ridgeline but that it should add to the landscape quality rather than detract from it or be a piece of public art or very special flagship building.*
- *18 respondents felt that development should not extend onto the ridge. Comments suggested that the landscape should be protected and development should be as inconspicuous as possible.*

- 13.3 The consensus of respondents was that the Science Park development should seek to avoid or minimise building on the ridgeline that forms a central east-west feature of the study area. There was a particular consensus among respondents that prominent buildings should not be sited on the ridge, for example of the type that a 'landmark' structure would represent.
- 13.4 The Preferred Option is to site buildings that will advertise the presence of the Science Park in the southern part of the study area where they can be set within a new and enhanced landscape but will be seen from the A30 frontage, particularly in the earliest years after commencement. In the longer term it is proposed that some buildings could be sited on the northern flanks of the ridge in order to mark the presence of the Science Park in views from southbound M5 traffic. In growing the Science Park northward from the initial phase sited near the A30 frontage in the south east of the site the development will expand northward and north-westward, skirting around the eastern end of the ridge form.
- 13.5 Importantly, and notwithstanding the expressed views of most of the respondents to the Issues and Options document, the proposed Preferred Option is also to continue to consider the merits of a building at the location where Redhayes house formerly stood. This is situated slightly below the highest parts of the ridge, and siting of an appropriate building there would help in the efficient use of land at the site, has some logic in terms of continuity in the historic landscape. The site of the former house also presents some challenges in how it can be integrated into the rest of the site if it is left undeveloped
- 13.6 It is recognised, however, that this is a sensitive part of the site, and any such building would need to be set into the landscape rather than presenting a dominant, building-led aspect and would need to be limited in height and massing.

## **Issue 14. Detailed Landscape Design Themes**

- 14.1 Notwithstanding the strategic approach to masterplanning and landscape design at the site it will be necessary to consider the approach to detailed landscape design. Although there is a wide range of approaches that could be adopted, these can to some extent be characterised by greater or lesser formality in the landscape appearance.
- 14.2 The response to the issue of detailed landscape design themes is summarised below.

#### **ISSUE 14. Detailed Landscape Design Themes**

- a) *Would you favour a more formal or less formal approach to the detailed landscape design of the site?***
- b) *Would you like to see a strong emphasis on providing habitats for wildlife as part of the landscape design at the site?***
- c) *Within the development do you think there should be more emphasis on hard landscape features such as a 'square' and other paved areas, or should soft landscape dominate – or should there be a combination?  
Or***
- d) *No opinion.***

#### **Summary**

- *26 respondents made representations on the issue of detailed landscape design themes. Of these, 6 agreed they would like to see a strong emphasis on providing habitats for wildlife whilst 3 favoured a combination of formal and less formal features.*
- *Other responses included 10 in favour of a combination of all three options, 5 in favour of a less formal approach including wildlife provision and hard landscaping.*
- *The main thrust of responses was toward a combination of hard and soft landscaping alongside provision for wildlife.*

14.3 The Preferred Approach to the detailed landscape treatment at the site will be to respond to the varying building densities and functional requirements across the site. As a result the detailed design for the site will include a rich combination of hard and soft landscapes and areas, geared to both the setting and user needs of buildings, and the wider landscape character for the Science Park. Proposals will need to make provision for wildlife enhancement through the use of native species, food species and areas of landscaping designed to have minimal disturbance.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Tabulated schedule of responses**

## UNIVERSITY OF EXETER SCIENCE PARK

### SPD ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION : Responses

		Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6	Issue 7	Issue 8	Issue 9	Issue 10	Issue 11	Issue 12	Issue 13	Issue 14
1	Stagecoach	A	A	A	A	C	B	A Option 3	A Option 3	B	B (+buses)	B	A Combined	B	A less formal/B/C combination
3	Mr A Jackson	A	A	C	A	A	C	C	C	C	A	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	ABC
5	Mr L B Rowe	A	A	C	A	BC	A Option 1	C	C	C	B	A Option 4	A	C	C-combination
6	Mr R J Sandover	B	B	B	A	A	A Option 3	A Option 3	B	B	A	B	A	B	B
7	Miss M Savory	A	A	A	A	A	A Option 3	A Option 2	A Option 2	A Option 2	B	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	ABC
8	Mr R R Robinson	B	C	D	D						B				
10	Mrs W House	C	C	B	A	A	A Option 3	A Option 1	A Option 2	A Option 2	B	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	B
11	Mr K E Thomas	B	A	ABC	A	A	A Option 3	A Option 3	A Option 3	A Option 1	B	A Option 3	A Landscape	B	ABC
12	Mr M Peach	B	A	D	A	B	A Option 3/4	A Option 3	B	B	B	B	A Landscape	C	ABC
13	Mr N D Waite	B	B	B	A	A	A Option 4	A Option 3	B	A Option 1	A	B	A Landscape	B	ABC
14	Mr I E J Broom	B	A	D	A	B	A Option 3/4	A Option 3	B	A Option 1	B	B	A Landscape	C	ABC
15	Edward Symmons	A	A	A	A	A	A Option 2/3	?	B	?	C	B	A Combined	B	C-combination
16	ECC Cllr Mrs M Danks													B	
17	ECC Cllr Mrs J Morrish													B	
18	Mr D.S Fisher	A	A	C	A	A	C	A Option 1	A Option 3	A Option 2	A	A Option 3	A Landscape	B	C Combination

		Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6	Issue 7	Issue 8	Issue 9	Issue 10	Issue 11	Issue 12	Issue 13	Issue 14
19	Miss J J Tancock	B	A	D	A	B	A Option 3*4	A Option 3*	B	B	B	B	A Landscape	C	ABC
20	Miss A E Hesketh	B	A	D	A	B	A Option 3*4	A Option 3*1	B	B	B	B	A Landscape	C	ABC
21	Mr & Mrs Lloyd	B	C	D	A	B	A Option 3*4	A Option 3*1	B	B	B	B	A Landscape	C	ABC
22	Savills										B				
23	Mr A Darke	B	A	D	A	B	A Option 3*4	A Option 3*1	B	B	B	B	A Landscape	C	ABC
24	Transport 2000 Devon Group	C							B	B					
25	Environment Agency					A	A Option 2/4	?	?	A Option 2	?	?	A Landscape	?	B
26	Eagle One MMIII Ltd			AC		?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
28	Mr M Felstead	A	A	A	A	BC (low density)	B Option 3/4	A Option 1	B	A Option 1	C	A Option 4	A Landscape	A	A less formal/B/C Soft
29	Highways Agency	A	A	A		?	?	?		?	A				
30	Mrs E Cook	A	A	A	A	B/C (Intensive)	A Option 3	A Option 2	A Option 3	B	B	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	A less formal/B/C Soft
33	S J Packer		B	A	A	A	A Option 3	C	A Option 2	A Option 2	B	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	B
34	Devon County Council	?	A	A	A										
35	Devon Conservation Forum	B Skypark/ Cranbrook	A	B	A	A	A Option 4	A Option 2	A Option 3 *3	?	B*2	A Option 4	A Landscape	B (except for public art)	A – informal/ B
36	Clyst Honiton Parish	A	A	C	A	A	A Option 2	A Option 2 or 3	A Option 2	A Option 2	A	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	A less formal/B/C softer

		Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6	Issue 7	Issue 8	Issue 9	Issue 10	Issue 11	Issue 12	Issue 13	Issue 14
	Council														
37	Mr Saunders R	A	A	C	A	B/C (low density)	A Option 3	A Option 3	A Option 3	B	B	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	A less formal/B/C softer
38	Ms A Lewis	A	A	B	A	A	A Option 3/4	A Option 1	A Option 2	A Option 1	B	A Option 4	A Landscape	B	B
39	Natural England	B*9	C	A	A	A	A Option 2	A Option 2	?*5	A option 2	D*10	A Option 3 or 4	A Landscape	A	B or B/C
40	Exeter City Council	A	B*6	A	A	B/C low density	B	A Option 2	A Option 2	A or B depending on circumstances.	C*7	B*8	B*8	B*8	?*8
	Totals	13 A, 12 B, 2 C	20 A, 4 B, 4 C	10 A 5 B, 5 C, 7 D, 1 AC 1 ABC	26 A 1 D	14 A 6B 1 C 1 BC 1 B/C (intensive) 3 B/C (low density)	1 A op 1 2 A Op 2 1 A Op2/3 1 A op2/4 7 A op 3 4 A Option 3*4 4 A op 3/4 2 A op 4 2 B 2 C	4 A op 1 5 A op 2 1 A op 2/3 8 A op 3 3 A op 3*1 3 C	6A op 2 5 A op 3 1 A op 3*3 11 B 2 C	5A op 1 7 A op 2 10 B 2 C	6 A 17 B 1 B*2 1 C 3 D	2 A op 3 11 A op 4 1 A Option 3 or 4 11 B	23 A landscape 2 A combined 1 B	2A 18 B 7 C	1 A informal/B 4 A less formal/B/C soft 1 A less formal/B/C combination 11 ABC 5 B 1 B or B/C 3 C - combination

### Notes

- \*1 With proviso that development of the parkland takes place.
- \*2 Unless public transport only possible.
- \*3 If SW quadrant excluded.
- \*4 Also suggest different strategy – use SW quadrant in developing option 3 which would require less 2 storey build. Alternatively would also consider option 4 with eastern part of NE quadrant bordering existing properties undeveloped .
- \*5 Whichever option can best retain the field pattern and hedges.
- \*6 More precise definition required
- \*7 Good links from City required,, avoiding A 30 but protect existing settlements from through traffic.
- \*8 Create high quality ambience preferably with development below the 38 metre contour.

\*9 Prefer to see M5 as limit to expansion of Exeter and provide a sense of separation between the city and the Airport/Intermodal freight development.

\*10 Don't mind but would like to see the associated hedgerows and wildlife corridors retained

Other representations not answering any of the questions on the proforma:

27 Ms H Galling

31 Mr R Coombs

32 CABE