

**EXETER CITY COUNCIL****SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – ECONOMY  
31 MAY 2012****EXECUTIVE  
19 JUNE 2012****BUS AND COACH STATION AREA DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES****1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 Members will recall the meeting of the Economy Scrutiny Committee and Executive in February 2012 which resolved that the draft Development Principles be approved for the purpose of a public engagement exercise.
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to present the responses received and to seek approval for proposed changes to the document and the endorsement of the amended document for development management purposes.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Bus and Coach Station Development Principles have been drawn up to guide preparation of a development scheme for this area by a prospective developer, allowing a degree of flexibility whilst ensuring that key principles are delivered.
- 2.2 The Development Principles were prepared in a series of four collaborative workshops. The workshops included representatives from Exeter City Council and Devon County Council with Land Securities, Chapman Taylor Architecture, English Heritage, and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE).
- 2.3 The Development Principles supplement the Development Plan Policies. The Exeter Core Strategy was adopted in February 2012 and Policies 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 & 17 are considered pertinent to development of the Bus and Coach Station site. The Exeter Local Plan (1st Review 1995 – 2011) was adopted in March 2005. Policies of the Local Plan are saved until superseded by the LDF process. Local Plan Policy KP3 is a site specific policy relating to the Bus Station site and includes all the land bounded by Sidwell Street, Cheeke Street and Paris Street. Policy KP3 provides for development of ... *“an enhanced bus station, commercial leisure facilities, including potentially a multi-screen cinema, retail floor space, an extended street market, short stay parking and possibly non-family housing”*.

**3.0 CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY AND PARTICIPATION**

- 3.1 Public Consultation was carried out over a six week period commencing 19th March and running until 23<sup>rd</sup> April.
- 3.2 Two briefings, aimed at Stakeholders but open to public attendance, were held on the afternoon of Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> March and evening of Monday 26<sup>th</sup> March a total of 50 people attended these events.
- 3.3 Two roadshow events were held at 6 Paris Street on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> March from noon until 5 p.m. and on Saturday 17<sup>th</sup> March from 10 a.m. until 3 p.m. 133 people dropped in to talk to officers at these events.

- 3.4 Static displays were mounted in the Civic Centre and at 6 Paris Street during the consultation period.
- 3.5 The draft Development Principles document was made available to download via the Exeter City Council website and paper copies were available in the Civic Centre and the Central Library.
- 3.6 The consultation was also advertised in the Exeter Citizen, which goes to all households, and direct email or letter to stakeholders including business umbrella groups and community associations. The consultation also received coverage in the Express and Echo.
- 3.7 Responses were received on the questionnaire form, on post it notes, by letter and by email. Verbal representations were made and recorded at the Briefing and Roadshow events. 19 representations have been received from groups or organisations, 38 letters and emails were received from members of the public, 41 submitted comments on post it notes and 124 people filled in the questionnaire form.

#### **4.0 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES**

- 4.1 95% of those who returned the questionnaire supported the redevelopment of the Bus & Coach Station Area.
- 4.2 There was 91% support for the principles (29% agreed with all the principles and 62% agreed with most of the principles).
- 4.3 People were also asked to say which they thought were the most important. Principle I (replacement bus station) was selected by 57%. Other principles received lower levels of support but even that least favoured was still picked by 20% of people. Officers consider that the responses are an endorsement of the principles as drafted and show that there are none which are considered inappropriate.
- 4.4 Narrative responses to the other parts of the questionnaire are included in the section below.

#### **5.0 PUBLIC RESPONSES**

- 5.1 Much of the response to the consultation is in the form of comments, recorded at the briefing events, roadshows or via the feedback form. The purpose of this section is to synthesise the comments into a coherent narrative that fairly sums up the concerns and issues raised through those channels and it is organised on a topic basis.

##### **5.2 Bus Station**

There were a lot of comments about what facilities the new bus station should have.

*“Passenger friendly waiting areas, that do not have doors which automatically open when someone approaches them”*

*“It must work properly as a bus station. Features must include enough capacity for current services, for increase in demand, proper passenger information and above all be attractive and functional”*

*“The current bus station is diabolical when it comes to giving users information on what services are due. Something akin to railway station information boards are required.”*

### 5.3 Retail

There was concern that Exeter has enough shops and that retail units would not be filled or would disadvantage local businesses.

*“Any new shops to provide appropriate provision for smaller traders, such as those forced out of Princesshay”*

*“Shops should be small, low rent for small businesses - no more national chain”*

*“Exeter has shops that are standing empty. Yes include some retail but the development does not need to be retail”*

*“Current retail outlets are struggling, we do not need more shops”*

### 5.4 Sidwell Street

There is a lot of concern about the future of the traders in Sidwell Street.

*“By mixed use (C) I hope you mean including charity shops, which are an extremely important part of the economy of the area in question, and market stalls (preferably ones the stallholders do not have to erect and dismantle themselves)”*

*“Whilst I agree the development should have a mix of retail I think it should incorporate the unique shops that exist in Sidwell Street.”*

*“It is important not to compromise the cheaper retail facilities for lower incomes such as available on Sidwell St”*

*“I also hope that the street traders will be accommodated”*

*“reinforcing the current “market and independent style” side of Sidwell street, emphasising local, quality, stalls and produce”*

*“I do wonder why it is necessary to remove all buildings in Sidwell Street. They are not of architectural merit but they provide affordable shops for some basic and budget shops which are needed by the Exeter shopping public.”*

However, there are some disparaging views on the built environment in the area

*“reinforce’ Sidwell Street??? Raise to the ground would be the preferred option.”*

*“Considering its prominence, Sidwell Street is by far the worst part of Exeter, avoided by many, sadly it forms an initial and lasting impression for visitors and tourists.”*

*“Sidwell Street, as it currently stands, represents a stark contrast to the Princesshay redevelopment and is incredibly unattractive, mostly because the architecture is so poor”*

### 5.5 Leisure uses

There were a great many comments requesting a variety of leisure facilities. The most frequently mentioned was a new theatre.

*“Can we have a nationally recognised theatre/concert venue?”*

*“As above, I believe a new theatre would pay for itself and attract people to Exeter from surrounding areas, and also be a focus for the Exeter Festival”*

*“Include a good quality theatre that can take the kind of shows that Torquay and Plymouth get, and most of us would never drive to.”*

An ice-rink was another popular suggestion

*“The development should include a public use facility, such as a theatre, swimming pool, or ice rink”*

*“An ice-rink for the young-uns”*

*“I think that the building of an ice rink could be an excellent addition to the development. At the moment, Plymouth has the only permanent rink this side of Bristol”*

## 5.6 Design

Respondents seem to have been excited by the opportunities offered by a new development and there are many views on what it should be like.

*“Also, want to include community spaces, available for a variety of community, and I expect more landscaping/planting/ than on offer in High Street and Princesshay”*

*“Creating a network of streets is important as this helps to create character and reflects how this site, and indeed the rest of the City Centre, looked before the war. It could help create an area that you were happy to mooch in”*

*“because we've got to get people into the area - to make it a vibrant area with a distinct character - and this seems to me the best way of doing it”*

*“Not really a principle but I feel that the City needs a large open area that can fulfil several functions and be used for different events - similar to Armada Way in Plymouth.”*

*“I think the architecture shouldn't tower over people - probably not a problem with what is envisaged. Lots of trees and some green areas to soften the look and encourage people just to sit”*

*“we have an opportunity here to create a wonderful space, based round a market square. Since the redevelopment of Princesshay, we have lost the market square and desperately need another. In addition, we need a flexible performance space in the city centre”*

## 6.0 WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM ORGANISATIONS

- 6.1 Stagecoach strongly supports the City Council's continued endeavours to regenerate and strengthen the City Centre. Stagecoach operates 160 vehicles and 500 from its Belgrave Road facilities that include offices, administration, maintenance and training. Stagecoach carries 15.5 million customers on Exeter services each year and believes these are vital to the City Centre Economy. The general proposals for the new bus station are welcomed but Stagecoach requests consultation on detailed plans. Stagecoach is concerned that moving the Bus Station further from the retail centre would be a disincentive to bus use and would have an effect on service viability. The bus station should allow for growth in bus use. The current bus station accommodates coaches and a growing number of National Express and Megabus services. Significant disruption to services must be avoided during development, which should be phased with this in mind. Traffic congestion has a negative impact on the operation and attractiveness of bus services. An operationally satisfactory alternative for the depot before development proceeds.
- 6.2 Carmel Coaches consider the development principles acceptable. The main concern is that a bus station is developed and not just a series of stands fitted as an afterthought. Provision should be made for visiting coaches to boost tourism.
- 6.3 National Express are concerned the reference to buses rather than buses and coaches is made in the document. The size of any facility must not be squeezed so as to be unable to accommodate services. Buses and coaches should have common facilities as there is interchange between them and other modes. Access for buses and coaches must be easy and not conflict with car park queues. The bus station should link directly to retail areas; not be hidden away. National Express have experience of working with a large number of modern bus stations, some of which

have operational performance or safety issues and would be happy to bring their knowledge of this to the table.

- 6.4 Transition Exeter. Creation of a modern bus station is an important to help people make more sustainable travel choices. Bus Station should be paid for by all city centre developments. All bus services should use bus station to enable better connections. Optimum location for bus station should be identified. Solution for visiting coaches required. We would welcome protection for small independent retailers and provision of a covered market. Greater pedestrianisation would be welcome. Any plans for surrounding roads should be spelled out in this document. Cycling routes should be provided. Consider no parking for retail development in this location. Specification of bus station should be consulted on separately. Principles E & J are supported.
- 6.5 Travelwatch Southwest is a public transport users group for the Southwest. Short easy routes between any bus and coach station and the city centre should be maintained. Redevelopment is not a necessity. Danger that moving depot will increase operating costs and hence the cost to passengers. A traffic plan should be published in advance of any planning application. In order to give a seamless pedestrian link to the city centre consideration should be given to closing upper Paris Street with bus stops and turning area on Paris Street. Closure of Bampfylde Street and Cheeke Street will have serious implications for surrounding routes. Provision must be made for disabled access and shopmobility should be located close to the bus station.
- 6.6 Exeter Trades Union Council support redevelopment provided that the level of service and accessibility is improved. Adequate toilets (including disabled), refreshment facilities and convenient and safe pedestrian access routes should be provided.
- 6.7 Devon Wildlife Trust believe that this represents an opportunity to showcase incorporation of biodiversity into development. The site offers the opportunity for living landmarks and recommend the extensive use of carefully selected trees in open spaces. This is an opportunity to support the Exeter Swift project. Green roofs should be considered.
- 6.8 RSPB the network of public spaces should contain a significant amount of planting. Living roofs or green walls could be incorporated. Provision for swift nesting should be built in and nest boxes for other urban bird species may be incorporated with planting designed to provide food and shade. An ongoing Wildlife Management Plan should be developed for the site.
- 6.9 English Heritage consider that the site offers the opportunity to add complimentary value to the city centre but that the development would potentially impact on numerous Heritage Assets in the area. The Development Principles document is the product of evidence gathering and appraisal work and to which we have contributed. We offer broad endorsement of its contents. The document is far from representing a comprehensive brief or masterplan and that work remains to be done.
- 6.10 Devon and Cornwall Police question the status of this document. They consider it positive that some crime prevention measures have been incorporated in the principles. The current bus station experiences some problems of anti-social behaviour and has issues arising from vagrants frequenting the site which deter use. Development should take in to account Secured by Design advice. Spaces that appeal to a broad demographic have positive benefits. Street furniture should be securely fitted and not crime generators. Car Parks should be encouraged to achieve

Park Mark Safer Parking Award as Bampfylde Street Car Park does. Landscaping should work in harmony with CCTV. Attention should be paid to the design of new routes.

- 6.11 Exeter Civic Society supports the redevelopment of this part of the city centre. We agree with development being more permeable with Sidwell Street and would welcome the improvement of Sidwell Street, but would wish its current function as a district centre for St. James area to be retained. Development should not come forward as one whilst there are vacancies elsewhere. We advise against hotels or offices if there are vacancies elsewhere. Improvements to public transport do not need to wait for this development. Buildings should provide the main character and cohesiveness for the area. We would like to see the enhancement of surrounding streets and creation of a landscaped space at the junction of Paris Street and Sidwell Street, a landmark feature or fountain would be an alternative to a building. The name 'London Inn Square' is questioned as London Inn is no longer there and it would not be the same location. Closing roads in this area will place additional demand on retained routes. Provision for pedestrian crossing on busy roads should be included. Any further congestion will affect bus services. The new bus station should facilitate links between bus services and other transport modes. Consideration should be given to making provision for long distance coaches outside the city centre. Proposals for the alternative depot site should be made known. Support Principle J but clarify last sentence. If Sidwell Street is redeveloped reduced rents should be offered to local business'. Alternative sites for any new pool should also be looked at, if provided here it should be a landmark building. The open air market in Sidwell Street should be retained, perhaps including the farmers' market.
- 6.12 Exeter City Council Environmental Health raise concerns that mixed use development can create noise and odour issues for residential elements and this should be addressed through control over detailed matters and requiring plant to be integrated and discharge at high level. Tranquil spaces can be promoted as well as vibrant ones, reduced car use should be promoted.
- 6.13 Exeter City Council Projects and Business Manger (Sustainable Transport) comments that Principle I should be promoted in the ranking, given the importance of the bus and coach station which has to be accommodated on site, and should be located conveniently for access to the city centre. The bus depot has to be accommodated elsewhere as part of the proposals. Provision of pedestrian and cycle routes throughout, with active frontages, will be particularly important.
- 6.14 Exeter Walking and Cycling Steering Group. Need for through routes for cyclists; more connectivity to Sidwell Street; Paris Street Roundabout should be reviewed to investigate replacement with a signalised junction; bus station located close to centre; welcoming and attractive design for new bus station; clear and direct onward links.
- 6.15 Devon County Council (Development Management Team) supports the establishment of these principles. The principles could be more specific, for example about crossing points. Existing businesses should be protected and re-sited if necessary. Smaller units in Princesshay have been less successful. Other desire lines into the site may exist. High quality buildings and public realm should be required. Principle J should be more aspirational.
- 6.16 Devon County Council is generally supportive of the document and the principles as drafted. Accommodating higher volumes of people travelling to the centre of Exeter will rely on greater use of public transport and the importance of the bus station cannot be underestimated. A peripheral bus station of high quality is less likely to

attract patronage than an acceptable quality bus station in a more central location. Operational and passenger access must be considered when considering the location of the new bus station. Adequate stands, layover spaces, passenger facilities, driver facilities and management arrangements will need to be secured. Separate provision will need to be made in the city for coaches. The County Council are keen to support the aspiration of making public transport the preferred means of getting in to the city. Comments on matters of detail are offered. Problems for pedestrian access from Newtown and St. Leonards should also be addressed. Principle C should be amended to strengthen the position of the bus station. The levels within the site make the provision of access for those with disabilities and cyclist challenging, servicing and access should not create conflict with cyclists and pedestrians. Significant investment in buses and bus stops to make them accessible has already been made and this should be matched in the bus station. The opportunity to exploit uses to maintain activity, and hence perceptions of safety around the bus station in the evening should be realised. Routes to and from the bus station should be legible and signposted. The bus station should deliver a positive first impression of the city. The development should not negatively impact on bus routes, particularly the important Sidwell Street corridor. Car Park design should ensure that queuing does not affect the flow of traffic or the safety of pedestrian and cyclists. The scope of the Transport Assessment will need to be agreed with DCC.

## 7.0 RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Although there are a few clear conclusions, the nature of the consultation does not lend itself to neat and straightforward answers. Rather, the respondents have taken the opportunity to express their aspirations and concerns for the development.
- Consultations that lead on concepts such as design principles struggle to engage the wider population.
  - There was clear agreement that the site should be developed
  - There are some strong concerns, in particular about the future of the bus station and of Sidwell Street as a low cost shopping area meeting local need.
- 7.2 Some responses addressed matters of planning policy that have been established through the Local Plan and Core Strategy, but most strayed beyond on to matters of design detail not being considered as part of these Development Principles. Those responses are however useful as they concern and can inform work on matters of detail yet to be addressed.
- 7.3 The main points raised are summarised below with a brief response.
- 7.4 Bus Station
- **“Replace bus station / Don’t replace bus station”**. Principle I requires an enhanced bus station to be delivered by any redevelopment. It makes no prescription about location which needs to be resolved at detailed planning stage. However Principles E, F & H which seek high quality, pedestrian friendly public realm have implications for the siting of a bus station.
  - **“Location of bus station should not be further from City Centre destinations”**. Positioning the bus station adjacent the retail area with good links for pedestrians to city centre destinations is required by Principle I.

- **“Safe convenient connection between bus and other modes (Taxi, safe car drop off, city buses, rail) important”**. The points raised are noted and changes proposed to the supporting text to Principle I to reflect this.
- **“Bus station must be at Sidwell Street level”**. It is important that movement between the bus station and city centre is provided without the need to negotiate steps.
- **“Passenger waiting facilities should be safe and clean”**. Principle I requires standards for Bus Station to be agreed by ECC, DCC and operators.
- **“Site bus station at shopping level with active evening uses”**. The points raised are noted but are considered to be a matter of detail rather than principle.
- **“Facilities at bus station: exclude takeaway food and drink, include toilets, staff facilities, bus layovers”**. Principle I requires the standards for Bus Station to be agreed by ECC, DCC and operators.
- **“Access to bus station must not be compromised by queuing traffic”**. It is essential that any development proposals allow for the operation of bus services in an efficient manner.
- **“Transitional arrangements for bus station - concerns expressed”**. It is essential that any development proposals allow for the operation of bus services during development.
- **“Alternative drop & parking for coaches to be provided”**. It is not the role of the Bus and Coach Station to accommodate occasional and intermittent coach services.
- **“New bus station is a requirement not optional”**. Principle I is clear on this matter, supporting text to principle A to be amended to avoid any ambiguity.

## 7.5 Transport issues

- **“Provide pedestrian access to site from Summerland Street/Sidwell Street corner”**. Principle F requires the creation of a network of streets that offer permeability and the break down of current obstacles to pedestrian movement.
- **“Paris Street should return to two-way / Paris Street should be pedestrianised”**.
- **“Traffic queuing problems, delay, noise, air quality”**. The matters of the detailed impact of the proposals on traffic circulation are properly a matter dealt with at planning application stages and as part of any proposed alterations to the highway network.
- **“Cycle parking must be provided & cycle access/routes through E-W and N-S”**. Supporting text to Principle F to be amended to require that provision for cyclists is given consideration.
- **“Crossing points on adjacent streets (Paris St., Western Way, Sidwell Street) should be looked at”**. This matter is dealt with in Principle F.
- **“Bus routing & stops need to be considered”**. These matters need to be considered if any detailed proposals for alterations to the highway are put proposed.
- **“Loss of parking”**. The level of parking provision to be made on the site is not considered to be a matter of principle.
- **“Shop mobility should be linked to new bus station”**. Noted. This is a matter of detail rather than principle.

- **“The site for an alternative bus depot should be identified”**. Development of the bus depot area of the site would not be able to progress without a suitable alternative site being delivered.
- **“Consultation should include highway alterations”**. Any alterations to the Highway network would be a matter for further separate consultation and approval.
- **“Define ‘accessible’ in terms of streets & bus station”**. Supporting text to Principles F and I to be amended to clarify the broad meaning of accessibility in this document.

## 7.6 Retail Issues

- **“No more retail, unnecessary, many retail vacancies in City Centre”**.
- **“Economic situation & internet retailing depresses demand”**. The capacity for further retail development in the city centre was addressed in the recently adopted Exeter Core Strategy which makes provision for up to 30,000 square metres of additional retail floor space on this site.
- **“Smaller retail units should be provided”**.
- **“Mix of retail units should be provided”**.
- **“Affordable rents should be required”**. Rent levels are a matter between tenant and landlord and cannot be set through this type of document; the supporting text to Principle C can be amended to include reference to a mixture of retail unit types.
- **“Special provision/protection/relocation for local and independent retailers”**. As with Princesshay business’ that are in units where redevelopment is proposed would have the opportunity to relocate.
- **“Market retained/provided/improved”**.
- **“Indoor market, farmers market relocated here”**. Local Plan Policy KP3 requires the existing Sidwell Street market. Supporting text to Principle C amended to echo this.

## 7.7 Sidwell Street

- **“Demolish Sidwell Street – outdated/poor”**.
- **“Keep Sidwell Street – good example of its time”**. The analysis of architecture in Sidwell Street has shown that there are no buildings that are of a standard considered worthy of protection.

## 7.8 Uses

- **“Leisure should be included in principle for consistency with policy KP3”**. Principle C amended to include leisure as a principal use.
- **“Theatre / Arts venue / Concert Hall / Ice Rink / Swimming Pool should be provided”**. These major uses all fall within the definition of leisure uses and would be in accordance with Principle C.
- **“Housing should be provided”**. Principle C allows for the provision of an element of housing on the site.
- **“Opportunity to provide a public space for children / green urban space”**. The design and role of spaces within the site is a matter of detail for a future

stage. Control of these matters can be achieved through the planning consent stage.

#### 7.9 Structure of document

- **“Reorder principles to make document more legible”**. Principle I will be promoted to raise the status of the Bus Station. To avoid confusion this will change will be made for the final version.
- **“Cut out/explain technical jargon”**. Where the principles themselves contain technical language this is explained in plain English in the supporting text.
- **“Premature to site allocations document”**. The document is informal guidance, supplementing Local Plan and Core Strategy Policies.
- **“Status of document should be explained”**. The introduction paragraph will be amended to clarify this.

#### 7.10 Design

- **“Development must have its own character, but also reflect city & regional character.”** Supporting text to principle G amended to reflect the need for the area to develop a distinct identity reflecting its location.
- **“Use more than one architect”**. Supporting text to Principle G amended to clarify this.
- **“There must be additional stages of detail and public involvement with those stages”**. Public consultation required to be carried out by a developer prior to submitting an application. Further stages will include outline and reserved matters planning approvals that will be subject of public consultation.
- **“No roof level plant / Extracts from kitchens at high level / Plant designed in”**. These are matter of detail that can be secured at planning application stage

## 8.0 AMENDMENTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES DOCUMENT

8.1 The following changes are proposed:

#	Change
1	Introductory paragraph amended to be explicit about status of document.
2	Principle A supporting text amended to avoid doubt that enhancement of the Bus Station is a requirement.
3	Principle B supporting text to be amended to refer to pace of development not fundamentally undermining other areas of the city centre.
4	Principle B & C supporting text amended to reflect support for Sidwell Street market in Local Plan Policy KP3.
5	Principle C amended to include reference to leisure uses as a significant part of the development
6	Principle C supporting text amended to refer to a mix of retail units.

7	Principle C supporting text amended to be explicit that Bus Depot and overlay bus parking can be moved off-site.
8	Principle F supporting text amended to include reference to links with surrounding residential areas.
9	Principle F & H supporting text amended to include reference to cycles.
10	Principle F & I supporting text amended to define accessibility more fully.
11	Principle G supporting text amended to reflect the need for the development to create a distinct character for the area that reflects its location.
12	Principle G supporting text amended to be explicit that more than one architect should be commissioned.
13	Principle H supporting text amended to make reference to pedestrians and cyclists
14	Promote Principle I in the order of principles.
15	Principle I supporting text amended to include transfer with other transport modes.
16	Principle I supporting text amended to refer to active evening uses being good neighbour uses for the bus station.
17	Principle J supporting text amended to make reference to desirability of forming linkage with surroundings.

## 9.0 REVISED PRINCIPLES

9.1 The proposed revised development principles are:

- A Development must be viable.
- B Development must reinforce Sidwell Street, complement the High Street and Princesshay and form a gateway to the city centre.
- C The development will be a retail and leisure led mixed use development incorporating a new bus station.
- D Development must positively respond to context including the grain of city, archaeology and site levels.
- E Development must create a high quality public realm with active frontages.
- F Development must create a network of accessible open streets and spaces.
- G Building must be individual and of a high architectural quality, with landmark buildings and gateways formed at key locations using materials appropriate to the location.

- H Vehicular traffic, servicing and car parking must be accommodated in such way as to minimise their impact.
- I An accessible new bus station must be provided to agreed standards.
- J The development must adopt high standards of sustainable design and enhance biodiversity.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 10.1 That Members note the consultation responses and endorse the Bus and Coach Station Development Principles, subject to the amendments listed above, to inform decision making by the City Council.
- 10.2 That Scrutiny Economy notes the consultation responses and endorses the proposed amendments to the development principles in paragraph 8.1.
- 10.3 That Executive agrees the proposed response to the public consultation and the amended principles in paragraph 8.1.

**RICHARD SHORT**  
**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR CITY DEVELOPMENT**

### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1972 (as amended)**

#### **Background papers used in compiling this report:**

1. City Centre: Carbon Emissions, Air Quality and Traffic; Scrutiny Committee-Economy 21 January 2010; Executive 9 February 2010.
2. Transportation Strategy: Measures to reduce carbon emissions/proposed City Council input to DCC Local Transport Plan 2011-16; Scrutiny Committee-Economy 21 January 2010; Executive 9 February 2010.
3. City Centre Vision; Executive 6 December 2011.
4. Exeter Core Strategy adopted February 2012
5. Exeter Local Plan First Review adopted March 2005