

**Wincanton Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation  
Summary of Comments Received**

No.	Name	Email	Comment
1.	Sport England	Planning.South@sportengland.org	General comments received regarding sporting information for Neighbourhood Plans, which should comply with the NPPF and the Policy statement: 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England'.
2.	Highways England	Steve.Hellier@highwaysengland.co.uk	<p>The Vision Statement is clear and well structured.</p> <p>In general we support objectives 3 and 4 which can contribute to a reduction in out-commuting and which encourage travel by sustainable modes. We also welcome the plan's policies to seek to improve local employment opportunities that can reduce the need for outward commuting.</p> <p>We support objective 5, (Protect public open spaces &amp; improve walking and cycling routes) as this will contribute to the wider Local Plan policies of walking and cycling links and encourage more active travel which will help in reducing the reliance on the private car.</p> <p>We have no objections to the Plan. We welcome the group's aim of maintaining a sustainable neighbourhood.</p>
3.	Somerset County Council Acoustics Specialist	aashepherd@somerset.gov.uk	<p>The Wincanton Neighbourhood Plan Submission has been considered with respect to the topics of noise and vibration. The County Council Acoustics Specialist notes that Policy 11 is correct to highlight the potential benefits that may arise to existing housing by changes in the use of employment land (possibly to further quieter residential uses).</p> <p>However the County Council Acoustics Specialist states that it may be less clear that alternative uses may have adverse impact on employment land if they introduce noise sensitive development, and the associated expectations for amenity, as this could conflict with or constrain potential commercial development opportunities and uses.</p>

			<p>The County Council Acoustic Specialist recommended that the plan should require the construction of new homes to be appropriate to their environment and the planning uses of adjoining land can, or should have a significant influence on housing design. The inevitable requirement to construct new housing and the increasing desire to utilise brownfield sites can give rise to noise conflict with existing nearby commercial development particularly if a housing developer does not design to effectively mitigate these impacts. The County Council Acoustic Specialist considers that the NPPF advice does not adequately consider this issue that was once addressed by PPG24 (repealed in 2012) and it has been left to local policy to identify the need for new housing to incorporate measures sufficient to mitigate the existing, or potentially likely, noise impacts from surrounding land uses. The Wincanton plan might therefore consider making reference to the new advice contained within ProPG Professional Practice Guidance on Planning &amp; Noise - New Residential Development as a simple way to address these potential noise conflicts.</p>
4.	Somerset County Council - Planning Policy	pvbrowning@somerset.gov.uk	<p>The Plan looks good. It is well-constructed, detailed and clearly reflects a significant amount of time and discussion. It has been well informed by the adopted South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan does not adequately consider strategic “county” planning policy matters as contained within the Somerset Waste Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and the Somerset Minerals Plan (adopted 2015). Both Plans are NPPF compliant and form part of the Development Plan (see <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/minerals-and-waste/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/minerals-and-waste/</a>).</p> <p>This is disappointing given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From a minerals perspective there are number of references to the use of stone (such as on pages 12 &amp; 13) as well as within Policy 2. Furthermore, on page 13 there is a reference to some land immediately south of the A303 falling within the minerals safeguarding zone. I recall also that within the conservation area there are a number of significant listed buildings that use or are dressed with local stone (for example, as one proceeds up Church Street) which give the town centre it’s special</li> </ul>

			<p>character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst this does not result in any apparent conflict in land use, the Neighbourhood Plan's support of design and layout that creatively incorporate these features has a corollary – the supply of such stone. And this could be given greater consideration at a local level.</li> <li>• Turning to waste consideration, the Neighbourhood Plan does refer to “minimising waste”. This response highlights opportunities to minimise waste production at the design stage. The bigger the project, the more important it becomes to have a strategic approach to construction, demolition and excavation waste management. Also, for information: the commencement of the review of our adopted waste policies.</li> </ul> <p>Technical officer comments from the Planning Policy Team are appended that expand on these matters.</p>
5.	Natural England	Oliver.Lowe@naturalengland.org.uk	<p>Natural England generally welcomes the Neighbourhood Plan and considers that it provides a valuable framework for the future sustainable development of Wincanton. As advised in previous consultation, we advise that the Neighbourhood Plan will not likely result in significant effects on statutory designated sites. We particularly welcome Policies 3 (Trees and Hedgerows) and 4 (River &amp; Stream Corridors), which will help protect and enhance wildlife corridors and the local landscape.</p> <p>An annex is attached which covers the general issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
6.	Abbey Manor Group Ltd	NTimmis@abbeymanor.com	<p>1. Page 11 – last paragraph: This suggests that Lawrence Hill be retained as informal open space. Although part of this land has a public footpath running through it is not in the same ownership as the proposed development land to the east and cannot therefore be secured by means of a development agreement. In this circumstance I would question whether it is appropriate to suggest the retention of this land as “informal open space” which infers more general public access than afforded by a footpath.</p> <p>2. Page 12 Para 4 (South west of Town): - The scale of housing development feasible within the development constraints is unlikely to be sufficient to support</p>

			<p>the servicing cost and land loss suggested for a new Primary School, especially as it is likely to have to contribute to the lack of inherent viability of the potential employment land on the flatter land to the south, i.e. that immediately north the roundabout.</p> <p>3. Page 12 Para 5 (Within the Town): - Further expansion of the primary school on the recently provided site in Station Road (i.e. on the new car park) if a replacement car park were to be provided within the Tythings Site as and when this is redeveloped. Such a proposal would allow further capacity to be provided on the single school site without seriously impacting on the viability of the Tythings.</p> <p>4. Page 15 – Policy 2: The policy should include a reference to viability, as is included in Para 3, Page 12 supporting text.</p> <p>5. Page 17 – Policy 7: This policy remains too proscriptive e.g. forbidding 4 bed homes. It is acknowledged in the supporting text (on P17) that this remains somewhat ambiguously “aspirational”, however the policy explicitly prevents 4 bed houses for which there will undoubtedly remain a need and demand.</p> <p>6. Page 17 – Policy 8: We believe that given the uncertain nature of Government Policy in this area (including definitions) it would be more appropriate for this to be dealt with at the Local Plan level where viability can be more properly assessed.</p> <p>7. Page 18 – Policy 9: We believe that this policy (which has now been expanded from the Nov 2016 draft) to include wheelchair access should be qualified (in the policy) to reflect feasibility/viability issues. Much of Wincanton’s development land is on steep sites and the cost of compliance, taken together with the other aspirational housing policies, is likely to impact significantly on viability.</p> <p>8. Page 18 – Policy 10: Whilst we understand and sympathise with the aspirations of potential self-builders, we question whether such a broad based policy is justified or appropriate. The policy if applied as proposed is likely to; i) impact on attraction to developers who are required to provide affordable and</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>general needs market housing, ii) delay delivery of housing due to the inferred development embargo during the “marketing” period and iii) likely to impact significantly on overall scheme viability with consequential impact on overall delivery. It might be better to consider the encouragement (outside a formal policy) of informal marketing of individual/groups of plots at a pre-application stage to test the real demand from would-be self-builders who might then be appraised of the likely costs, planning constraints and other restrictions/ contributions that are likely to impact on their plans before risking the potential downside of such a requirement. The final paragraph on Page 18 suggests this approach but is clearly at odds with the Policy 10 as stated.</p> <p>Given the statutory nature of the Neighbourhood Plan I would suggest that Policy 10 is demoted from Policies to the general text of the Section 6.</p> <p>9. Page 18 – Para 2 – This Paragraph concludes with the words “in addition”. It is not clear what this text is intended to infer the required is in addition to. The text of the Policy 8 suggests that the 20% starter homes is to be considered as contributing to Affordable Housing otherwise sought, rather than in addition.</p>
7.	Abbey Manor Group Ltd	NTimmis@abbeymanor.com	<p>1. We wish to support the general content and Policies of the April 2017 draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, and especially their implications for the Local Plan Area of Growth, north of Lawrence Hill and west of the Wincanton Business Park which our company intends to promote for mixed use (Employment and Residential) development, of which approximately 3.0 Ha would be for Employment Uses (as attached key plan).</p> <p>2. This proposal will facilitate a connection to the proposed Route A walking/cycling route of Policy 15.</p>
8.	South Somerset District Council Spatial Policy Team	david.clews@southsomerset.gov.uk	Comments are included on a separate schedule