

Case Officer: Dave Kenyon  
Site: Baltic Wharf Ltd, Baltic Wharf, Totnes TQ9 5EW  
Ward: Totnes Town  
Applicant: TQ9 Partnership

## **DEVELOPMENT FORUM HELD AT 10.00AM ON 21 JULY 2010 – BALTIC WHARF NOTES**

### Members of South Hams District Council (SHDC) Development Management Committee who were in attendance:

Cllr B Cane, Cllr J Carter, Cllr S Cooper, Cllr P Coulson, Cllr M Hannaford, Cllr J Hawkins, Cllr M Hicks, Cllr D May, Cllr R Rowe, Cllr J Squire, Cllr R Steer, Cllr R Vint, Cllr A Ward and Cllr J Westacott.

### Other Members of SHDC who were in attendance:

Cllr M Howarth (Chair) and Cllr A Barber

### Speakers in attendance at the meeting:

Steve Mittler – TQ9 Partnership  
Stephen Taylor – Harrison Sutton Partnership  
Richard White – FMW Consultancy  
Charles Couzens – Ecos Trust  
Tony Whitty – Totnes Town Council  
Louis Victory – G4BW  
Adam Corney – British Marine Federation  
Pat Sykes – Co Housing  
Tanya Vickers – Totnes Living Community  
Don Lang – Transition Town Totnes  
Kate Wilson - Co-ordinator with Friends of the Earth  
John Cole - Objector  
Kevin Newton White - Supporter

### Officers in attendance at the meeting:

Steve Munday – Head of Development Management  
Dave Kenyon – Major Projects Team  
Paul Tyler – Major Developments and Projects Manager  
Liam Reading – Affordable Housing Manager  
Michael Cozens – Economic Development Officer  
Stephen Evans – Solicitor  
Nick Hill – Solicitor  
Kathryn Trant – Senior Member Support Officer  
George Bryant – DCC Highways

Cllr Howarth opened the meeting and welcomed everybody to the second Development Forum convened by the Council. The Head of Development Management explained that Development Forums should firstly assist Members to understand complex schemes. It was not a meeting for decision making, and Members must be careful to avoid pre-determination. The second purpose of the Forum was to inform the community. The final purpose was to inform the applicant.

The Chairman then asked for any declarations of interest and the following were made:

Cllr Hawkins declared a personal interest by virtue of him storing a vehicle on land owned by the father of one of the applicants.

Cllr Steer declared a personal interest by virtue of knowing the father of one of the applicants as a fellow farmer.

### **Part One – Clarification of Previous Refused proposal and Current Amended Proposal**

The Case Officer, Dave Kenyon, began his presentation by showing plans and explaining some of the details of the previous application which had been refused outline permission by the Committee at its meeting on 13 January 2010. Aerial photographs were shown and buildings identified, along with the pinch point into St Peters Quay which had caused concerns in terms of traffic flow.

The reasons for the previous refusal were explained. The Case Officer then advised the Forum that since the refusal, the Developer had engaged with the community and a revised scheme was now being proposed. In terms of Policy, TP3 of the 1996 Local Plan identifies Baltic Wharf as an employment site and does not normally permit the loss of land or premises from employment use. Marine associated B1 and B8 uses will be permitted but retail uses will not be permitted.

However in April 2010, the Council published its Site Allocation Document for Totnes and Proposal T1 identifies Baltic Wharf as a mixed use site with potential to include about 150 dwellings, maintaining at least the existing number of jobs and maintaining the boatyard and associated facilities. There is also the need to provide play provision and other public space and cycle and footpath provision.

The consultation process for the Site Allocation Document has now ended, and the Council had received both letters of objection and letters of support. The Forward Planning team are currently compiling a summary to be sent to the Inspector for the Examination.

The Case Officer concluded his presentation with a slide which highlighted the differences between the previously refused application and the current proposal.

**Part Two – Presentation by Steve Mittler of TQ9 Partnership, Stephen Taylor of HSP, Richard White of FMW Consultancy and Charles Couzens of Ecos Trust.**

Steve Mittler: Steve Mittler began by explaining that he was one of three partners who all live within TQ9 who had bought the Baltic Wharf site as the TQ9 Partnership. Their overall aim was to bring the riverside and town together and to provide jobs, homes and open space. The site had been purchased in 2006 and the scheme was launched to the public in 2008 with public support of 80 – 90%. Immediately following this the economic crash happened and the occupants of the Goss Building announced that they were moving off site. As a result, the plans had to change and, to ensure viability, the number of homes had to be amended. The number of jobs nor the number of affordable homes changed (although the percentage did). There was no opposition when the scheme was first tested but when the application was submitted there were objections and opposition from some community groups. When presented to the Committee on 13 January 2010 and despite an officer recommendation for approval, the application was refused by Members for the reasons previously outlined.

TQ9 Partnership was still encouraged by the sense that generally people were in favour of a scheme. G4BW was then formed from the opposition groups and a number of meetings were held. Difficult discussions took place and a number of problems were resolved. Tribute should be paid to the members of G4BW for their time and effort.

The new scheme has reduced in overall scale by 20-25% with over 30% less traffic. TQ9 feels that the new scheme that has arisen from those discussions is better than the previous scheme, and for that reason has decided not to appeal the previous decision. This new scheme will be less costly, will reduce traffic and will offer more affordable homes, more quickly. G4BW has recommended that this scheme is supported by their respective community groups.

In terms of more detail, slides were shown which demonstrated 'How reasons for refusal have been addressed'. Overall the scheme had reduced in scale by 20-25% except for the boatyard which had been protected. Heights and densities had been reduced to well within council policies.

The traffic impact had been reduced and there was now a ratio of one parking space for each home. This ratio of 1:1 was usually only seen in cities, never in more rural areas like Totnes. The scheme includes extensive travel plan commitments and the Partnership believed that the scheme will generate the least traffic of any development.

In terms of numbers of affordable homes, the actual number will be decided by an independent assessor, between a raised floor of 25% and raised ceiling of 50%. However, more importantly because the costs had been reduced so markedly, a higher number of affordable homes with this scheme would be delivered quicker. The price rise needed to achieve 50% affordable housing with full grant, will be 25%.

However 50% affordable housing may be very difficult to achieve on Brownfield sites such as Baltic Wharf, particularly when the cost of developing a Brownfield site and the commercial value reduces the affordable funds by several £ms. This percentage has rarely been achieved even on Greenfield sites in better economic terms. The Affordable Housing Manager also asked TQ9 to look at the impact of reduced grant and a reduction of £40,000 for example, would require a 12% increase in sales price. If no grant were available the minimum number of affordable homes would be 25 but alternatively the Partnership could gift the equivalent land with full grant to the Council, which would meet the obligations of TQ9 under the Councils policy.

Further changes to the scheme include reducing the built up area and replacing with open space such as a community orchard. Also, at the request of the community, there is the protection of the quayside for waterborne transport.

A number of people have questioned the siting of the Retirement Village housing next to the boatyard. However the site was requested by Retirement Village as some residents like to see the hustle and bustle of activity. In terms of noise disturbance it has been assessed that the two communities can live together, providing the workshop is appropriately sound proofed, new plant and equipment are bought which are quieter and a wall is built between the two areas to screen the ground floor residents. Retirement Villages are often built in the middle of nowhere; this scheme makes the residents part of the town and the community.

A slide was then shown which presented a plan of the site. Key elements were summarised by TQ9 as follows:

- A planned boatyard the same size as the current open area and capable of accommodating existing demand (currently being maintained, possible signs of decline);
- A new yard with open space for 200 boats and another 30 boats on new pontoons up and down the quayside to allow extra boats to be brought in both winter and summer;
- Racks for small boats/kayaks for locals and holidaymakers;
- A marine and business centre consisting of marine workshops providing employment for 60 people (currently 35 people are employed);
- The first floor of the marine and business centre will be a managed office suite with space for around 130 office workers including managed workspaces where locals can work and starter units;
- 20 workspaces in homes to live/work units;
- Other potential employment includes 100 jobs at the Retirement Village and 35 retail jobs. This results in a total of 350 jobs – currently there are 80 on site. The Partnership want all the existing employers to stay and can offer space to them;
- The open space is now enhanced to include 12 acres of private green field to be opened up for the people of Totnes. There will be play areas, a community orchard and kitchen gardens on site;
- The scheme allows for 180 homes of high quality design. The funding from the market homes enables the whole scheme to go ahead;

- The Retirement Village will consist of a 60 bed registered care home and 75 independent living units. It is a scheme for local people and is supported by the Devon Primary Care Trust and Plymouth University. It meets the needs of care and support for the elderly and is positive in that it makes a saving for the NHS. It enables living at home for as long as possible and helps to keep people out of hospital;
- This is the first time a Co-Housing scheme has been integrated into a wider development. It is also unique in including an affordable housing provider. A community house is proposed along with a sustainability visitor centre;
- There is a sustainability strategy for well insulated homes and heat technology will be decided nearer the time. However it was confirmed that the minimum Code level on site will be level 4 with some level 5 and some level 6 zero carbon homes also being anticipated. This scheme will be badged as a green exemplar site.

TQ9 believed the key benefits were jobs, homes and open space - the key priorities of the town, as well as a whole lot more.

The presentation was concluded by stating that the Partnership had listened hard to the issues and concerns previously raised, and they believed they had comprehensively addressed them. At a recent public consultation event, 74% agreed that the Partnership had listened, and there was 80 – 90% support for the scheme. This was the last chance to hear any issues and the Partnership believed that they now had the best scheme for the area and would ask for support from all who wanted to see the revival of Baltic Wharf.

Stephen Taylor: Stephen Taylor began by stating that many people believe the boatyard is larger than it actually is. The revised site layout and building forms relate to a shift in balance. That shift is now towards town houses and terraced forms which are more convenient.

The boatyard is focussed on the slipway and will be more intensively used. Green space components will feature in the final scheme and ecological elements will be included.

The Northern area has pulled back from the previous proposal and the intention is to provide a public/private entrance and a green lane. This will provide a good link between the town and countryside. The Co Housing area will have footpaths running through and the community house will sit within a pedestrian area.

Slides were then shown which detailed the profile of the previous scheme in comparison with the new scheme. This helped to demonstrate the increased space between the buildings, lower heights and many links between the built and green areas. The intention was to have free movement of people between the buildings and fields.

The presentation was concluded with a slide which showed a thumbnail sketch of what the proposal could look like.

Richard White: Richard White introduced himself as a transport consultant who had been involved with TQ9 Partnership for four years. Following the issues previously raised, the scheme has been looked at again and we have started from scratch.

There are three main issues as follows:

1. No of trips/level of traffic generated. The current scheme levels have reduced trip generation by 30%, and at peak times this reduction is up to 50%, as a result of fewer homes and employment.
2. Access to St Peters Quay. The improvements to St Peters Quay access have been costed at over £500,000 which the developer would pay. An 'old fashioned approach' was not considered desirable i.e. making St Peters Quay a two lane road. The aim has been for a sense of balance in order to retain the character of the area. So the existing footway will be improved by widening. There will be a different coloured surface and there will not be a lot of signs as they are not in keeping but there will be a priority system which will have visibility all along and this system helps to reduce road speeds.
3. The Travel Plan. This will consist of 9 broad areas. The Travel Plan Co-ordinator will be an important role. Discussions have been held about monetary contributions and amounts are still under discussion. There is the potential to link into the Totnes Travel Plan. Specific items currently being discussed include linking into bus services and separate discussions have been held with Cllr Hannaford about the Bob the Bus service. As part of the Retirement Village two minibuses will be provided. There will be a contribution from TQ9 towards their operation. Bus vouchers will be allowed up to £75,000 to enable claims on existing buses. Discussions have also been held with the Ring and Ride services. The Travel Plan also includes a car club, which is not the same as car sharing, and a number of vehicles will be provided. Discussions have been held to ensure that three dedicated parking spaces are provided on site for the car club and the Partnership is looking at a contribution towards the cost of setting that up. The car club allows flexibility at weekends and a contribution towards membership for three years would be sought. In terms of car sharing, a database will be set up which will link into the Devon website. For walking and cycling there will be provision for showers with a hope to link into any national scheme. There will be a parking management system. There will also be the potential for a water taxi facility and a landing facility will be provided to allow for the potential of such water borne transport. The marketing of all this would be undertaken through the website and leaflets, and this would assist the co-ordinator to ensure everybody understood the facilities available.

Charles Couzens: Charles Couzens introduced himself as being from the Ecos Trust, which was an educational charity based in Somerset, which undertook work with both the public and private sectors.

He showed a number of slides which explained the ethos behind sustainable construction and design and highlighted the different Code levels that could be achieved. He explained that a potential exemplar development would include a sustainable location, sustainable design and a voluntary commitment from the landowner. He also explained the different technologies that contributed to sustainability such as renewable heat and power and low carbon technologies.

He concluded his presentation by highlighting how the Baltic Wharf development would meet the sustainability code and the technologies that would be employed to ensure that the houses would be permanently low energy. Although there were some other very sustainable schemes, Baltic Wharf was planning to be the most sustainable private site in the south west.

### **Part Three – Feedback of Stakeholder and Public Comments**

#### **Totnes Town Council:**

Tony Whitty: His comments reflected Totnes Town Council's opinion. This development must be sensitive to the needs of the town. The discussions and involvement of G4BW have been welcomed. As a result of those discussions TQ9 has responded with modifications to the original scheme.

The position of the Town Council is that any development must be within the Site Allocation DPD. The Town Council would wish to have discussions in greater detail with TQ9 and subsequent to this the Town Council will then review the proposals and will be better informed. During discussions the Town Council will need to be satisfied that the infrastructure issues are dealt with such as traffic, travel, transport and infrastructure. Also the effect of the Retirement Village on the town will need to be assessed together with such other issues as the green travel plan, utilities, employment, education, sustainability and visual impact.

Finally, the Town Council looks forward to further discussions with TQ9 Partnership.

#### **G4BW:**

Louis Victory: G4BW came about as a group of individuals from groups such as Totnes Town Council, Totnes Preservation Trust, TotSoc, the Totnes Strategic Group and Transport Forum. The aims have been to do something positive for the community by helping to shape development at Baltic Wharf. In discussions with the developer, the group set out to be constructively critical as the scale of the original scheme was inappropriate, and has hoped to influence TQ9 by reducing scale, impact etc. of the development scheme. The group has always recognised that it was working for the community. Discussions with the developer were, at times, protracted and difficult, and TQ9 was commended for producing a scheme which (in the view of G4BW), ought to be acceptable. G4BW's report has now been published and is available on the TotSoc website; the report commends the scheme.

In terms of characteristics, the group is pleased that the scale has been reduced and is more in context with what is characteristic for Totnes. The percentage of affordable homes has been increased. The maximum building heights are now lower, the visual impacts on the landscape are reduced, parking provision has been reduced by 20-30% and traffic generation will be reduced.

G4BW would have liked to see more employment provision, affordable housing, green spaces between the site and the town and more sustainability, so it would be wrong to say G4BW are entirely satisfied. What the Group has accepted is the reduction from the previous scheme and for this development to be commercially viable there has to be a sense of realism. Work will continue and G4BW will ask for further meetings.

The final point is that this is an outline application. The drawings are excellent but conditions need to be attached such as access and building heights, all of which need to be enforceable. G4BW is pleased that TQ9 has worked with the Group and hopes that TQ9 will end up developing the site.

### **British Marine Federation:**

Adam Corney: Represented an independent view on behalf of the marine sector which is the fourth most important industry in the South West. The British Marine Federation (BMF) is a trade association with 1500 members nationally and 200 in Devon. Baltic Wharf Ltd is not a member, but some of its tenants are. Mr Corney was representing their views and the views of the wider marine community.

The BMF supports the retention of a boatyard of a similar size and a continuation of existing businesses with an upgrade of facilities. The Dart operates in an ecosystem with several businesses feeding off each other. To withdraw one part could fatally damage the whole system. The maintaining and upgrading of the workshops are welcomed, which will add value to the Dart. There is no doubt that along the coast there is pressure on storage and provision of marine businesses. The provision of marine workshops should be welcomed, including a large workshop for working on large commercial vessels. The market for the marine sector industries is growing in the area and therefore the creation of new facilities on this site is supported. The renewable energies market will result in a requirement for space to service associated vessels and Baltic Wharf can play a significant part in this.

To conclude, this is a very important site for the marine industry in the South West and the provision of facilities is welcomed.

### **CoHousing:**

Pat Sykes: There has been a CoHousing group in Totnes since 2002. A previous site at Dartington did not work out and so far there has not been any CoHousing in Totnes which is a shame given the towns ethos. CoHousing is well established in Scandinavia, the Netherlands and elsewhere in the UK.

People are interested in CoHousing schemes because it reminds them of close knit village communities. There is a community hall, neighbourhood activities and people help each other. There is a communal laundry – people would not contemplate having their own washing machines, they would share. And they would share cars. All of this makes the design and layout of the site very important.

There is no road through the site, properties are in a cluster and every bit of space is open and free to use. It is not a commune as each person has their own front door and private space, but people can come together as much as they want. Traditionally, these schemes have progressed where land is available. That is impossible in Totnes. Back in 2005, TQ9 were approached to ask for a sustainable visitor centre on the site.

*(Post Forum Note - TQ9 offered to provide a free plot to TTT for a Sustainability Visitors Centre).*

Later, in 2007, TQ9 approached us to discuss the potential for cohousing on a designated site without the need to buy land. This provided a unique opportunity for cohousing to be built alongside a traditional development. We have worked with TQ9 using our own design team. The merits of the scheme include being in the first phase and then being established to help with sustainable ideas for the whole site.

We have been working with a Housing Association and are hoping to create more affordable housing on site with innovative ideas of our own for example a three or four bedroomed house where the rooms can be rented out. We do hope you will all support this development.

### **Totnes Living Community:**

Tanya Vickers: Totnes Living Community (TLC) represents 300 members (families) in Totnes. TLC was pleased that the initial application was refused and TQ9 has listened to concerns. TQ9 arranged a meeting with TLC to hear what facilities TLC would like and TLC came away from that meeting buoyed up by the potential for Totnes. There will be spaces for families and lots of leisure space. TQ9 has listened to the community and that is commendable. It is also commendable that SHDC allows this opportunity for discussion pre planning. TLC is excited that TQ9 have allowed the Group to put forward ideas such as educational planting and a community orchard, and the development will link to Sharpham and Dartington. There will be facilities for families, facilities for cycling.

It is now time to end the speculation, there will always be critics. TLC believes TQ9 has listened and they will deliver what is being proposed.

## **Transition Town Totnes:**

Donal Lang: Reported the views of Transition Town Totnes (TTT). Totnes was the first transition town in the country and there are now over 300 nationwide. TTT looks at how the economy would work without fossil fuels, and tries to take a longer term view.

In terms of the Baltic Wharf development, TQ9 has listened to the community and taken their views on board. The new proposal is better, however TTT would like to see problems solved before they are made worse, for example the traffic problems need to be sorted out before the development goes forward.

Secondly, SHDC has a policy on affordable housing (50%). If the development was delayed until after the recession then there would be more affordable housing built on the site rather than building a reduced amount now. TTT would like to see good development go forward that suits Totnes and is good for the town in the longer term.

Totnes is a port which has existed for over 1000 years until 15 years ago when the site became redundant. So there is 1000 years of history as a port and 15 years of non use. TTT would like to see development go ahead accepting this. For example 150 trucks would be needed to bring over the timber for the houses – but this could be carried on one boat.

PPS1 refers to key planning objective which relates to patterns of urban growth and sustainable transport. PPG13 is about the identity and protection of sites which could be critical and ensuring such transport sites are not severed by new development. It refers to freight infrastructure and water transport. If you try to put housing on a dockside you would have problems and people will object. TTT would ask that the lower level be retained as a commercial site and kept in single ownership until a viable alternative presents itself. The 150 house development could still go ahead at a higher level. This could still be an excellent site but it is important that it is preserved.

Kate Wilson: Co-ordinator with South Hams Friends of the Earth. Whilst not objecting to the entire scheme, there are some parts that need to be re-examined.

This is a developer-led scheme with too many open market houses, too few jobs, and too much traffic generation.

There is the potential for the site to have places for 'well off' people. The lower part of the site should be maintained for maritime activity. There are other parts which are still not consistent with the DPD. The inclusion of the care home results in overdevelopment. Totnes needs affordable homes and it is the percentage that counts not the numbers. The DPD states the allocation should be 55%. The target is subject to viability but Ms Wilson queried the definition of viability. Developers are speculators and they must bear the risk. The developer states this is a Brownfield site and therefore there will be less affordable housing – it almost sounds like a threat.

Whilst pleased with the Travel Plan, there are still some issues with car parking. 400 car park spaces is a huge number and the Travel Plan needs to reduce such a number. Will the travel plan coordinator be able to cope with all the cars which are trying to park. 60 marine workers on site is small compared to 100 healthcare workers. A care home employing fewer staff than the number of residents is dubious. The developer states that the workers and residents will be local but locally existing staff feel that new staff will be brought in to the area. Reference was also made to PPS4 and the need to assess the application in terms of impact on local businesses and the economy.

The final issue is flood risk as this area is prone to flooding. PPS1 advises that a sequential test should be applied. The Retirement village should not be sited where it is unless there is no alternative. Flood warnings are not an exact science and this is a sobering thought. PPS1 also advises prudent use of resources.

John Cole: An objector. Mr Cole explained that he had been asked to speak on behalf of a number of residents. He had initially been reluctant as he felt that business people deserve to be encouraged, the firm of architects were award winners and G4BW had put in a lot of time and effort. Also, it is easy to resist change.

However, despite the reduction in scale, the development is still too large and in danger of creating a 'new' Totnes. It is moving in the right direction, and perhaps a third time the development will be an appropriate size for Totnes. There will be excessive traffic along New Walk and this will still be dangerous, despite the Travel Plan. Totnes will become a traffic jam.

The development is contrary to the DPD – what is the point of the document if the provisions are ignored. The siting of the Retirement Village is not compatible with the boatyard. What about housing opportunities for local people? The award winning South Gate was designed for local people but how many local people live there now?

Mr Cole echoed the comments of G4BW but they have been limited in their scope by starting with something large and scaling down. The reductions are good but the starting point was too high. So despite the G4BW recommendation, there are still comments that need to be addressed.

Finally, on affordable housing, the provision is still dependent on the ratio with market homes. There is an urgent need to re-examine the system nationally and locally.

Kevin Newton White: A supporter. Mr White had recently attended the public consultation event and explained that his interest was in 'green areas' and family areas such as being able to cycle to Sharpham. Creating jobs and employment in Totnes in the future has to be agreed. This development is a positive way forward for this embankment.

## **Part Four – Questions and Answers**

Cllr Howarth advised that a number of officers were available and Members would now be able to ask questions. One of the questions already raised was about viability and he asked the Affordable Housing Manager (AHM) to go into more detail.

The AHM confirmed that viability was in fact a very complex issue and it was about finding the balance between delivering affordable homes and the wider package of planning obligations whilst maintaining the profitability of the scheme. It was not just about the bottom line, but about enabling a scheme which was sufficiently profitable to attract the necessary development funding required to deliver the scheme.

Cllr Howarth then asked for any further questions.

Cllr Hannaford: Confirmed that he drives the community bus. What will be the gain for the community?

Cllr Howarth: A number of presentations have tried to cover that.

[Since the forum took place the developer has asked that the document at Appendix A be included to provide answers to this question]

Cllr Vint: Commended the Development Forum process and Members need to remember this is an outline application, not a detailed submission. What is going to be guaranteed through the outline application in terms of renewable energy/sustainability targets? What are the future improvements and plans to enable sustainability to increase over time – will high renewable energy levels be possible?

Charles Couzens: The minimum targets have been mentioned today and the use of shared heating has been discussed i.e. CSH level 4 and 10% renewables/shared heating. This is good proof of the concept. The scale of development will allow for increases in the current minimum targets. The density of the site will allow going above the target as technology improves.

Cllr Vint: What conditions are under negotiation to ensure affordable housing for local people?

AHM: In terms of local letting this has not been discussed with the applicant. It is a matter for the Council to decide and this matter will not be dependent on the applicant.

Cllr Steer: We have heard nothing about wildlife.

Stephen Taylor: Detailed work has taken place. The only species we know about is the mouse. We do want to enhance the ecology and will be testing for bats but there is no known protected species on site.

Steve Munday: It has come to our attention that the Dart is an important river corridor for Greater Horseshoe bats in terms of flight paths and foraging routes, so we do need to understand what part the river frontage plays in this movement. Discussions are taking place with TQ9, Natural England and officers.

Steve Munday then concluded the Forum by explaining that no decisions are taken today as this was a meeting for disseminating information. The notes of this meeting will be on the website soon ([www.southhams.gov.uk](http://www.southhams.gov.uk)) and the developer will consider the wide range of responses heard today before formally submitting an application to the Council for its determination.

Cllr Howarth thanked everyone for their constructive contributions and formally closed the Forum at 12.15 pm

## **Appendix A**

### **What Baltic Wharf will mean for Totnes**

Protection for the town's greenfield sites – meeting Totnes' housing and employment needs on a semi-derelict industrial site instead.

A thriving employment area with space for 350 jobs.

A boost to meeting the town's acute housing shortage with as many genuinely affordable homes as the site can manage.

A £3 million investment in the town's boatyard and new marine workshop space to secure its long term future.

Huge new public open spaces to address the town's need for recreation and children's play areas.

Traffic minimised due to site location adjacent to town centre, extensive on site live work opportunities and innovative travel plan resulting in tightly managed and minimised parking provision. The Retirement Village and co-housing are particularly low users of cars.

A solution to the critical shortage of quality elderly care, enabling people to live in their own home with back up of health and leisure facilities and a registered nursing home.

An innovative co-housing scheme to meet the need for new ways of living for a local group.

Market homes, including some live work units, to address demand and provide funds to enable the above benefits to be achieved.

Highest possible standards of design and sustainability, including green travel incentives and some zero carbon homes.

A community-driven project devised with the close involvement of many Totnes groups and the local council together with the site owners.