

Appendix 1

South Somerset Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 – Main Points arising from Issues and Options Consultation October 2017 until January 2018.

During the consultation period, the Council received over 800 representations to the Local Plan Review Issues and Options consultation resulting in 1,424 individual comments, many of which are very detailed and lengthy in nature. 49 late responses were also received. What follows below is a summary of the main points made by respondents, including the late representations. All of the representations received during the consultation period can be found in full on the Council's website at [Homepage - South Somerset District Council Consultations](#)

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Foreword	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been several questions as to why the Local Plan is being reviewed so soon after adoption of the current Local Plan. It is suggested that as the current Local Plan was only adopted in 2015 the new plan should utilise an evidence base from 2016 and the plan period run up to 2036. • There are also queries as to why so much new housing is required. • It is also felt that the consultation document and Foreword make no mention of Neighbourhood Plans - the Government's main initiative. 	<p>The Council agreed to carry out a full Local Plan Review in the Local Development Scheme, April 2017. The National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018 (NPPF) expects Local Plan to be reviewed with five years of the date of adoption.</p> <p>The Foreword to the Local Plan Review will include a reference to Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
	Sustainability Appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is asked why, when the 2017 HELAA identifies the site (E/MIPO/0003) as having capacity for approx. 68 dwellings and concludes that it is suitable, available, and achievable for development in the next five years, the site was discounted from the Sustainability Appraisal or I&O consultation and there is an objection to what is seen as to lack of reasonable alternatives for Milborne Port. • It is stated that, without site visits and a lack of qualitative analysis of sites, there are a number of inherent flaws in the site appraisal criteria, leading to 	<p>The Council has commissioned consultants AECOM to carry out Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Site options for Milborne Port are discussed later in this Appendix.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>some distorted findings, examples of which are given, particularly in relation to sites at Milborne Port</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is thought that 8.2(b) and (c) are preferred, which is supported by Option 2 of the SA - Option 2 being to have a more dispersed strategy based upon where the market is delivering. 	
	Duty to Cooperate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Consultation Document is said to pay little attention to the duty to cooperate and that simply commissioning joint studies across local authority boundaries is not sufficient. 	<p>As well as joint studies there are regular meetings with adjoining authorities and contact with specific bodies. A duty to co-operate report will accompany the Local Plan at the Submission stage.</p> <p>The NPPF now requires Councils to produce and maintain one or more Statements of Common Ground documenting cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress on cooperating on these. SSDC will be complying with this requirement.</p>
	Spatial Portrait of South Somerset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is generally supported, but it is stated that poor economic outlook and skills attainment needs to be addressed; that the Yeovil Vision needs to re-imagine the town centre; and that more mention should be made of electric cars. • It stated that that the Plan must accommodate demographic change to meet the needs of ageing population, that there needs to be more provision for the elderly, including bungalows and care/ nursing homes; and that the loss of younger people that may be due to lack of suitable employment opportunities should be included. 	<p>The Local Plan Review seeks to provide a planning policy framework that supports the Councils regeneration objectives for Yeovil Town Centre, helps to promote a healthy economy, aligned to the Councils emerging Economic Development Strategy and which supports the provision of</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is thought that protection of Grade 1 & 2 agricultural land is essential and vital for a sustainable future, particularly in our rural area with agriculture being such a dominant local industry on which many depend for their employment. • It is stated that the planned improvements to the A303 have yet to be funded, are already out of date and will not provide the relief needed. The point is made, however, that any excavated material during the A303 and A358 works should be used on site - the principle of 'lean design' should be adopted. Waste and recycling infrastructure should consider as a cross-border matter with TDBC. • It is suggested that reference should be made to the convenience of buses being a vital consideration for rural residents since they provide access to their employment, leisure, medical and commercial needs. All allocations will result in increased car journeys and traffic due to lack of public transport. • It is thought misleading to say South Somerset is well linked by three major railway lines. South Somerset is not well served by railways. There are only stations at Yeovil, Crewkerne, Templecombe, Bruton and Castle Cary. A number of other Market Towns are not served. • Evidence from the National Housing Federation's Home Truths is quoted which indicates that South Somerset is becoming one of the most unaffordable places to live in the South West, with a house price to income ratio of 10.0. • Fuller reference to AONBs is encouraged, with potential for greater policy integration, particularly as the Blackdown Hills AONB Management Plan will shortly be reviewed. Reference is also made to the Cranborne Chase AONB Management Plan. • There is an objection to the loss of employment land to residential. • It stated that the economic benefits brought by the tourism and leisure sectors should be given more emphasis, particularly given that these will be strengthened by the planned improvements to the A303 and A358. 	<p>infrastructure for electric vehicles (see Policy EQ1)</p> <p>The Local Plan Review recognises the role agri-based business play in the South Somerset economy. Footnote 53 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality." It is recognised that South Somerset has a significant amount of high quality agricultural land any loss has to be balanced against the need to provide land for housing and employment growth to meet needs of the current and future population of South Somerset.</p> <p>The importance of buses is recognised. Additional text has been inserted to set out the contribution the community and voluntary sector make to connectivity for communities.</p> <p>The "well" has been deleted where referring to the railway stations.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>The Office of National Statistic identifies an affordability ratio of 8.16 for South Somerset (2017).</p> <p>A reference to AONB Management Plans has been inserted.</p> <p>Permitted Development Rights allows B1 employment use premises to convert to residential use without the need for planning permission. The Governments focus is the delivery of new housing. The provision of employment land is discussed in more detail later in this schedule and includes Policy EP2 which seeks to resist the loss of employment sites and buildings.</p> <p>A reference to tourism expenditure and the opportunities present by the A303 and A358 improvements has been inserted.</p>
	General Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several comments have been received complaining about an apparent lack of or inadequate consultation. • It is stated that not enough consideration has been given to minerals and waste matters – and that there is a need to amend the definition of development plan to include reference to the adopted plans. The need to safeguard building stone resources and promote use of local vernacular stone is highlighted. 	<p>The Local Plan Issues and Options were consulted upon for a 12 week period. A number of ‘drop-in’ sessions were held across the District. All documents were available in libraries Council Offices and online.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>The consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, 2015 (and updated in 2018 to include more detail on neighbourhood Planning).</p> <p>Somerset County Council is the Minerals and Waste Authority and produces a development plan document on these matters.</p>
3.1	Do you agree with the suggested vision to 2034, and, if not, how should it be changed?	<p>Some people agree with the suggested Vision saying, for example that the current vision to 2028 is outdated and too long winded and the proposed vision is succinct, memorable, and provides an acceptable solution. However, there have also been many in disagreement and suggestions made for its revision, which include the following:</p> <p><u>Employment/ Economy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It needs to be more aspirational in terms of providing jobs growth and economic prosperity. • It include a reference to supporting the tourism industry and tourist accommodation, stated as key contributors to the local economy and a major source of local income and employment. <p><u>Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with national policy, this should reflect the full objectively assessed need for development and infrastructure needs. SSDC should be aspiring for sustainable growth and in order to achieve this. • There has been a persistent under delivery for many years. The Vision should set out that the Council will work proactively in this regard. 	<p>Various amendments have been made to the proposed Vision in order to reflect the comments made including the addition of:</p> <p>'healthy' in the first sentence.</p> <p>A second sentence reflecting the Council Plan.</p> <p>Infrastructure of all types' and 'improved' to the now third sentence.</p> <p>A reference to the regeneration of Yeovil, Chard and Wincanton town centres and a reference to building on existing economic strengths and</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Regeneration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regeneration of Yeovil and Chard should be specifically included in the Vision. <p><u>Natural Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of emphasis on the protection of the natural environment, natural habitats, and wildlife. The vision should emphasise their protection, as well as the rural nature of the district being maintained. • South Somerset is a notably beautiful place in terms of landscape. This is of economic benefit in terms of tourism. • It does not mention sustaining, conserving and enhancing the District's AONB. <p><u>Rural Investment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the vision is to become a reality then more investment must be generated within rural settlements for example to improve infrastructure, create new job opportunities (start-up units) and improve public transport. • It needs to refer to more medical facilities and care in rural areas. <p><u>Low Carbon</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for low carbon towns with enhanced green infrastructure and public transport links is supported as it complements the objectives of Wessex Water to minimise energy use, improve water efficiency and support SUDS which reduce flood risk, provide amenity, biodiversity and water quality improvements. • Low carbon towns needs to be changed to low carbon communities. <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit reference should be made to the timely provision of infrastructure alongside housing and economic growth to support a thriving community. • The aim should be to eliminate rather than just to reduce digital inequality. <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a focus on sustainability and enhanced public transport links. 	<p>enhancing the role of the district as a gateway to the south-west.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Miscellaneous</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should set a positive view for the future that promotes sustainable economic development to deliver homes, businesses and infrastructure that the local area needs. • It is recommended that the last two sentences are put first - the most important focus should be protecting the distinctive nature of different environments, then a productive economy and then proactive support for town centres. • The role of the District as a gateway to the south-west should be included. • It is very generalised and could be referred to as a statement of aspirations. The Vision is generic and not specific to SSDC, its issues, or local needs. • There is no mention of employment or education. • It does not consider the social sustainability and health of residents, so does not fully reflect the NPPF Core Principles or the Objectives of the Plan. It is generic and does not reflect the key issues identified. 	
3.2	Do you agree these Strategic Objectives are still relevant for the LPR, and, if not, how should they be changed?	<p>There seems to be general support for the Strategic Objectives, but with some suggestions as to possible changes. These include the following:</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives should be measurable to assess progress of the Plan. Include the spatial strategy followed by the strategic objectives, which will relate back to the former. • A settlement strategy and hierarchy which allows for growth to be allocated to the larger, more sustainable settlements in the District is supported. <p>Comments referring to the topic areas referred to below may relate to multiple objectives as currently stated.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p>	<p>The objectives have been amended to better reflect the Council Plan, priority projects and revised Vision. Objective numbers have changed.</p> <p>They seek to address the housing and employment needs of off the residents, of South Somerset.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be monitored and monitoring indicators are identified in Section 15 of the Local Plan Review Preferred Options document.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit reference should be made to the timely provision of infrastructure alongside housing and economic growth. <p><u>Information Technology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omit “especially to and from Yeovil” in Objective 3 - efficient and fast broadband is essential for small rural settlements. <p><u>Transport and Accessibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More investment in providing non-car based transport is required, particular in rural settlements. Difficulties have already been encountered in expanding pavements and creating cycle ways as an example. There is a need to reduce motor traffic in general, especially at peak times. Public transport, cycling and walking all have a major part to play in reducing car travel. • The bulk of planned infrastructure investment is in road schemes not on walking, cycling or public transport provision. Therefore question if strategic objectives 1, 3 and 7 are aligned with the transport elements of the plan. • Consideration needs to be given to promoting walking and cycling on roads and narrow lanes where vehicle movements, speeds, and size of vehicles are all increasing. • Delete reference to non-car based transport and replace with non-carbon fuel cars and commercial vehicles. Add reference to the encouragement of electric and hybrid vehicles and public charging points and require the provision of these in all developments. • Work, education and shopping should also be referred to in Objective 1. • The stated importance of sustainable transport to healthcare services is highlighted. This should be by as many forms of transport as possible and therefore primary healthcare services should be located close to bus routes and within walking distance of homes. <p><u>The Economy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst Yeovil has previously been the centre of growth in the District, a change in this objective to promote inward investment through the District 	<p>Objective 6 addresses communications technology and refers to both urban and rural areas.</p> <p>Comments are noted. Walking and cycling are addressed within the Preferred Options document. Objective 5 now refers to non-carbon fuel car and commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Objective 2 now refer to the whole of South Somerset. The importance of agriculture is recognised in the</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>as a whole and removing reference to specific settlements, would be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture remains an intrinsic part of the overall economic picture but is hardly mentioned in the Local Plan or this document. • SSDC continually strives to bring high tech, high value businesses to the area but take so long that it loses out to more pro-active areas. A clear and detailed economic strategy is required. <p><u>Natural and Built Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The insertion of ‘distinctive’ as the second word in objective 5 to underline that the natural and built environment to be special is advised. <p><u>Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add ‘social rented housing’ to Objective 6. “<i>both general and affordable housing</i>” should be changed to “<i>general, social and affordable housing</i>”. • Developments should also be built using low impact materials, with energy efficient and renewable energy systems; and homes built to Lifetime Home standards. • A balanced housing market to meet the required growth is agreed, but the Council has consistently been unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of land. If this strategic objective is to be met, it is imperative that suitable and deliverable sites should be identified. It should be made clear that SSDC is committed to delivering the full and up to date OAN for housing for the District, having regard to the standardised methodology. • Current developments with high density build and few gardens fail to achieve Objective 6. • There is high demand for older people to downsize – there are not enough bungalows being built as other housing types are more profitable to developers. 	<p>Preferred Options document. A revised Economic Development Strategy is being consulted upon.</p> <p>The word distinctive has been included in Objectives 10 and 11.</p> <p>Objective 1 address all housing and includes market and affordable housing. Other comments are noted and addressed elsewhere in the Preferred Options document.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Objective 6 should be more relevant and specific. It is essential that residential development is delivered <i>promptly</i> as reflected by Government Policy. <p><u>Climate Change</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Objective 7 needs to be expanded and not be restricted to Yeovil. It should apply to all development; not just exemplar ones in Yeovil • Reference should be made to green infrastructure as suggested in the new Vision. It is suggested that multi-functional green infrastructure will enhance new and existing developments and provide multiple benefits including amenity, surface water attenuation and purification, improvements to air quality and localized shading to reduce heat stress. <p><u>Healthcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several comments refer to the need to maintain and improve access to healthcare. • Symphony Healthcare Services (SHS) support the objectives relevant to healthcare. This requires investment into its future to ensure that services can continue to be provided where they are need within the settlements. This requirement needs to be balanced against the changes to the NHS system and operational efficiencies required to meet the changing nature of the demand and supply of healthcare provision. <p><u>Agriculture</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mention of agriculture or food production. Agriculture is very important to the rural economy because of nation food security. 	<p>Objective 9 deals with the whole of South Somerset.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The importance of agriculture is reflected in the Preferred Options document and Objective 2 refers to the urban and rural businesses.</p>
4.1	Which of the following options should be taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many comments suggest that the Council should merely include the advice in the new Plan as it will be required to do so in any case (a). Government guidance will need to be followed once adopted - it is essential that the presumption in favour of sustainable development (para 14 of the NPPF) is 	Policy SD1 has been retained as the Local Plan Review will be a development plan document. Whilst the NPPF as a significant material

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>forward through the LPR?</p> <p>4.1(a) Revise Policy SD1 to reflect a revised paragraph 14 of the NPPF.</p> <p>4.1(b) Delete Policy SD1 and supporting text and rely on the revised paragraph 14 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>expressed in Local Plan Policy SD1. This will give SSDC certainty and control so that when the new Plan is adopted the policy is sound and compliant. An overarching policy relating to sustainable development within the emerging Local Plan is required to guide and ensure proper decision-making and ensure the aspirations of the NPPF are reflected at a local level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the other hand, it is also stated that the Government has only consulted on the changes to the NPPF para 14 so the changes are not certain. The White Paper only signals an intention. To change the Plan without the outcomes of the consultation would bring into question the soundness of the Plan. • It is suggested that “sustainable development” is misleading and should be replaced with ‘delivering development for local sustainability’. • However, the deletion of the Policy is also supported (b), with comments such as the new NPPF is likely to replace the current version prior to the adoption of the revised Local Plan. Assuming the revised NPPF will include a definition of the presumption of sustainable development, there is no need to duplicate it. • There is also some criticism of Government policy and that the Local Plan should be kept local. 	<p>consideration means that provisions of the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be taken into account as part of the decision making process on planning applications. The inclusion of Policy SD1 within the Local Plan Review ensures development plan status.</p>
5.1	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR?</p> <p>5.1(a) Progress on the basis of an OAN of 13,200</p>	<p>(a) <u>The currently proposed approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people think that 660 dwellings per year (13,200 across the Plan period) will more be achievable than the 725 per year (a). • It is suggested that migration from the EU is likely to be reduced after 2020. Although 13,200 is currently the best estimate it should be kept under review and revised if migration turns out to be significantly lower. • Option (a) is agreed with the proviso that this includes an increased number of older person bedspaces given the aging population in the District. There could be care centres with small bungalows centred around a unit containing meal facilities and medical facilities. It would be counter-intuitive to exclude C2 bedspaces from the five year housing land supply. 	<p>The minimum local housing need figure (housing requirement) for South Somerset has been calculated in accordance with the new Standard Methodology published in July 2018 and clarified in the Ministry of Homes, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) consultation published in October 2018.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p> dwellings (includes bedspaces for older people) 5.1(b) Progress on the basis of another OAN. Please provide a detailed justification for any alternative suggestion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that more houses need to be built to the lifetime standard. Developers need to take into account the footprint of houses thus allowing for wheelchair access etc. which in turn will enable the people being able to stay at their home without having to adapt the house to suit the aging, infirm or disabled as they get older. • It is suggested that a caveat should be introduced to allow the OAN to be adjusted as new methodologies/ data emerge during the 3 year evolution of the LPR. Alternatively, the current OAN may result in unachievable targets and failure to deliver a 5YHLS. <p>(b) <u>An Alternative Approach – the Standard Methodology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people refer to the Government’s published standard methodology for assessing OAN, which results in there being a need for 734 dwellings per annum (b). The 2017 White Paper advises LPAs to use the most up-to-date data when calculating housing need. The new standardised OAN employs two measures – household projections, and house price earnings ratios – both of which will be updated between now and the Council’s anticipated consultation on its Preferred Options. Continuing to work with the lower figure from the SHMA (i.e. 660 dwellings a year) runs the risk of the LPR being found unsound. • However, it is also stated that it would be best to progress on the basis of the 13,200 as a minimum in advance of the Government’s standard methodology being finalised. <p>(b) <u>Other Approaches – Higher OAN</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OAN should be 795 dwellings per annum in-line with the Standardised Methodology’s figure of 734 (to adjust for the District’s affordability of the average home at 7.5 times the average salary), plus 10 dwellings per annum (for concealed households, as calculated by the SHMA), and 51 dwellings per annum (for older persons’ bedspaces as calculated from the SCHMA). 	<p>This results in a local housing need figure of at least 14,510 dwellings over the 20 year Plan period (2016-2036) and 726 dwellings per year.</p> <p>This new approach supersedes the options presented in the Issues and Options consultation document.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council Plan (2016-2021) includes a priority to increase the focus on jobs and economic development and a strategic objective of the Local Plan is to achieve a high performing economy. Therefore, the OAN should reflect the standardised methodology plus an additional allowance for economic growth. • After an allowance for concealed households and older persons bedspaces is made, this increases the dpa from 734 to 795 dpa. Using the methodology set out in the White Paper, there would be a need to allocate land for a minimum of 8,700 units. • SSDC could also take account of the need to provide homes that are constrained in neighbouring authorities due to AONB, SSSI designations etc. • There is no uplift to ensure affordable housing needs are met; and the adjustment for market signals is insufficient. • In Sajid Javid’s speech to Parliament, he explained that the standardised methodology figure is the “<i>bare minimum that will be required in order to stand still</i>”. LPR should therefore introduce a higher target in order to address housing need and affordability issues. <p>(b) <u>Other Approaches – Lower OAN</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windfall has been consistent and should be included in the figure, allowing a lower OAN. • A figure of 547-597 is preferred = 572 dpa plus 10 for concealed households but not include the C2 requirements resulting in 582 dpa which over 20 year equates to 11,640 dwellings. Given the aim to build 40% of development on brownfield sites this leaves 6,984 dwellings on greenfield sites. • It is stated that Immigration will be reducing partly due to Brexit – with more people leaving and less people wanting to live here – meaning fewer houses are needed. • Several comments state that care home bedspaces should not equate to dwellings. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Criticisms of the SHMA</u> These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to consider jobs/housing alignment; • Inadequate analysis of past employment trends (which have been higher than now assumed/ which are shown to be higher than the forecasts used by JGC); • The indicative use of national levels of economic activity without consideration of local factors and no information about unemployment rates; • Failure to consider impact of Hinkley C; • Inadequate consideration of concealed households (the 2014-based SNHP of household formation rates should be applied); • Failure to respond to signs of market pressure; and • Failure to consider implications of affordable housing need. • The OAN of 13,200 dwellings is based on mid-2014 estimates and was produced in October 2016. It is therefore already a year out of date. The more recent sub-national (i.e. local authority) mid-2016 estimates for population will not be published by the ONS until mid-2018. The national mid-2016 estimates for population have been published and forecast a lower growth compared to the mid-2014 basis due to lower long-term net international migration; lower birth-rate; and life expectancy increasing less than predicted. • The SHMA does not provide an appropriate evidence base to inform the LPR due to the time period it covers differing from the period covered by the LPR. • Failure to consider the implications of affordable housing need upon need, contrary to a number of recent High Court Judgements (Satnam, Kings Lyn, Hinckley and Bosworth). • The SHMA has focussed on writing off the shortfall approach. It is not compliant with paragraph 47 of the NPPF and Government focus on housing delivery. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Completions to date put actual delivery at about 624 dwellings per annum. The Shortfall in delivery plus a 20% buffer means that over the next five years, the requirement is 1,136 applying 'Sedgefield' and 825 using 'Liverpool'. The Plan should be addressing this shortfall.</p>	
	<p><i>Housing Growth Distribution Strategy - Introduction</i></p>	<p><i>This issue attracted by far the greatest number of responses in the consultation, with opinion sharply divided and a wide variety of reasons being given for either supporting or objecting to each Option set out in Question 5.2.</i></p> <p><i>The Section below is divided by comments in favour and then against each Option, with additional detail or alternative suggestions where appropriate. In the interests of brevity, brief summaries only are given of the main points.</i></p>	
5.2	<p>Which of the following options for the distribution of housing growth do you think should be taken forward through the LPR? 5.2(a) Continue with the existing Local Plan spatial distribution of growth: Yeovil 47%, Market</p>	<p>(a) Existing Spatial Distribution</p> <p><u>In Favour</u> Reasons stated for supporting this Option include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is based on a robust methodology and the current strategy was found sound. • It would minimise the loss of greenfield land and priority habitats. • Although smaller sites in smaller towns deliver more quickly, it would be a mistake to drop the Yeovil key site programme. All the key sites in Yeovil are delivering and planning applications lodged. Timelines for developments like Keyford and Mudford are not unusual. Yeovil is by far the most sustainable area in the District – allocating sufficient land and allowing enough time for it to come forward is the most sensible housing strategy. • The over-delivery of housing in rural settlements should not result in a deviation from the current strategy and current Government policy. • Yeovil is the focus for retail, services and housing and should continue to be the main location for the majority of new housing. 	<p>Using evidence base documents such as the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, the five-year housing land supply the Authority Monitoring Report and the Strategic Employment Housing Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and bearing in mind the Government's focus on housing delivery through the Housing Delivery Test. The emerging Local Plan Review identifies a spatial distribution of growth which maintains the integrity of the adopted spatial distribution but proposes to introduce a 'Villages' category of settlement.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Towns 32%, Rural Centres 7% and Rural Settlements 14%.</p> <p>5.2(b) Have a more dispersed strategy based upon where the market is delivering.</p> <p>5.2(c) Introduce an additional tier of 'Village' settlements where development could be allocated. Which settlements should be identified and why?</p> <p>5.2(d) Allocate a Garden Town or Village. Where should it be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a continued focus on the larger towns as too much housing has been provided at the rural settlements – the Council should adopt a more robust approach against such planning applications. • The larger settlements are most likely to be able to provide an appropriate level of healthcare for new residents. <p><u>Against</u> Objections to the continued strategy include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no further major housing growth in Yeovil as it could not cope in terms of existing infrastructure, notably highways. • Housing in Wincanton, Castle Cary, Langport/Huish Episcopi, Ilchester and South Petherton have exceeded targets, with the major sites in the larger towns have not come forward, largely on grounds of viability, so an alternative should be sought. The infrastructure of these smaller rural communities is not suited for further development. • There has been too much growth at smaller rural settlements – these are an asset to the character of South Somerset, yet they are most attractive to developers due to their relatively unspoilt landscape and village qualities. • This option would not address persistent under-delivery. Yeovil, for example, has delivered only 29% of housing growth compared with the target of 47%. • There has been an imbalance in the target for housing growth at Yeovil of 47% and that for employment of 33.5%. <p><u>An Alternative Approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeovil's percentage should be raised to 50%. • Housing numbers should be based on an assessment of each individual settlement rather than grouping them. 	<p>The methodology for the identification of the Villages is set out in the evidence base document 'The Potential for Rural Settlements to be Designated 'Villages', 2018. Stoke sub Hamdon, due to the level of local services and constrained nature of the surrounding landscape is now proposed to be a Village rather than a Rural Centre.</p> <p>The settlements proposed to be included as Villages are: Abbas and Templecombe, Broadway and Horton, Charlton Adam and Charlton Mackrell, Combe St Nicholas, Curry Rivel, Henstridge, Keinton Mandeville, North Cadbury, Queen Camel, Sparkford, Stoke sub Hamdon and Tatworth.</p> <p>This Villages approach seeks to address the issue of having delivered far in excess of the target for new homes identified to be delivered in Rural Settlements. The proposals also see a more restrictive approach being taken to development in Rural Settlements (see response to Option 5.3)</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response						
	<p>located and how many homes should it accommodate ?</p> <p>5.2 (e) Another option (please specify)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeovil’s proportion is more than can be delivered. It is suggested that 40% should be directed to Yeovil and 40% to the Market Towns. • Another respondent thinks that there should be an increase to 10% for rural centres and a reduction in rural settlements to 11%. • A suggestion for a more dispersed distribution of growth is as follows: Yeovil 29% (3521) Market Towns 30% (3642) Rural Centres 9% (1093) Rural Settlements 17% (2064) Standalone Garden Village on A303 near RNAS Yeovilton (15%: 1,200-1,500 dwgs.) • If a Garden Village (A303 Corridor) option was not taken forward then distribution of growth should be as follows. This reflects a better balance more broadly based on what has actually been delivered: Yeovil 34% (4128) Market Towns 34% (4128) Rural Centres 12% (1457) Rural Settlements 20% (2428) <p>(b) A More Dispersed Strategy</p> <p><u>In Favour</u> Reasons stated in favour of this Option include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should recognise the need to provide housing in areas of high market demand in the wider rural area. • Further expansion of Yeovil will have a detrimental environmental and amenity impact on both residents and those living adjacent to the town. • The proportion of growth at Yeovil and Chard could not be relied upon. It should be more dispersed, which would allow a range of sites to be identified, rather than relying on large strategic sites. 	<p>The proposed spatial distribution of growth is as follows: Principal Town (Yeovil) – 33% (1 settlement) Primary Market Towns – 30% (4 settlements) Local Market Towns – 11% (3 settlements) Rural Centres - 8% (5 settlements) Villages – 8% (12 settlements) Rural Settlements - 11% (23 settlements as at October 2018 based upon the proposed new policy criteria).</p> <p>These percentages equate to the following number of dwellings (it should be noted that the emerging Local Plan Review identifies more housing than the local housing need figure – this is to allow some flexibility as the Local Plan Review progresses.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1704 1177 2195 1396"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1704 1177 1937 1337">Settlement</th> <th data-bbox="1944 1177 2195 1337">Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Number of new homes required (net)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1704 1337 2195 1369">Principal Town</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1704 1369 1937 1396">Yeovil</td> <td data-bbox="1944 1369 2195 1396">5,091</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Settlement	Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Number of new homes required (net)	Principal Town		Yeovil	5,091
Settlement	Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Number of new homes required (net)								
Principal Town									
Yeovil	5,091								

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response																																				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people are opposed to any more large-scale housing developments attached to existing market towns. Some villages could take some new housing in proportion to their existing size. • Housing in rural areas would help support viable local services and amenities – it would increase their sustainability. • There needs to be more affordable housing in rural areas, particularly for younger people. It would also have the benefit of more children having access to the countryside. <p><u>Against</u> Those objecting to this Option state the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not assist in focussing growth at the most sustainable locations. • The Local Authority should not be market led – it is an abdication of responsibility. • It would put a strain on local services and an increase in the use of private transport. There would be more cars and delivery vehicles, increasing pollution. • There is not an appropriate level of jobs, public transport or community facilities. • Larger sites are more likely to deliver strategic infrastructure. • It will have a relatively great negative impact on biodiversity through the loss of greenfield land and priority habitats. • A market led strategy could lead to intrusion into the countryside and detrimental impact on the landscape. <p>(c) An Additional ‘Village’ Settlement Tier</p> <p><u>In Favour</u> Reasons stated for supporting this Option include the following:</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 333 2199 363">Primary Market Towns</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 363 1939 394">Chard</td> <td data-bbox="1939 363 2199 394">1,995</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 394 1939 424">Crewkerne</td> <td data-bbox="1939 394 2199 424">1,194</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 424 1939 454">Ilminster</td> <td data-bbox="1939 424 2199 454">839</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 454 1939 485">Wincanton</td> <td data-bbox="1939 454 2199 485">613</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 485 2199 515">Local Market Towns</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 515 1939 585">Castle Cary and Ansford</td> <td data-bbox="1939 515 2199 585">727</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 585 1939 639">Langport and Huish Episcopi</td> <td data-bbox="1939 585 2199 639">351</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 639 1939 670">Somerton</td> <td data-bbox="1939 639 2199 670">574</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 670 2199 700">Rural Centres</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 700 1939 730">Bruton</td> <td data-bbox="1939 700 2199 730">152</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 730 1939 761">Ilchester</td> <td data-bbox="1939 730 2199 761">361</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 761 1939 799">Martock and Bower Hinton</td> <td data-bbox="1939 761 2199 799">330</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 799 1939 829">Milborne Port</td> <td data-bbox="1939 799 2199 829">245</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 829 1939 860">South Petherton</td> <td data-bbox="1939 829 2199 860">116</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 860 1939 890">Villages</td> <td data-bbox="1939 860 2199 890">1,314</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 890 1939 920">Rural Settlements</td> <td data-bbox="1939 890 2199 920">1,686</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 920 1939 951">Total</td> <td data-bbox="1939 920 2199 951">15,588</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For context once housing completions and planning permissions as at 31st March 2018 are taken into account the number of homes still to be delivered, including pending planning applications and proposed allocations is as follows:</p>	Primary Market Towns		Chard	1,995	Crewkerne	1,194	Ilminster	839	Wincanton	613	Local Market Towns		Castle Cary and Ansford	727	Langport and Huish Episcopi	351	Somerton	574	Rural Centres		Bruton	152	Ilchester	361	Martock and Bower Hinton	330	Milborne Port	245	South Petherton	116	Villages	1,314	Rural Settlements	1,686	Total	15,588
Primary Market Towns																																							
Chard	1,995																																						
Crewkerne	1,194																																						
Ilminster	839																																						
Wincanton	613																																						
Local Market Towns																																							
Castle Cary and Ansford	727																																						
Langport and Huish Episcopi	351																																						
Somerton	574																																						
Rural Centres																																							
Bruton	152																																						
Ilchester	361																																						
Martock and Bower Hinton	330																																						
Milborne Port	245																																						
South Petherton	116																																						
Villages	1,314																																						
Rural Settlements	1,686																																						
Total	15,588																																						

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response																																									
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council should introduce a village tier for settlements that outperform the definition of a 'rural settlement' and are truly sustainable and suitable locations for housing. It could increase flexibility. Most of the 14% of Housing for Rural Settlements should be allocated amongst the 'Villages', then the rest split to the smaller settlements. The current 'one size fits all' Policy SS2 does not distinguish between widely differing population sizes. The previous Local Plan included a village tier below market towns and rural centres. It is also suggested that all settlements should be considered for development on their own merits, without which many village services would not survive. It would assist in housing delivery. SSDC must explore all possible ways to facilitate a significant step change in housing delivery and small sites can be delivered more quickly than major urban extensions. Local, small-scale, modest developments deliver in many ways, as they are usually undertaken by local developers who turn sites around quickly. They live locally, employ local people, and use other local services such as solicitors, estate agents, and accountants, and the future occupiers use local services such as carpet fitters, decorators, and furniture suppliers. Cary Moor PC would like to see a village tier with clearly defined criteria. It agrees that the addition of a village tier could be useful depending on the criteria used to define it. It is agreed that a separate policy to protect the character of rural settlement would be of benefit. <p><u>Against</u> Those objecting to this Option state the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the volume of delivery already in smaller settlements, there does not appear to be a need for an additional village tier, which is not a sustainable or reliable strategic approach. 	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1688 333 1935 488">Settlement</th> <th data-bbox="1942 333 2199 488">Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Residual Number of new homes required (net)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 493 2199 520">Principal Town</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 525 1935 552">Yeovil</td> <td data-bbox="1942 525 2199 552">2,887</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 557 2199 584">Primary Market Towns</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 588 1935 616">Chard</td> <td data-bbox="1942 588 2199 616">1,490</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 620 1935 647">Crewkerne</td> <td data-bbox="1942 620 2199 647">480</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 652 1935 679">Ilminster</td> <td data-bbox="1942 652 2199 679">720</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 684 1935 711">Wincanton</td> <td data-bbox="1942 684 2199 711">270</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 716 2199 743">Local Market Towns</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 748 1935 775">Castle Cary and Ansford</td> <td data-bbox="1942 748 2199 775">161</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 780 1935 807">Langport and Huish Episcopi</td> <td data-bbox="1942 780 2199 807">180</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 812 1935 839">Somerton</td> <td data-bbox="1942 812 2199 839">140</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1688 844 2199 871">Rural Centres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 876 1935 903">Bruton</td> <td data-bbox="1942 876 2199 903">65</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 908 1935 935">Ilchester</td> <td data-bbox="1942 908 2199 935">200</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 940 1935 967">Martock and Bower Hinton</td> <td data-bbox="1942 940 2199 967">210</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 971 1935 999">Milborne Port</td> <td data-bbox="1942 971 2199 999">140</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 1003 1935 1031">South Petherton</td> <td data-bbox="1942 1003 2199 1031">55</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 1035 1935 1062">Villages</td> <td data-bbox="1942 1035 2199 1062">722</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1688 1067 1935 1094">Rural Settlements</td> <td data-bbox="1942 1067 2199 1094">876</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Preferred Options document does not propose the allocation of the Garden Village/Town. Such</p>		Settlement	Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Residual Number of new homes required (net)	Principal Town		Yeovil	2,887	Primary Market Towns		Chard	1,490	Crewkerne	480	Ilminster	720	Wincanton	270	Local Market Towns		Castle Cary and Ansford	161	Langport and Huish Episcopi	180	Somerton	140	Rural Centres		Bruton	65	Ilchester	200	Martock and Bower Hinton	210	Milborne Port	140	South Petherton	55	Villages	722	Rural Settlements	876
Settlement	Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Residual Number of new homes required (net)																																											
Principal Town																																												
Yeovil	2,887																																											
Primary Market Towns																																												
Chard	1,490																																											
Crewkerne	480																																											
Ilminster	720																																											
Wincanton	270																																											
Local Market Towns																																												
Castle Cary and Ansford	161																																											
Langport and Huish Episcopi	180																																											
Somerton	140																																											
Rural Centres																																												
Bruton	65																																											
Ilchester	200																																											
Martock and Bower Hinton	210																																											
Milborne Port	140																																											
South Petherton	55																																											
Villages	722																																											
Rural Settlements	876																																											

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan (2006-2028) states that there is a risk of too much housing being accommodated in Rural Settlements in applying Policy SS2. Monitoring shows delivery in Rural Settlements is too high, encouraging unsustainable development in place of sustainable locations. • This Option could lead to a strain on local services, an increase in use of private transport, intrusion into the countryside and a detrimental impact on the landscape. • The designated Rural Settlements offer the most sustainable locations for development. Smaller settlements do not provide the same levels of jobs, public transport and community facilities. • This Option would not protect and enhance the natural, built, and historic environment. • There are few local bus services. The Option would be contrary to elements of the NPPF relating to the need to promote sustainable transport, minimising journey lengths and reducing emissions. It would harm biodiversity, increase waste and pollution, and increase car use leading to an acceleration of climate change, not a low carbon economy. • There is no methodology for village designation. • It is likely to have a relatively large negative impacts on biodiversity through the loss of greenfield land and priority habitats. <p><u>The Definition of Villages (See also Question 5.3)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settlements which have at least six of the eight services listed in the Local Plan should be considered to be in the village category. • Specialist shops with limited stock are very different to small convenience stores and often not a true local service. Any service open only a few days a week should not be included. The definition should include a requirement to have a shop. 	<p>proposals require significant masterplanning and investment including funding from the Government, they also take a long time to deliver.</p> <p>Given that Councils are expected to maintain a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and the Housing delivery Test now imposes penalties on Council's where delivery is below the annual housing target; it is important to maintain a constant supply of housing sites. This means that the designation of a Garden Town or Village cannot be seen as an alternative to developing sites elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>At this point in time the Council is able to identify enough sites to meet the housing need and has not made the decision to commit the resources to actively pursue a Garden Village/Town proposal in relation to this Local Plan Review. However, this something it may wish to consider in the future.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another respondent suggests that the following services should be required for a settlement to be defined as a Village <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hall/Community centre Post Office or shop Health Centre Primary School Footways to local services Useful and regular public transport to nearest market town for education, employment, shopping, and leisure. Provision of mains drainage and mains sewerage before the developments of 3 or more dwellings are proposed. • A consideration of the ability of the settlement to take increased vehicle movements without a negative impact on road safety for pedestrians and other non-vehicle users. <p><u>Specific Settlements Suggested for Potential Designation</u> Several locations have been suggested as being appropriate for designation as Villages. Responses have been received from a variety of people, including Parish Councils, developers and landowners and other members of the community. The reasons for settlements being put forward are summarised below.</p> <p><u>Merriott</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of Merriott is supported. It is one of the largest Rural Settlements in the District with a variety of services and facilities including a shop, village hall, pub, and recreation ground and employment opportunities; it is very sustainable, and has been subject to recent housing developments, proves its sustainability. It is one of the most sustainable due to its proximity to Crewkerne; and the village has a large brownfield site at the old Scott's nurseries. • There may be a number of opportunities for development in Merriott, but only with rigorous oversight to ensure the right sites are allocated. If Merriott 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>were to be included as a designated village, the Parish Council is concerned that an 'open door' policy would prevail and that every development would have a 'presumption for' tag.</p> <p><u>Keinton Mandeville (See also objections below)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keinton Mandeville is a large village with a good range of services and facilities and is an appropriate location for additional housing. Therefore it should be in the villages tier. • Additional housing would increase footfall and the vitality and viability of existing services, including additional children for the local school. The CIL would also benefit the community. • A proposed omission site is said to be located centrally in the village, close to amenities such as the shop, pub, school, church, and village hall. It could be phased to provide extended residential and commercial delivery, to provide housing and employment opportunities and additional services to support the enlarged village. Two further omission sites have also been suggested. <p><u>Curry Rivel</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curry Rivel Parish Council is receptive to further limited development within the Parish provided that it has more say as to the type, number and location of houses. • There needs to be provision to create local employment within rural settlements. Employment opportunities must be provided within rural settlements to ensure that they don't just become dormitory villages. • An omission site has been suggested on land at Stanchester Way. <p><u>Henstridge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that Henstridge has a population of 1,800 residents; larger than most Rural Settlements across South Somerset. There are a range of services and facilities (primary school, shop/post office, church, 2 pubs, 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>village hall & recreational ground), all within easy walking distance of the village. There are some employment opportunities within the village and at the nearby Henstridge Airfield; and a number of bus routes serve the village which connect it to Yeovil, Wincanton & Blandford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henstridge is not subject to nationally or locally significant environmental designations that would constrain its potential growth. • Land off Stalbridge Road has been suggested as an omission site. <p><u>Templecombe</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Templecombe has a population of 1,600 residents; larger than most Rural Settlements across South Somerset. There are a range of services and facilities, all within easy walking distance of the village. Templecombe has a train station which connects village to national rail network. There is a frequent bus service, seven days a week. • There are some employment opportunities within the village, most notably Thales. • Templecombe is not subject to nationally or locally significant environmental designations that would constrain its potential growth. <p><u>Sparkford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sparkford is one of the largest Rural Settlements in the district and is very sustainable. Its services and facilities include a shop, village hall, car park, pub, recreation ground, cricket club, and prep school. • It has a variety of facilities and employment opportunities. It has been subject to recent housing developments. This proves its sustainability. • An omission site is suggested for a development for up to 50 dwellings, for which an outline planning application is being prepared. <p><u>Long Sutton</u></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Church Commissioners would be supportive of a ‘village’ tier. They have a site in the settlement which provides seven of the eight key services; and the 2009 Settlement Role study found high levels of self-containment. <p><u>Specific Settlements suggested should not be designated</u> The following objections to possible designation have been received:</p> <p><u>Dowlish Wake</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dowlish Wake should not be identified as a ‘Village’. It is poorly located for accessibility by foot to schools, doctors/dentist surgeries, post office, bank and other services. It has no bus service or footpath to Ilminster. Any development would be car dependent and highway safety would be an issue as would potential impacts on listed buildings and the Conservation Area. Drainage and flooding are also issues. • Roads to/from Dowlish Wake are predominantly single-track, so extra traffic would cause a severe strain on the road structure and dynamics of the area, like for many villages. <p><u>Keinton Mandeville</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the 42 homes granted at Lakeview Quarry, the village is already playing its part. Keinton Mandeville has serious traffic issues due to its existing layout, the huge increase in general and HGV traffic on the B3153; there are very limited bus services; no significant employer and wages are low; and the sewerage infrastructure is over-stretched. • Heavy traffic levels and large and farm vehicles use the narrow roads in the village, but no Council assessment appears to have yet occurred before going ahead with more development in the village. There are no pavements on the B3153 should development occur on land to the west of the village. • Keinton Mandeville has no senior school, supermarket, dentist pharmacy or medical centre. • If it gets village status, it will simply make it a dormitory village for Yeovil – exacerbating traffic, pollution, lack of social inclusion and climate change. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(d) A Garden Town or Village <i>This seems to have been one of the single most responded to Options, probably prompted by the informal publicity given to proposals for a new settlement north of Yeovilton near the end of the Issues and Options consultation period. The initial groups of comments set out below appear to be general responses to the issue, either in agreement or against this Option. This is followed by suggested locations; and a separate section then follows on the Yeovilton proposals, both in support of or objecting to them.</i></p> <p><u>Comments in Favour</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would create opportunities for a step change in local skills development capacity, increasing the flexibility and range of the industrial base to support higher paid jobs. • Yeovil cannot take additional significant growth as the infrastructure does not have the capacity and it has reached its topographical limits. • A garden town close to A303 with good transport links would be preferred to the inappropriate expansion of Yeovil. This is an opportune time with the agreed upgrade plans. It could also allow new housing and industry to be planned for holistically rather than in a random, piecemeal, approach, causing less disruption to local communities and Grade 1 agricultural land. • Yeovil has failed to deliver the expected number of houses in the Local Plan, so the current split is not working. Yeovil should keep to 30%, the amount it is currently managing to deliver. This would allow all rural settlements, large and small, the opportunity to grow, as well as having a garden settlement. • It would ease some of the pressures on existing market towns and villages; and could prevent the undermining of the local distinctiveness of many settlements through development. • It would be an opportunity to show what modern architecture and building materials can achieve. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It offers the opportunity to deliver low carbon energy and renewable energy options with open spaces. • It would secure a range of infrastructure in a comprehensive way. • In view of a continuing five-year housing land supply, this would be an innovative and new way to deliver housing and boost overall supply. • The Education and Skills Funding Agency recommends a strategy which facilitates strategic infrastructure planning. Incremental growth through the delivery of smaller sites is not considered a sustainable long-term strategy as existing schools do not have infinite capacity to expand and this becomes a serious constraint to development. • Whilst a preferred option for some, it is also stated, for example, that the timescales associated with a Garden Town or Village mean that it is unlikely to be delivered in the plan period; and that this would need to be a long term aspiration. <p><u>Comments Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of a Garden Town or Village is unsustainable when the lack of economic growth is taken into account. • It would do nothing to help sustain and enhance the viability of existing towns, particularly Yeovil. Additional housing can and should be accommodated sustainably through the expansion of existing settlements. The emphasis should be on urban regeneration, which the town centres badly need. • A new town would take a very long time for land assembly, define, promote and gain necessary approvals; and then to deliver; the RTPI estimate that a development of 4,500 to 8,000 units would take 12 to 18 years and on this basis there would be no delivery until 2030 at the earliest. Even then a development of this size is not required. • The provision of entirely new large settlement(s) in the open countryside should be avoided; it would mean maximum destruction of farmland. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Suggested Locations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would need to be located near employment opportunities such as the Yeovilton proposal. • On the northern side of Yeovil is suggested which is said would increase the diversity of choice for the settlement, education and employment. • The location should be near Cartgate, close to the A303, and include significant employment land. • Possible locations close to Podimore/ Sparkford or Ilminster/ Ilton/ Ashill. • There is an opportunity to promote a strategic site owned by SCC, at Donyatt. SCC Cabinet has agreed the vision and key principles for a new community in Somerset that key stakeholders can buy into. This was informed by technical work undertaken by the Garden Town volunteers in 2016/17. The next steps will be to develop a specific proposal to influence the Local Plan process. It would be in line with the NPPF; could make a significant contribution to the housing requirement; exploit public assets for the public good; deliver affordable housing and a wide variety of tenure options; would follow garden town principles; and assist in meeting sustainable development aspirations. • If considered necessary, it should be an urban village next to Yeovil, South Chard or Ilminster, to make maximum use of shared infrastructure, employment opportunities and urban services. <p><u>The informal submission of proposals for a garden town north of Yeovilton</u></p> <p><u>In Favour</u></p> <p><i>General Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Church Commissioners are significant landowners within the Garden Settlement proposal submitted by Grass Roots Planning Ltd on behalf of SWSD Ltd and are supportive of the Council considering a Garden Settlement in this location. They agree with the site assessment and strategic suitability of the site presented by Grass Roots. The Church 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Commissioners believe the proposal could deliver the first completions by 2020 with five operators on site delivering circa 50 dwellings per annum delivering 3,500 dwellings by 2034 and go to deliver over the longer term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many expressions of general support have been received. <p><i>Design Benefits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will allow the planners to have full scope in designing living spaces fit for the 21st century. • Many modern housing estates suffer from lack of space, not enough parking, poor build, no public transport, schools, surgeries or shops. A development such as Cranbrook is cherished by the new house owners. <p><i>Infrastructure and Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garden settlements can be comprehensively and holistically planned to ensure that not only housing is delivered, but infrastructure requirements and employment needs can also be met. The development would deliver a comprehensive development of a minimum of 10,000 dwellings, local centre, technology/university presence, medical facilities and significant levels of public open space. • It would provide amenities such as shops, schools, employment, healthcare, retirement care, leisure facilities, business facilities, and provide lakes and parks. • Flood risk could be mitigated by excess being released slowly into downstream watercourses during heavy rainfall. <p><i>Lack of Physical Constraints</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that no other sites offer such an extensive tract of land that is subject to very limited constraints to potential development. Any such constraints could be overcome through sensitive design and mitigation proposals. <p><i>Relationship to Yeovilton</i></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RNAS Yeovilton is one of the busiest airfields in the country that currently employs around 4,300 people. The Garden settlement proposal can utilise and enhance its available facilities by providing technology and aeronautical industrial and employment land in close proximity that can potentially access the airbase for commercial and testing purposes. There is a unique potential to deliver large scale employment development due to its proximity; up to about 19,000 jobs according to the Church Commissioners. <p><i>Traffic in Yeovil</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would reduce traffic flow through Yeovil and reduce congestion in Yeovil; and it would help the capacity problem at the Horsey Lane roundabout. <p><i>Highways</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be adjacent to and benefit from the dualling for the A303; and provide immediate access to London and the west via the A303 and to Bath and Bristol via A37. <p><i>Rail</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be able to link to and will benefit from the rail line. <p><i>Landscape and BMV Agricultural Land</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not covered by any statutory designations and no available documentation or character assessment work identifies the site as a particularly special or valued landscape; and its topography is also not subject to any severe gradients or elevation that would make any development particularly visually expose. • It would be built on Grade 3 & 4 agricultural land rather than on Grade 1 land. • It would not affect areas of natural beauty. <p><i>Benefits to Other Settlements</i></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development will be self-sustaining and the surrounding villages will not suffer further pressure on limited resources. There may be opportunities for Ilchester residents to access new shops, library, entertainment facilities etc. <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is very under-populated and it would affect far fewer residents. • The Local MP states that a garden town or village is the kind of creative thinking attractive to the Government and MPs as it fits in with the policies and aspirations for more homes and jobs. There would be Government funding available to aid development. He says he would help ensure local transport improvements to make sure other towns and villages are networked with it. A garden town would be attractive to local government too because of its ability to create new markets and revenue from business rates, council tax and new homes bonus that can support local services. <p><u>Objections</u></p> <p><i>Government New Town Policy and Funding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location proposed would be contrary to the government's policy of placing towns/villages next to large towns or cities (like Taunton, Exeter and Plymouth) where they work best and there is less impact on rural character. • New town funding no longer being available. • It is the most expensive option for a new town due to there being no utilities, facilities, or amenities. The schools, health centres, community centres, sewers, link roads, railway station, biomass plant, massive flood prevention schemes, business parks, and a university must all need to be funded. <p><i>Impact on other Settlements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns over the impact of a new retail park on existing town centres of Yeovil, Street, Shepton Mallet, Somerton, and Wincanton. There are already a number of vacant shops in Yeovil. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be detrimental to the character of rural settlements, including the historic villages of Babcary, Foddington, Podimore, Cary Fitzpaine, South Barrow; and the hamlets in between. <p><i>Rural Character</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Somerset is an area of the UK defined by its rural nature. It will take away what is special and affect tourism and ways of life. • There would be more air noise, and light pollution, resulting in the loss of air quality, dark skies, tranquillity, and quietness. <p><i>Housing Distribution Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dispersal approach is preferred and would boost existing communities, shops and schools. • Rather than destroying a large swathe of countryside with a low density car-dependant garden settlement, SSDC should concentrate on delivering growth in existing larger settlements. <p><i>Preferred Garden Settlement Locations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be opportunity for something much smaller to the east of the proposal area, almost along the A37 stretch. Perhaps a few hundred homes at the Podimore roundabout. • The 176 acre former wireless station near Somerton might be more suitable. • A new town should be located by Hinkley Point power station – near jobs, a motorway, and mainline railway station. • Any new town would be more appropriately located in the Cartgate area or to the east of the Cartgate roundabout, with good access an already dualled section of the A303. <p><i>Flood Risk</i></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is a low lying flood plain, with Flood Zone 3 present, which often floods. • The water table is very high; and the land is clay and holds the water, resulting in run-off. • The Dyke Brook overflows regularly after periods of heavy rain and the surrounding fields frequently flood. • The Environment Agency’s mapping does not show the extent of the flooding; the vale is badly waterlogged and flooding affects Babcary, its access routes and other villages downstream. • Building the garden settlement would result in flood risks for existing properties not currently at risk; adjoining villages; and low lying villages upstream of the new town which drain into the area; the houses and businesses of the new town itself; and Somerset Levels and Bridgwater downstream. • Excess water and household sewage would have to be channelled through the flood-prone Somerset Levels and Bridgwater; the rivers that take the water away to Bridgwater are at capacity and prone to flooding. • Option ‘Route 2’ for the A303 dualling proposals showed flooding to be a major risk. • There is a lack of information on the potential hard engineered flood risk mitigation and their wider impacts. <p><i>Highways Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrounding roads are already overcrowded and a new settlement would mean more traffic on roads already too small to cope. • Access on Steart Hill is extremely limited. It has a steep gradient and is narrow. • The crossroads at Lydford and the incline at Wraxall Hill are both unsuitable. • The road running through the development connecting the A303 to the A37 is single carriage and unsuitable for an increase in traffic. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would mean an extra 20-30,000 vehicles and the A303 is already overloaded. The proposal would likely require an upgrade of A303 in other locations as well as those where it is already planned. • Podimore would be a severe bottleneck. • The local roads aren't appropriate for the biomass plant alleged to power the settlement, which will require a huge site for its operation, and regular large vehicles to keep the plant running. <p><i>Public Transport</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local bus service is inadequate with few routes and very infrequent services. Public finance would not be available. • The railway station would not be at the new town but in Sparkford. It would still be 7 miles from the new town to the Sparkford Station so commuters would have to drive there, and it would require a new road link. • The station would be on the Bath/Weymouth line – a minor branch line with slow, infrequent trains, and no link to London or Exeter. <p><i>The Economy and Employment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Augusta Westland is in doubt as more helicopter building is re-patriated by its parent company back to Italy; 600 redundancies have just been reported at Westlands; and BAE systems closed its Yeovil factory in October with the losses of 200+ jobs. It is not a thriving aerospace industry, so the new town is unlikely to attract the numbers of aerospace companies required. • It is uncertain that the MoD can share its main airfield. The huge existing accommodation expansion at Yeovilton still needs to be filled. • The figure of 19,000 jobs is unsubstantiated. • There is no employment to sustain this many people locally. It is a rural community. <p><i>MOD/ Yeovilton</i></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns over the impacts of noise, pollution, and risk of military aircraft landing in close proximity to residential and commercial uses. • There is no precedent of shared military-commercial airfields and the MoD would not consider or support a shared commercial and military airfield together with airside access from a new business park for operational and security reasons. • RNAS Yeovilton is not currently “underused”. According to the Royal Navy’s web site “RNAS Yeovilton is one of the Navy’s two principal air bases, and one of the busiest military airfields in the UK. It is home to more than 100 aircraft operated on both front-line squadrons and training units. • If Plymouth cannot sustain a commercial airport due to the competition from Exeter and Bristol, then Yeovilton could not cope. There is also a commercial airport at Southampton. <p><i>Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A massive amount of infrastructure would be needed in this agricultural area. The proposed 15,000 homes will result in some 40,000 individuals, 25,000 cars and the consequent arrival of additional infrastructure necessities. • An additional hospital, medical and GP facilities would be required as Yeovil District Hospital is overstretched currently and could not cope with another 45,000 people in its catchment area. <p><i>Housing Quantity and Affordability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6,600 new homes are needed and once completions and commitments are account for; only 3,000 additional homes are required; there is only a shortfall of 1,107 in Somerset. 15,000 homes are too many. • The proposed settlement is disproportionate in size to the needs of the area. • There is concern over the affordable housing proposals and a lack of a commitment to affordable housing other than a passing mention. <p><i>Five Year Housing Land Supply</i></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not solve the current 5YHLS as it will take a long time before housing is delivered. <p><i>Agricultural Land</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would have an adverse effect on farmland and food production. <p><i>Ecology</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between Podimore and Babcary is an important wildlife corridor avoiding the main roads and will be even more important when 'A303 Expressway' built. There are protected species that would be affected. • There is no reference to the Babcary Meadows SSSI. <p><i>Heritage Assets</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Trust are custodians of several historic properties in the area, including Lytes Cary Listed Buildings and Registered Gardens. More time and information would be necessary to consider the implications of new settlements being proposed. It would also ruin the heritage site of Cadbury Castle. • It would have a detrimental impact on an area of considerable archaeological importance given the proximity to Ilchester and the Fosse Way. <p><i>Pollution</i></p> <p>There is concern that such a large development should not be positioned in an area prone to fog, which when mixed with pollution from the development would create a toxic, unhealthy and unpleasant living environment.</p> <p><i>The Proposed University</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new university is not needed. SCC and SSDC should not be seeking to provide a new university. Whilst Somerset does not have a university there 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>are perfectly good universities within easy travelling distance, at Bristol, Bath and Exeter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detail of funding is provided. • It would be remote with inadequate transport links. <p><i>Alternative Suggestions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be five 'garden villages' with a schools, pubs, church etc. built as housing construction begins. • It would be preferable to have 5,000 dwellings alongside small businesses and services. • There is enough brownfield land to accommodate one million homes nationwide. Development of brownfield sites if preferable to this. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <p><i>Surface Water</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water from the proposal will enter the Parrett Drainage Board's District at a location where flood risk and operational sensitivities already exist. It is important that any proposal reduces any surface water runoff to pre-development runoff rates and volumes and where possible reduce the overall existing flood risk. The surface water mitigation should employ an effective sustainable drainage management train to ensure the quality of the surface water runoff is not detrimental to the downstream aquatic environment. <p><i>Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development would have to provide improved road access for traffic heading south to Sherborne and Yeovil, and perhaps with new trunk roads to bypass Ilchester, Marston Magna, and Queen Camel. SSDC and SCC should bid for some Government money from the DfT. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><i>Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was not long enough to comment, consult, or undertake in-depth investigations before the LPR consultation deadline. The proposal was bought forward at the eleventh hour without consultation with the Council. • Such a proposal should be the subject of a district-wide consultation. • The Council should consider whether all landowners agree to their land being promoted. Not all landowners have been consulted. <p><i>Maps and Plans</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans are too simplistic and there are some major shortfalls. The maps provided are lacking essential components such as a key or scale <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical challenges of building on the land in question were found through consideration of the A303 options. Construction in the unspoilt rural area should be minimised <p>(e) – Another Option</p> <p><u>A Combination of Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that a garden village along the A303 corridor be pursued and an increased percentage to all rural settlements. • Others think, for example, that there should be a combination of a more-market led approach and the introduction of a Village tier. It is also stated though, that Yeovil and the main market towns should still be the main focus but to a lesser degree. • The policy should recognise that there are varying degrees of countryside (outside of official designations) and with the greater ecological, historic and community value, should be afforded greater protection. <p><u>Specific Locations for Increased Growth</u></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>It has been suggested that the following settlements could accommodate additional growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Cary – it has a wide range of shops, services, schools and employment opportunities, together with good public transport linkages, including a mainline railway station. • Ilchester – it has capacity to accommodate additional growth. • Keinton Mandeville – A site north of Church Street and west of Queen Street is suggested for allocation. It is stated that its development would cause no landscape harm and it occupies a highly sustainable location. • Charlton Horethorne – it has four of the listed community facilities and shares the surgery at Milborne Port; and transport links are good; it should be designated a Rural Centre. • Curry Rivel – the Parish Council is receptive to further limited development within the Parish, provided that it has more say as to the type, number and location of houses. • The A303 corridor – the road is set to be improved. South Petherton and Sparkford both have several sites suitable for redevelopment; or new villages along its length could be established. • SCC Land – it is stated that future housing growth affords the opportunity to promote various non-strategic sites owned by SCC and exploit surplus public assets for the public good. It is therefore the intention to promote seven various sites. 	
5.3	Should the supporting text to Policy SS2 (Rural Settlements) be amended to ensure growth	There have been a very large number of responses on this issue and it is clearly of particular interest to landowners, developers and the wider community, in both urban and rural areas. A wide range of comments have been received, ranging from those thinking that the number of services required under the Policy should be increased, to those thinking that the requirement should be removed altogether, with a completely different strategy. The observations received are grouped below	A new settlement category of 'Villages' has been introduced in order to direct growth to the more sustainable locations currently within the Rural Settlements category. The evidence to support the Villages designations can be found in The

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>is focussed towards the more sustainable Rural Settlements? 5.3(a) Amend the supporting text of Policy SS2 to require a Rural Settlement to have three of the services listed in Local Plan paragraph 5.41 in order for the Policy to apply. 5.3(b) Amend the list of services in Local Plan paragraph 5.41 by combining the faith facility with village hall/community centre and the</p>	<p>in relation to the number of services, their type; and the weight that should be afforded to each.</p> <p><u>Numbers of Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that a minimum of three services, and preferably four, should be required for development in the smallest settlements. These 3 or 4 services should be used on a daily basis such as a shop or pub. • It is suggested that the Council could consider combining faith facility and village hall; and the post office with a shop; and add transport network and broadband; and require four of the services. • There is some agreement with increasing the number of required services to three. It is suggested that 5.3(a) and 5.3(b) are combined as too much development is being approved in Rural Settlements. The Council should take a more positive stance on development in settlements with three of the listed services. • In order to continue supporting and maintaining the delivery of primary healthcare in South Somerset, Symphony Healthcare Services supports the approach within the current Local Plan, of settlements having to contain at least two facilities in order to qualify as an SS2 settlement. This maintains a key nucleus of people to justify and maintain primary healthcare services in settlements. • It is stated that there is no basis to amend the supporting text to Policy SS2 because a focus towards development in more sustainable Rural Settlements would act as a constraint to housing in certain villages. Para. 55 of the NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain vitality of rural communities. • It is also stated that further constraint of development in rural areas will lead to a loss of facilities and will lead villages to become dormitory settlements for the retired and commuters. If anything, para. 5.41 of the Local Plan 	<p>Potential for Rural Settlements to be 'Villages', November 2018.</p> <p>The proposed revised Policy SS2 (now Policy SS4 in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options document) still allows growth in qualifying Rural Settlements but would help to protect the character of the very smallest and most rural locations.</p> <p>Policy SS2 (now SS4) and its supporting text has been revised to make the policy clearer and easy to use.</p> <p>The list of facilities which qualify a settlement for growth under Policy SS2 (now SS4) has been refined and now as a settlement must have four of the six facilities listed. This will ensure that growth is directed to the most sustainable Rural Settlements. The list has been revised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local convenience store / post office; 2. primary school; 3. health centre;

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>post office with the convenience shop and continue the requirement two facilities.</p> <p>5.3(c) An alternative option?</p>	<p>should be amended so that any settlement with at least one of the listed facilities would qualify as an SS2 settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view is expressed that SS2 should be amended to allow growth in settlements that have functional connectivity to more sustainable communities, thus allowing clustering of settlements for mutual benefit and mutual sustainability. It should be recognised that villages and hamlets share functional connections in rural areas, for example through access to primary schools etc. Guidance describes this more generally as “the roles of housing in supporting broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements” (Planning Practice Guidance – Rural Housing). Two rural settlements in a particular parish have large employers but hardly any affordable housing – both might support development but do not meet the current criteria. Development in Rural Settlements should be encouraged in a way that supports the local rural economy, creates and or enhances community facilities, local services and rural primary schools. The concept of Parish clustering will be positively supported to allow development, as required locally, across all rural settlements. There are many other comments in this vein. It is suggested that the policy should be amended to allow opportunity for small-scale growth in all settlements. • It is commented that development in rural settlements should always have the support of the local community, although another comment states that appeals have shown that community support is not a prerequisite for gaining planning consent. • It is stated that Para 28 of the NPPF promotes “the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. It does not suggest that they are prerequisites for ‘sustainability’ or should determine selection of settlements for development. <p><u>Types of Services</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. pub; 5. Village hall and/or community centre or faith facility with a community meeting space; 6. children’s play area; <p>Whilst the proposed policy seeks to encourage engagement local communities it cannot be a requirement and nor can the agreement of the community be requirement of the policy.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Again, there are a wide range of views expressed about the types of service that a settlement should have in order to be considered a sustainable location for development. They include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A local convenience shop, health centre, and primary school. • Fivehead currently ticks four of the SS2 services but the sustainability of the village does not feel robustly defined as there is no shop. Policy SS2 should also refer to a regular and extended bus network and effective and reliable broadband. • Post Offices are vestiges of the past; many have closed, and the sector is changing due to the internet, so more will shut. So remove Post Offices from the list. • Must have utilities, main drainage, gas, broadband and Local Public Transport • The addition of 10-20 homes has no bearing on the continuance of a pub. Pubs have to find their own way to survive and local people rarely patronise them anyway, so pubs can be excluded from the list. • SS2 is quite adequate for proposals for 1 or 2 locally acceptable (as supported by the community) dwellings within Rural Settlements. However if a developer seeks 3 or more dwellings within a Rural Settlement then the list of services should be combined as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hall/Community centre Post Office or shop Health Centre Primary School Footways to local services Useful and regular public transport to nearest market town for education, employment, shopping, and leisure. Provision of mains drainage and mains sewerage • Add to the list: a frequent bus or train service with a stop/station within 800 metres; and a reasonable network of footways. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the impact of limited infrastructure such as low mains water pressure, poor highways infrastructure (narrow lanes with overhanging trees and no passing places), and poor telephone and broadband services. • The current list of services is too simple – other factors must be taken into account and the whole settlement looked at holistically. For example, schools must have places available, facilities must be accessible by foot (i.e. footpaths) or have public transport links or parking facilities. Access to health facilities such as a doctor's surgery should be included. • Many of these facilities have no off road parking, additional residential dwellings will only add to the parking difficulties. • Utilities – land around Keinton Mandeville drops down and water/ sewerage facilities and flooding will present difficulties for proposed development sites. <p>There is disagreement about whether any of the existing list of services should be combined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some think it would be sensible to combine facilities in the way; and for example, amalgamate shops and post offices as they are most likely to be in the same premises. • Others state, for instance, that a faith facility and a village hall are completely separate; and that post office and convenience shop should remain as they are. <p><u>The Weight Attached to Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that Policy SS2 does not weight any of the facilities. In terms of sustainability and self-containment village shops and primary schools meet every day needs whereas faith facilities, village halls and play areas meet less frequent needs and may meet a combined need. It is considered there should be a requirement for Rural Settlements to have an existing shop and 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>primary school and one other facility in order to be considered a sustainable location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is said that the ‘value’ to a community of individual amenities is not the same. For instance, a school should be given a higher value than say a stand-alone sports pitch. Schools in rural areas are suffering from the increasing age of the population in these settlements, so development, which encourages younger families, in areas with existing schools, should have a higher weighting. • The view is also expressed that, from the list, children’s play area/ sports pitch, village hall / community centre, and faith facility have no bearing whatsoever on sustainability of a rural settlement. They are simply place to go and do things. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One example is given of a scheme offering the provision of a café and dog walking track in the scheme. It is stated that the café would have closed due to a lack of demand, yet the housing would have remained; and that It was transparently seeking to ‘tick the boxes’ of SS2. • It is stated that SSDC should publish the comparative impacts of both options, individually and combined on the current spatial distribution system; and that the current system has undermined the distinctive character of rural settlements through excessive development and resulted in extensive planning appeals. • It is suggested that priority should be given to the provision of more affordable housing in rural settlements. This would help to balance the ages within these communities and would promote the use of amenities. 	
5.4	Are there any other appropriate	<u>Specific Sites and Locations</u>	The Local Plan Review will identify employment land allocations based upon the evidence set out in the

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	locations where new employment development could be directed and if so, where, how much and of what type?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somerton, adjacent Edgar Hall - There is approx. one hectare of undeveloped land next to the Hall not identified in the Review. • Somerton, Badgers Cross and wireless station sites - due to access to the road network (i.e. A303 and M5). • Lopen Head – the Nursery site has been extended recently and has reached its capacity. Lopen Business Park has considerable opportunity to extend and is an ideal candidate to contribute towards the lack of delivery of employment. • Keinton Mandeville, land south of Castle Street and west Of Row Lane - should be in the villages tier with this site allocated. Additional detail submitted. The needs of the small, sustainable, rural settlements across the District should be assessed and a suitable level of growth apportioned to them accordingly. This should be supplemented with the allocation of sites in these locations. This will help to maintain services and facilities, increase self-containment, and allow housing and employment needs to be met in the rural communities. • Martock - growth should be directed to the larger, more sustainable settlements. The rural service centres need to continue to receive growth in order to remain sustainable. • Wincanton – varied large and small sites to suit. • Castle Cary - employment development should be extended northwards along the railway line from the existing industrial estate towards the station. Employment development should also be encouraged adjacent to Torbay Road trading estate; there is an opportunity to the rear of Castle Cary railway station. Sites should be made available for studio/ workshop/ start-up premises at affordable rents. • Carymoor Environmental Centre - land should be protected and expanded with the closure of the landfill. • Milborne Port - an allocation of employment in a well-chosen suitable location such as with direct access to the A30 would be welcomed. An alternative might be to the north of the village off of Charlton Horethorne 	<p>Employment Land Review 2019 (ELR). The ELR will be complete and inform the LPR before consultation in June.</p> <p>Each site listed opposite will be considered and a full response will be published alongside the ELR.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Road; or to the east on the A30. Light industrial and office accommodation is encouraged but all forms of employment suitable for the village population would be considered. More than 0.84ha may be appropriate as some employment land has been lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cadbury Business Park - There is land of approximately 2.5ha in two parcels either side of the existing premises that have previously been assessed as suitable, deliverable and available employment land. It could accommodate 7500m² of floorspace across both sites. It is a commercially attractive location with good links close to the A303, catering for a different market to the towns. • Cartgate - New employment should be sited on land here. Land should be allocated for retail, business, hotel and leisure as a destination for strategic employment growth and as a gateway to the south-west. • Dimmer - Two sites are sustainably located and could deliver new employment without any significant environmental effects. The sites have good transport links and are in one of the least sensitive in landscape terms; and avoid the need to use BMV land. • Ilminster Hort Bridge - SDDC should invest in the employment land already allocated, rather than find more land elsewhere. Ilminster has had very little employment growth. • A new Garden Settlement - promoted by Grass Roots Planning on behalf of SWSD Ltd offers the unique potential to deliver large scale employment development (providing circa 19,000 jobs) due to its proximity to RNAS Yeovilton. The Church Commissioners are supportive. Employment and industrial land could be linked to RNAS Yeovilton and aerospace industries, diversifying the employment sectors in South Somerset. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that Bunford Park has not been delivered and Pen Mill Trading Estate is not fully utilised and other allocated areas of employment have not been delivered it is difficult to understand why more employment land is required 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>around major settlements. More organic growth is supported focussed on smaller units and where it is needed rather than trying to force employers into the towns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment land needs to be in sustainable locations and should not be driven by cheap land. Dimmer is not appropriate for further employment land. • There should be a dispersed strategy for the location of employment in the District, particularly in locations with good access to the A303 transport corridor. • Highways England state that development should be targeted at sustainable locations which reduce the imbalance between population and jobs within settlements in order to avoid out-commuting which may lead to increased trips on the SRN. It would welcome early engagement in relation to future sites for employment development. Development would need to be supported by appropriate robust transport evidence. • Identify opportunities for access to the railway network for businesses and homes • Small enterprise development should be encouraged in rural areas where transport links are poor and roads narrow and over-used. Larger scale development should be promoted on the M5 corridor and along the A303. Encourage modern technology; and should also encourage tourism through good quality food outlets and holiday accommodation and activities. 	
5.5	Should the District Council reduce the amount of employment land required to be delivered within the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people think that the employment allocations within the Yeovil SUEs should be removed and the land perhaps used for affordable housing, or in the case of Keyford, a replacement school site. • It is stated that it is clear the employment land requirement in the Local Plan was based on unsustainable aspirational employment growth. Employment growth is significantly lower than predicted in the Local Plan and economic job projections going forward are circa 8,500 between 2014 and 2034 (about 1/3 lower than the Local Plan); Class A and B uses tend to require the 	<p>The evidence base which supports both the jobs and employment land figures in the adopted Local Plan is being updated as part of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Economic projections have been undertaken which illustrate that</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Local Plan period and if so how much of the currently allocated land should be removed and from what locations?	<p>largest provision of land and as only 3,000 class A and B jobs are projected, a significant reduction in employment land would be required. It would appear appropriate to reduce the employment land requirement from 150ha detailed in the Local Plan by approx. 50% down to 75ha. In Yeovil, the 50ha requirement should be reduced to approx. 20ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, many others think that the current aspiration of new employment land should not be reduced. The target was calculated from a sound evidence base and should not be reduced just because the employment targets are not being met. Instead, a more permissive and flexible approach should be taken to encourage a diverse, robust, thriving and local economy which supports the establishment, expansion and diversification of business. Whilst Brexit has brought some uncertainty to economic forecasting, post-Recession South Somerset has shown positive growth in GVA. • It is stated that housing growth needs to be matched by an equivalent increase in employment opportunities; and that, whilst larger allocations haven't come forward, smaller sites have, indicative of strong demand. The supply of sites should be encouraged with district-wide marketing, use of public money for infrastructure and cross subsidy. The deallocation of sites would send the message that South Somerset is closed for business. Reapportioning the location of employment land in rural settlements would help supporting them. • One comment is that demand for B1 offices is low – it tends to be a mix of B1 and B8 space with a larger floorplate. South Somerset has a strong history of manufacturing in aerospace and this should be encouraged, like iAero. Larger floorplates require more land so the level of supply should be kept. 	<p>there will be less of an increase in net additional jobs between 2016 and 2036 than the previous Local Plan period, this is due to a number of factors including the current economic and political climate, aging population and sectoral make-up of South Somerset's economy. The projections, indicate that over the Local Plan Review period there will be approximately 9,360 net additional jobs generated in South Somerset. This is a lower figure than in the adopted Local Plan (11,250 net additional jobs), the reasons are explained above.</p> <p>An exercise has been undertaken which uses the evidence regarding net additional jobs and other sources of evidence to establish the overall District-wide employment land requirement by sector. This illustrates that there is a District-wide employment land requirement for between 3-7 hectares of office land and 41-84 hectares of industrial land.</p> <p>https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/930363/long_term_-</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>final report addendum 1 v4.0.pdf</p> <p>The Employment Land Review (ELR) is not yet complete. This will break down the District-wide requirement to establish the employment land requirement by settlement.</p> <p>The ELR which will then be used to establish the employment land allocations that will be within the Local Plan Review. The Local Plan Review will identify employment land allocations based upon the evidence set out in the Employment Land Review 2019 (ELR). The ELR will be complete and inform the LPR before consultation in June.</p> <p>Each comment listed opposite regarding quantum of employment land will be considered and a full response will be published alongside the ELR.</p>
5.6	What would be the most appropriate and quantifiable	<p><u>Existing Policy SS3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that Policy SS3 provides the most appropriate and quantifiable criteria to monitor and measure the level of economic growth. 	In order to monitor the performance of the Local Plan Review it is important that the amount of employment land gained and lost continues to be measured as well as

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>criteria or combination of criteria that should be monitored to measure performance of the Local Plan in promoting economic growth?</p>	<p><u>New Jobs/ Calibre of Jobs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A representative comment received is that “Area Developed” is a poor measure and should not be used. Large logistics sheds generate relatively few jobs in comparison with the local disadvantages such as road congestion that arise. It would be better to include the number of net new jobs and calibre of jobs (and as a sub-set, the number of those jobs allocated to local residents). <p><u>GVA/ GDP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received state that GVA is a good indicator and that the current approach is outdated. A package of measures is suggested. A bias towards largescale warehousing does not maximise job opportunities. Strategic focus should be on outputs. Some people think that economic growth should be measured by the increase in number of jobs and increase in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), rather than by employment land figures. <p><u>Commuting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some comments state that another useful measure would be the reduction in out-bound commuting which would measure local employment generation. Reducing travel distance to work is important. Providing suitable employment within rural centres and villages. Reducing unemployment. Increasing part time work opportunities for those of retirement age. <p><u>Miscellaneous</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that the current Local Plan appears to be a blunt instrument that has little prospect of successful delivery or satisfactorily monitoring delivery 	<p>the amount of floorspace gained and lost. Not only is this important, but monitoring also needs to record the types of uses (Use Classes) the employment falls into. By recording this information officers are able to gain an understanding of the sectors that are performing best, how land is being used and where. This approach allows the Council to understand which sectors are contributing most to the South Somerset economy in terms of jobs as well of land take.</p> <p>Increases in GVA and GDP will be also be measured through the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR).</p> <p>The District Council has no way of monitoring commuting annually. Census data is too infrequent. The Local Plan Review can only provide the planning framework to support business growth. This includes allocating land to meet identified need and supporting the Council’s own Economic Development Strategy.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>of jobs or performance. South Somerset’s rural economy appears to have been strong, as has the self-employed sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is also suggested that KPIs could include how many young people return after completing a university degree; and how long do vacant commercial properties and homes remain so. 	
5.7	Should the Local Plan remove the jobs growth figures by settlement in Policy SS3 and provide a District-wide figure to be monitored instead?	<p><u>Jobs Monitoring</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was disagreement on this issue. On the one hand, people felt that when combined with housing growth by settlement it provides an indication of how successfully employment growth correlates with housing growth. Otherwise, housing growth will not reflect local employment growth, which runs contrary to the objectives for increased self-containment. Others felt that it appears logical to remove jobs growth figures by settlement as it has clearly failed and this also reflects on the housing growth. SSDC appears to have recognised it can’t dictate to businesses where they should be located. It is agreed that a considerable proportion of jobs will be dispersed and not necessarily urban focussed. A smaller number of relatively small strategic locations for employment land should be identified primarily on PDL. <p><u>Homeworking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is commented that micro enterprises requiring little land are the way forward; accompanied by improvements to technology, homeworking and a mobile workforce. <p><u>Brexit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some thought that there should be an acknowledgement that Brexit may have an impact. 	<p>Jobs Monitoring: Experience has demonstrated that monitoring jobs at a settlement level is not practical. The Local Plan Review (LPR) will monitor jobs growth at a District-wide level. It will also monitor employment land and this will be done at a settlement basis.</p> <p>It is considered that place based employment land requirements give developers and communities more clarity and certainty about future development in individual settlements. The Local Plan Review can only provide the planning framework to support business growth.</p> <p>Homeworking: This comment is noted and is very much reflected in the evidence base which generates the jobs and</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>employment land requirements for the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Brexit: It is acknowledged that Brexit might have an impact and this is relevant to the economic projections which support the predicted jobs and subsequent employment land requirements for the Local Plan Review. However, Brexit is so uncertain that until there is some clarity surrounding the future of the UK in Europe, the projections will not be revised.</p>
5.8	What additional infrastructure would be required to support the provision of the additional new homes and economic development?	<p><u>Roads/ Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that development which would increase traffic on small roads that are severely impacted by HGV lorries and congestion should be suspended until there is funding to protect communities (provision of pavements, lights etc). Many 'B' roads are already overloaded. Housing and particularly employment should be located adjacent to the strategic road network. • Highways England would seek mitigation for any development site which has severe impact on the SRN. It would expect the mitigation to be identified at the Local Plan stage and agreed with HE. This should take the form of an Infrastructure Development Plan. There would be concern relating to potential site allocations along the A303 and the impacts this may have in terms of traffic generation. • It is stated that cross-border working on transport, particularly on bus services and community transport is vital to maintain access to key services, 	<p>Somerset County Council are the Highways Authority and Highways England are responsible for the strategic road network (SRN). Both organisations have been consulted as part of this process and Somerset County Council are providing SSDC on feedback in relation to the proposed preferred options.</p> <p>SSDC and SCC are fully engaged and working together in the Development Consent Order process for the planned improvements to the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>especially in relation to Yeovil. A sustainable transport interchange in Yeovil would be supported and reference to this should be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dorset County Council says it has a long term aspiration to improve the links between the A37 and A3088, which provide part of a major regional freight route network for businesses in south and west Dorset. It is disappointed that improvements have not been made to match those to the south within Dorset. There also remain concerns about accessibility of key employment sites in Weymouth and Portland to the national motorway network – funding streams through the Transport Investment Strategy should be fully exploited for improvements. The proposed Yeovil SUE to the south of the town provides an opportunity to deliver a local link road to the A37, which could also reduce traffic on the Quicksilver roundabout and West Coker Road, bringing health, air quality and safety benefits to local residents; the route of the link is not currently identified, but the opportunity should be taken in connection with YEO 6,7 and 8. • Somerset County Council states that full traffic modelling is required to assess infrastructure needs. It strongly agrees with the IDP which states that a District-wide Transport Strategy is developed. • Charging points for electric vehicles. • Specific comments have been received relating to Castle Cary and these are dealt with in that Section. • Curry Rivel is a village with in excess of 2500 residents with over 1000 households and improvements to Parking, Highways, Pavements and the creation of cycle ways needs action now. • The proposed route for the A303 improvements has a detrimental impact on West Camel unless a relief road is built for local traffic in for use in the event of an accident or blockage on the A303. <p><u>Rail</u></p>	<p>Walking and cycling: Walking and cycling infrastructure provision in association with development proposals is addressed through Policy TA1 and in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2015/2016</p> <p>Rail: There are currently no feasibility studies which support the re-opening of railway stations in South Somerset. The current priorities regarding Rail are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2015/2016. The extension to Castle Cary train station car park is identified under the Priority 2 schemes.</p> <p>SSDC is fully aware of the need to consult with the relevant rail operator regarding the Preferred Options and will continue to do</p> <p>Buses: Improvements to bus services are sought through S106 agreements in associated with development where it is justified and viable to do so.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase access to the railway network – provide new stations near settlements and development sites; link to community transport. • Any developments which would result in a material increase in the character of traffic using rail level crossings should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that safety would not be compromised or mitigation measures are provided. This could be the case with CREW1 and CACA4. The Council has a statutory responsibility to consult the rail undertaker in such circumstances. <p><u>Buses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better public transport needed. • In Dowlish Wake they do not have a bus service – an increasing concern of the elderly. Recently, the ford has run across the road twice, stopping vehicles from entering. Roads to/from Dowlish Wake are predominantly single-track, so extra traffic would cause a severe strain on the road structure and dynamics of the area, like for many villages. <p><u>Cycling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of high quality cycling infrastructure in all main settlements, combined with measures to remove through traffic from residential streets, to form a viable and attractive walking and cycling network. • NDDC would like to work with SSDC towards the continuation of the existing North Dorset Trailway to Templecombe via Henstridge, which would offer substantial economic, social and environmental opportunities. <p><u>Technology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology infrastructure should be improved. High speed broadband must be a priority to facilitate productivity. Continual upgrading of technology, 	<p>There are three Community Transport Schemes in South Somerset providing essential journeys for those who do not have access to a car or public transport. Typical journeys include medical appointments, Day Care Centre visits and shopping.</p> <p>South Somerset Community Transport operates a fleet of wheelchair accessible minibuses in the Yeovil, Chard, Ilminster, Somerton and Langport areas. The scheme also operates South Somerset Community Cars offering bespoke journeys and the pre-bookable Chard & Ilminster Slinky bus.</p> <p>South Somerset Community & Accessible Transport (SSCAT) similarly provides accessible transport to the communities of Wincanton, Bruton, Castle Cary and the surrounding villages including the ring & ride 'CAT' bus and a community car scheme.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>encouragement of provision of fibre through Openreach fibre to premises free network.</p> <p><u>Flooding/ Water/ Sewerage/ Utilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear whether the alternative rates of growth and spatial strategies have been considered in the context of infrastructure improvements by Wessex Water. • Failure to update flood risk evidence and refinement of allocations adequately before submission would result in the EA considering the Plan unsound. The NPPF requires the Council to demonstrate through evidence that flood risk is considered in the site allocation process, so the SFRA must be updated. All types of flooding including surface water run-off should be included. • The NPPF requires the Council to prevent new and existing development from contributing to unacceptable levels of water pollution. • Subject to location and extent: Additional sewers and pumping stations Additional treatment capacity at sewage treatment works Additional water mains and boosting stations. • Support renewable energy provision. • Upgrading electricity infrastructure to ensure development can connect to the grid at reasonable cost. <p><u>Healthcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To meet the core planning principles (para 17 of the NPPF) it is of upmost importance that healthcare provision is considered at the heart of any housing allocations. Whilst these services respond to the needs of residents, the health service is changing to prevention of ailments and it is key that the service can respond to the needs of the communities they are 	<p>Crewkerne Voluntary Transport, which is run entirely by volunteers, offers group transport for residents of Crewkerne, Merriot, Hinton and surrounding areas. However, this scheme does not offer hospital or medical transport.</p> <p>Broadband: SSDC will work with providers and the development industry to help ensure that broadband services for the residents of South Somerset can be the best possible.</p> <p>Flooding/Water/Sewerage/Utilities : The infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the Local Plan Review process and in association with the IDP. SSDC has jointly commissioned with Taunton Deane and West Somerset Councils the production of a Stage 1 Strategic Flood Risk assessment this will inform the plan going forward and the final report will be published on the Council's web site.</p> <p>Healthcare:</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>within; it also needs to respond to the District's ageing population. Symphony Health Services and Yeovil District Hospital will support SSDC to ensure that primary health services are considered as part of any housing allocations, with either a facility included within the allocation or a financial contribution sought to mitigate the expansion in population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Trust has developed a strategic masterplan for the period 2016-2031. From the masterplan the following projects are required to respond to population increase: Ward expansion – an additional ward will be required. Daycase Unit Development – planning application is in for a stand-alone daycase operating facility (17/01997/FUL). Expansion of the Emergency department into the space vacated by the existing daycase unit. Primary Care Development – to better manage the flow of unscheduled/emergency patients, better triaging will be required. This could include a more suitable environment such as a walk-in primary care centre and/or pharmacy located at the hospital. <p><u>Community Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The acknowledgement that additional infrastructure would be needed for education to support proposed housing is welcomed. Reference should be made to the fact that development in Yeovil and Milborne Port may have an impact on Secondary school places in Sherborne and should be reflected in any S106/CIL strategy. When specific sites are allocated, the Plan should identify specific sites that can deliver school places; the requirements for school delivery, the minimum site area, any preferred site characteristics and any requirements to safeguard land for expansion as necessary. The Plan should specify that provision of new schools will be confirmed at the application stage based on the latest data; and that requirements for delivery could change in the future. 	<p>Healthcare provision is taken into account as part of the LPR and the IDP processes. SSDC officers meet with representatives from NHS England, the Clinical Commissioning Group and Yeovil Hospital to understand the requirements for additional healthcare associated with development. With regards to GP provision the key areas to be addressed are Yeovil and Bruton.</p> <p>Community Services: SCC education officers have advised that the fact that some pupils from South Somerset chose to attend schools in Dorset is a matter of parental choice and those pupils can only be accommodated where there is capacity at the chosen school. The catchment school for Milborne Port is King Arthur's at Wincanton and there is capacity for new pupils at that school.</p> <p>SSDC officers meet regularly with Somerset County Council education officers and will seek to ensure that adequate school provision is provided to accommodate planned</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IDP should be updated and reflect the latest detailed assessment of education infrastructure by SCC. It should be made clear that school provision will sometimes be Priority One. Cross-boundary considerations should extend to SEND, the general costs of which should be secured from developers in general. The ESFA supports the Council's approach to the use of S106 and CIL. • Of particular concern is the A357 Henstridge/ Stalbridge corridor and potential impact on Stalbridge School. • The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places duties on local authorities to work with Police Authorities in tackling crime and disorder – alongside other service providers, the police are facing challenges from increasing demands from housing and population growth, but the Police are generally not considered appropriate recipients of developer contributions. <p><u>Garden Village</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that a more dispersed and flexible housing and economic growth strategy is likely to reduce major infrastructure requirements. If Yeovil continues to be the focus for 45-50% of housing growth further major highway and utilities infrastructure projects would be needed and likely have an impact on the desirability of the town as a preferred retail location. A Garden Village on A303 would be a positive to ensure the A303 upgrade is taken forward at an appropriate time. The Church Commissioners agree that proposals for a Garden Settlement at land north of Yeovilton provides an opportunity to deliver significant growth without putting unnecessary burden on existing infrastructure. • New water supply/sewerage networks and long connections to existing networks or new works will be required to serve a new garden village. <p><u>Miscellaneous</u></p>	<p>growth. S.106 contributions are sought where justified. Education provision is currently not included on SSDC's Regulation 123 list and is therefore not part of CIL. This could change when the Council reviews the list.</p> <p>Garden Village/Town: This is addressed in the section responding to Question 5.2</p> <p>Miscellaneous: These points are addressed above with regards to flood risk, in the section dealing with Policy SS2 (now SS4) and in the environmental policies.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be provision to create local employment within rural settlements, so that they don't just become dormitory villages. • Flood prevention and highways work at Hort Bridge. • The NPPF is clear that sustainable development includes the need to move to achieving net gains for nature and the need to contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reduce pollution. Policies should maintain the importance of watercourses and wetlands as priority habitats. 	
5.9	<p>Which of the following options do you think would best address previously developed land?</p> <p>5.9(a) Retain both Policy SS7 and Policy HG2 with no changes.</p> <p>5.9(b) Combine Policies SS7 and HG2 into one, but do not include the reference to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaction to this issue is mixed, with some thinking that both policies should remain (a). It is stated that it is essential the Council reacts positively to any future advice offered in Government Guidance in respect of brownfield housing delivery and the maintenance and management of a five-year housing land supply. It would be useful to identify contingency sites. • Others are supportive of merging them, saying, for example, that both policies seek to achieve the same outcome and could easily be combined (b); that site allocations should help to achieve the delivery of these sites; and that the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow development at any brownfield site which becomes available during the Plan period where there is no prospect of continuing employment. • One comment is that the development process is driven by opportunity and viability. It is hard to see how an embargo on greenfield development before PDL comes forward can operate other than to restrict supply and increase costs. • Several comments have been received concerning the required percentage of development on PDL. Some think that the 40% figure is conservative and needs to be increased to, say, 50% or more. Others think that a policy should be linked to others which place less infrastructure burdens on such development, and that a specific target should be removed. Some also think that the establishment of a Brownfield Land Register and associated 	<p>The NPPF 2018 supports the use of previously developed land but no longer includes the reference to locally set targets which was in the 2012 version.</p> <p>It is considered that the introduction of Brownfield Registers and the new permission in principle negate the requirement to set a local target but opportunities to make use of brownfield sites within existing settlements should generally be supported and encouraged. Particularly in Yeovil, Chard and Wincanton where Town Centre regeneration is a priority. Therefore Local Plan Policies SS7 and HG2 are not be included in the Local Plan Review document.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	the need to have a five-year housing land supply. 5.9(c) Another option (please specify).	<p>permission in principle negates the need for specific policies relating to brownfield land altogether; and that as the NPPF encourages the use of PDL rather than stipulating a sequential approach, local policy should not repeat national policy. In many cases, because of viability issues, the policies are too restrictive upon residential development coming forward when a 5 Year Housing Land Supply is not in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also stated that the development of PDL can often present constraints that are costly and time consuming to resolve, reducing the viability of schemes and the ability to provide affordable housing or other enhancements such as highways improvements. • One comment is that environmental value must be assessed and a precautionary approach is encouraged. A site would be considered of high environmental value if it contained priority habitats; holds a nature conservation designation; defined as a Local Wildlife Site; and would impact on eg. ancient woodland and aged and veteran trees 	
	Yeovil Spatial Portrait	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is support for the acknowledgement that Yeovil is the focus for employment, retail, services, and housing in South Somerset (para. 6.1); and as such, it is considered that the majority of new housing provided within the District should be located within the Yeovil area. • It is noted that Yeovil is surrounded by BMV agricultural land; Grade1 land should be retained for agriculture, particularly due to the recent resurgence is people growing their own food. • It is stated that net completion figure of 2,385 equates to roughly 217 per year; and that if this were to continue until 2028 this would equal 4774 - 2667 short of the projected 7441. The build rate should have improved in recent years for a number of economically favourable factors, including cheaper mortgages, lower interest rates and help for first-time buyers. The future does not look so favourable with, for example, higher interest rates and uncertainty over Brexit. • It is suggested that Yeovil could attract more tourists if it "marketed" the historic buildings in a combined way. Even a "small centre" which showed 	<p>A reference to the fact that much of the District is covered by best and most versatile agricultural land has been added to the section.</p> <p>The Yeovil Refresh project seeks to bring about overall improvement to Yeovil Town Centre and improved marketing will go hand in hand with the project.</p> <p>The Mudford Sustainable Urban Extension proposal includes and neighbourhood centre other facilities are proposed to be provided, the planning application is pending.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>the Roman Britain with instructions about how to get to various monuments etc would help.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is claimed that the Sustainable Urban Extensions are not sustainable, and not urban as they are out on a limb and take up valuable agricultural and historic land. One respondent lives on Wyndham Park and states that there is no post box on the estate, the buses are infrequent and not suitable for workers, the size of the estate equates to a medium-size village and, while the primary school has been finished, there are no other facilities on the estate at all. • Despite the specific mention in Paragraph 6.19, surprise is expressed that the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan was not mentioned in the Local Plan Review. 	<p>Neighbourhood Plans and their status are mentioned in each of the relevant settlement specific sections of the LPR Preferred Options document. The East Coker Neighbourhood Plan is referred to in the Yeovil section.</p>
6.1	<p>Which of the following options do you think should be taken forward through the LPR? 6.1(a) YEO 1: Land north of Oak Farm for mixed use 6.1(b) YEO 2: Land adjacent Yeovil Town Football Club for mixed use 6.1(c) YEO 3: Land at</p>	<p>(a) - <u>North of Oak Farm – mixed use</u></p> <p>Comments in favour of the site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in close proximity to existing employment land and the residential schemes north of Thorne Lane (220m) and at Lufton (500m). The housing, employment, retail, and other land opportunities combine to provide an holistic mix of uses to the north-west of Yeovil, providing an ideal base for further development. • The moderate landscape capacity and BMV agricultural land are not bars to development. • It is not in a floodplain; there are no rights of way through the land; it is outside the AQMA; and there are no obvious physical constraints within the site. <p>However, there are numerous objections to its possible inclusion:</p> <p>Heritage Assets</p>	<p>a) North of Oak Farm This site will not be taken forwards due to heritage constraints - SSSDC Conservation officers, Historic England and The National Trust have all objected because of the adverse impact on heritage assets.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Brimsmore for housing 6.1(d) YEO 4: Land at Marshes Hill Farm and at the junction of Combe Street Lane and A37 for housing 6.1(e) YEO 5: Land north of Mudford Road for housing 6.1(f) YEO 6: Land at Key Farm, Dorchester Road for housing 6.1(g) YEO 7: Land at Greggs Riding School and land off Sandhurst Road and Gunville Lane for housing 6.1(h) YEO 8: Land at White</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorne Coffin, first designated a conservation area in 1978, is so situated that there is little capacity for change without adverse impact upon its secluded character. • It involves development immediately abutting the Conservation Area and nine listed buildings, including St Andrews Church and The Old Rectory. This is a threat to an area with continuous community history stretching back to Anglo-Saxon era, with uninterrupted views of the historic village and Montacute House, and the current archaeological excavations of a Roman villa at Lufton. • SSDC Conservation Unit objects to the site, due to potential harm to Thorne Coffin Conservation Area, adjacent listed buildings; and Lufton Villa Scheduled Ancient Monument. • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity and are probably inappropriate for development. • There are objections as the site sits entirely within the identified setting of Montacute House registered landscape. The site is visible from the house; and the continued encroachment of Yeovil to the west is increasingly visible during the day, but also evident within hours of darkness and late afternoon in winter. <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational facilities, both primary and secondary are lacking in this area, the new primary schools being built at Brimsmore and Lufton will barely address current shortage. <p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road and transport access are completely inadequate. Highways issues are a major concern in the area. Rat- running is already a problem and the 	<p>It is not known what the view of SCC is in respect of school places in the area, but this is a matter for the education authority.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Post / Yeovil Court for housing 6.1(i) YEO 9: Extension of Yeovil North East Sustainable Urban Extension for housing 6.1(j) YEO 10: Land at Watercombe Lane for housing 6.1(k) YEO 11: Land at Dairy House Farm for housing 6.1(l) YEO 12: Lufton 2000 for economic development 6.1(m) YEO 13: Land part of allocation S/WECO/1 for housing 6.1(n) YEO 14: Land at	<p>Western Corridor improvements are only designed to cater for existing development and allocations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an historic problem with YTFC supporters parking. <p>(b) <u>Adjacent Yeovil Town FC – for mixed use</u></p> <p>Comments in favour include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit’s preferred options from a landscape perspective. • This is only of three options that would not be on BMV agricultural land. <p>Those not in favour of the allocation state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of covenants associated with this land – designated as recreation land for community use. The viability of the site could be an issue. Huish Park Stadium and surrounding land are included in SSDC’s ‘Assets of Community Value Register’ – agreed in April 2016. This land would be appropriate for Local Green Space designation. Just 10 dwellings will have little impact on housing need. • It would mean the loss of pitch/ parkland area and loss of essential football parking. <p>(c) - <u>Brimsmore</u></p> <p>Comments in favour of the site’s inclusion are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies submitted by CBRE all state reasons in support of the option: including Landscape & Visual Opportunities and Constraints; Vision and Design Concept; Land Budget; Framework Plan; and Transport Appraisal. 	<p>The Highway Authority have raised concerns about narrow roads and there being no pedestrian provisions on either side of the road.</p> <p>(b) Adjacent Yeovil Town FC This site is the subject of a planning application and its suitability for development will be decided through the determination of that application. There is no need at this stage to allocate the site in the Local Plan.</p> <p>(c) Land at Brimsmore This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Babylon Hill – West Dorset District for housing 6.1(o) Another option (please specify)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in two ownerships and is being actively promoted collectively. The land has a rolling topography, most notably in its north eastern corner where it slopes more steeply down to ponds and wooded area. • It can deliver 175-200 homes and would complement the Brimsmore Key Sites. <p>Concerns about the site are mainly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestion and the access onto the A37. • There is no continual pedestrian link from Tintinhull Road to Yeovil. There is a crawler lane on the A37; and there will be a potential need for a right-turn lane, which may not be possible because of this. <p>(d) - <u>Marshes Hill Farm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comment in favour of the site states that this is 5.5 ha of greenfield land on northern edge of Yeovil. It is stated that, given the topography the site, it is of limited agricultural use. Recent discussions with Somerset County Council have confirmed the principle for the tipping of inert waste on the site- so site could serve two positive purposes. The site would be available within the plan period and could accommodate 100 plus dwellings. • There are though concerns about the need to restrict further development to the north of Yeovil due to traffic congestion and the access onto the A37. <p>(e) <u>North of Mudford Road</u></p>	<p>Access onto the A37, although difficult due to crawler lane and height of bank, might be possible, although the preferred route would be off Tintinhull Road - may need improvements to the double roundabout where Tintinhull Road meets Thorne Lane.</p> <p>(d) Marshes Hill Farm The topography would also restrict capacity for residential development.</p> <p>It is not known what SCC's views on the tipping of waste here is.</p> <p>There is no need to take the site forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>It is agreed that an assessment of the impact on A37 may be needed.</p> <p>(e) North of Mudford Road This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option, although the</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comment in support states that this includes two HELAA sites – although S/YEWI/0004 is identified as having low capacity, it is considered that all of that parcel could be included without harm in view of the development to the south. The site could benefit from infrastructure being provided for YV2 SUE. • Concerns about the site are that it is particularly visible across the valley from the A303 and could potentially lead to development further north. • The landscape impact would be severely detrimental. • There is no pedestrian footway. <p>(f) - <u>Key Farm, Dorchester Road</u></p> <p>Reasons given for preferring this Option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict further development to the north of Yeovil due to traffic congestion. • One of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred options from a landscape perspective. • There is support on the basis that adequate infrastructure is already in place or preplanned. • Wessex Farms Trust owns a large part of the site and it would form a southern extension to the Yeovil SUE at Keyford. The site extends to 24ha and could include 630 dwellings, 3ha of employment land and 3ha of internal green space; an extension of the SUE sports and school area; buffer landscaping, attenuation ponds; and a riverside walk. It could be integrated with the SUE. <p>Concerns about the possible allocation are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been ruled out by two planning inspectors. 	<p>northern part of the site is visually sensitive and any development should be restricted to that part closest to Mudford Road, with strong landscaping to the north.</p> <p>Footways would need to be provided.</p> <p>(f) Key Farm Dorchester Road This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>The Local Plan Inspector stated that "There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate conclusively that development would have serious consequences in terms of light pollution and there is no substantive evidence that there would be any threat to the setting of the ancient monument (Roman Villa) or to any other heritage asset". However, a Heritage Impact Assessment would probably be required.</p> <p>The status of BMV Grade 1 need not necessarily rule out development in principle. The Local Plan Inspector expressed the view that "It is correct</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is Grade 1 Agricultural land. • Horsey Lane roundabout will be near capacity near 2020 according to SCC Highways department. • The cycleway has not been demonstrated as viable by the developer, SCC or SSDC. • There is no pedestrian link and it is a narrow road. The realignment of roundabout arm may be necessary. • This is not in the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan; and it would be harmful to the separate rural character of North Coker and East Coker • Housing and employment are logically moving towards the A303 which would mitigate any further increase in general flow of traffic across Yeovil from south to north. • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • A respondent is concerned about being overlooked, making them vulnerable to flooding from run-off; and making the house darker. <p>(g) – <u>Greggs Riding school and Sandhurst Road/Gunville Lane</u></p> <p>Support for the Option is given for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The owner of the land at Greggs Riding School, the northern section, reiterates the land remains available for development. The owner of three parcels in the option believes the other two owners are sympathetic to development of the overall area. The owner is hoping to move the equine development to a more rural location, more suitable for the horses; away 	<p>that some high quality agricultural land would be lost but a balance has to be struck between seeking to boost significantly the supply of housing and protecting land of agricultural quality”.</p> <p>It is not known what SCC’s views on the Horsey Lane roundabout are.</p> <p>The details of the cycleway and other highways issues would be ascertained at the time a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>The East Coker Neighbourhood plan expresses the number of dwellings to be built in the Parish as a minimum. Other comments are noted.</p> <p>(g) Greggs Roding School and Sandhurst Road/Gunville Lane</p> <p>There are a number of constraints to this site that would restrict development; and there is no need to allocate the site to meet Yeovil’s housing needs during the new Plan period to 2036.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>from the noises and other intrusions associated with being close to the A30 and the built environment, including fireworks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is surrounded on three sides by existing housing; and it is not visible from the vernacular of East Coker. • It can provide a sufficient volume to provide generously towards the figures for growth. It is in close proximity to Keyford, Leonardo, the Western Corridor and Yeovil Junction. It would assist with Policy YV5, the Local Plan strategic objectives and infrastructure requirements set out in figure 6.8. • A “bolt on” to the SUE at Keyford in area YEO7 would appear sensible; and adequate infrastructure is already in place or pre-planned. • It is one of SSDC Conservation Unit’s preferred options from a landscape perspective. <p>There are, however, also a number of concerns that have been raised, most of which are the same as those raised in relation to Option YEO6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been ruled out by two planning inspectors. • This is Grade 1 Agricultural land. • Horsey Lane roundabout will be near capacity near 2020 according to SCC Highways department. • The cycleway has not been demonstrated as viable by the developer, SCC or SSDC. • This is not in the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan. It would be harmful to the separate rural character of North Coker and East Coker • There is no reference to Naish Priory or the sunken lanes which feature in T.S.Eliot’s poem. • Housing and employment are logically moving towards the A303 which would mitigate any further increase in general flow of traffic across Yeovil from south to north 	<p>The significance of Naish Priory and other adjacent listed buildings is recognised; and the East Coker CA. There may scope for some limited development within this area. The extent of built form would need to be determined by a heritage impact assessment.</p> <p>See also responses in respect of YEO 6.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • Pedestrian footways would need to be considered and road widths to accommodate development. There are concerns about the access. <p>(h) – <u>White Post</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 6.3 states that the option combines part of HELAA site S/EACO/0004 in addition to land adjacent to the east and west where there is believed to be developer interest. The inclusion of the adjacent land could provide opportunity to create a new access from West Coker Road. • The Peripheral Landscape Study identifies the land as having a moderate-high capacity to accommodate built development. The site could accommodate around 130 dwellings. • Consultation responses to the 17/03673/OUT ‘Land East of Holywell, West Coker Road...’ show the development is acceptable from a landscape, visual impact, highways, ecology, heritage, drainage, and ground condition. • The site is both developable and deliverable. • This is only one of three Options that do not include BMV agricultural land. • It is one of SSDC Conservation Unit’s preferred options from a landscape perspective. • The site is within 500m of ancient woodland, so the Forestry Commission’s general policy advice should be considered. (A number of policy documents and strategies are referred to). • There is support on the basis that adequate infrastructure is already in place or preplanned. <p>There have been a number of objections, nearly all of which are identical to those expressed in relation to Options YEO6 and YEO7.</p>	<p>(h) White Post A planning application (17/03673/OUT) for in the region of 95 dwellings was approved at Area South on 2nd May 2018 – and subsequently at Regulation Committee. At the time of writing, there is no need to allocate this site as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>See earlier comments relating to BMV agricultural land.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been ruled out by two planning inspectors. • This is Grade 1 Agricultural land. • Horsey Lane roundabout will be near capacity near 2020 according to SCC Highways department. • The cycleway has not been demonstrated as viable by the developer, SCC or SSDC. • This is not in the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan. It would be harmful to the separate rural character of North Coker and East Coker • There is no reference to Naish Priory or the sunken lanes which feature in T.S.Eliot's poem. • Housing and employment are logically moving towards the A303 which would mitigate any further increase in general flow of traffic across Yeovil from south to north • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • Concerns about where the access will be and about the site crossing over the public highway. <p>(i) - <u>Extension to North East SUE</u></p> <p>Comments in support of the Option are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be able to leverage some infrastructure being provided in connection with the SUE, although heritage issues and safety concerns regarding the gas main will need to be considered. A new site (Plan supplied) could be added, which although identified as having low capacity, could also leverage infrastructure in the SUE as well as providing an additional point of access. • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred options from a landscape perspective. 	<p>(i) Extension to North East SUE Comments noted, but this site is not being taken forward Preferred Option as there is no need to allocate it in order for Yeovil to meet its housing needs and fulfil its role as the Principal Town in the District; and given the availability and deliverability of other more suitable sites.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>A large number of objections to the site being taken forward refer to the following areas of concern:</p> <p>Anthrax</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns for local people's health • The whole site may have been contaminated by the spores due to the spreading of waste from the tannery. • Ten or so cattle have died from anthrax over many years and have been buried on the site. The exact locations of the burials are unknown. • A proper scan of the site is needed. • SSDC appears to be working to a document which claims to have found 95% of the bacteria, leaving 5% unaccounted for – a very low standard of safety. • The report commissioned by Mudford Parish Council by world experts in Land Quality Management states that far more test points are required to be undertaken, or the application withdrawn. <p>Visual Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is an area of great visual amenity when looking at it from the north. • The Inspector attached a condition to the outline permission for tree planting to screen the buildings on site. A later addition effectively removed those trees. <p>Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bigger attenuation tanks to be constructed further down the slope are positioned over the gas main from Poole to Bristol. Many thought the scheme insufficient without the additional tanks which will have to be repositioned. It cannot be evidenced that the scheme will not result in increased flood risk, so it should be dropped. 	<p>The possible presence of contaminated soil is noted, but it is for the developer to resolve any related issues. It is also being addressed in connection with the current planning application.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the northernmost section of the Option has a moderate to low capacity for development, but the majority has a moderate capacity.</p> <p>Drainage and flood mitigation can be considered through the development management process and this issue alone need not preclude development of the site.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Archaeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a medieval village over a significant part of the site. <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of grade 1 agricultural land. • Proximity to a local wildlife site • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • There is a risk of flooding to Mudford and other villages downstream; and there is no agreement who would manage the attenuation scheme. • Concerns about where the access would be; how it would link to the southern SUE and details of footway links required. The highway through the site may need to be upgraded. 	<p>Although the Historic Environment Record refers to indications of a shrunken settlement, no features or finds have been recorded. The site is not a County Archaeological Site and not designated an Area of High Archaeological Potential. An archaeological assessment would be required through the development management process.</p> <p>The loss of BMV in itself would not be sufficient reason to prevent development in principle.</p> <p>There is no reason in principle why a local wildlife site could not be integrated into a development as long as it was protected and any potential harm mitigated.</p> <p>The significance of local assets is recognised, but HE suggests that there is scope for some limited development within the area. The final extent of built form should be determined by a heritage impact assessment, with due respect given to the settings of the local heritage assets.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(j) – <u>Watercombe Lane</u></p> <p>Comments in support include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has a moderate to high capacity to accommodate built development. • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit’s preferred options from a landscape perspective. • The site is now subject to a current planning application and should be taken forward if this is not yet approved. <p>Concerns expressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity • There is an Issue about how access would be gained from Watercombe Lane as there is a crawler lane; and the footway on other side of road. <p>(k) – <u>Dairy House Farm</u></p> <p>Support is given for this Option for the following reasons:</p>	<p>Drainage would need to be the subject of a mitigation management plan.</p> <p>It could be accessed via the NE Urban extension. Depends on the capacity of the new roundabout off Mudford Hill.</p> <p>(j) Watercombe Lane A planning application has been submitted (17/03320/OUT) for a residential development for up to 100 dwellings. The acceptability of the site will be determined through the decision on the planning application and there is no need to allocate the site.</p> <p>(k) Dairy House Farm</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has a moderate to high capacity to accommodate built development. • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit’s preferred options from a landscape perspective. • YEO11 and 12 could be combined with other land in the vicinity (Plan supplied) to form a more significant urban extension of up to an additional 25ha in conjunction with YEO1. By connecting with the Lufton Trading Estate, a valuable alternative route for commercial traffic could be provided. <p>The concerns expressed about the inclusion of the site are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Owners may wish to retain it as agricultural land. • SSDC Conservation Unit state the site has the potential to erode the setting of Lufton Manor listed building and suggest this is a constraint upon development opportunity. • The site sits entirely within the identified setting of Montacute House registered landscape. The site is visible from the house; and the continued encroachment of Yeovil to the west is increasingly visible during the day, but also evident within hours of darkness and late afternoon in winter. • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • There are issues about pedestrian link; a single lane leading to site and the junction with New Road. <p>(l) – <u>Lufton 2000 – for economic development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YEO11 and 12 could be combined with other land in the vicinity (Plan supplied) to form a more significant urban extension of up to an additional 25ha in conjunction with YEO1. By connecting with the Lufton Trading Estate, a valuable alternative route for commercial traffic could be provided. 	<p>SSDC Conservation Officers, Historic England and the National Trust have all raised concerns regarding impact on Montacute House, so this site will not be taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>Access could potentially be gained through the Lufton site.</p> <p>(l) Lufton 2000</p> <p>SSDC Conservation Officers, Historic England and the National Trust have all raised concerns regarding impact on Montacute</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site forms part of the Bunford Park Site actively being progressed for economic development through the current application for mixed use development and benefitting from outline planning permission for a business park. Hence, the land has planning permission for employment uses and is also subject to a current mixed business park and food store development application. • Land forming part of the Bunford Park Site but not previously allocated for employment purposes or benefitting from outline planning permission should be taken forward in the LPR process as forming a suitable extension to employment allocation ME/WECO/1 • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • There are issues over the access onto Watercombe Lane; how it could affect the highway and roundabout upgrade; and the proximity to the crawler lane. The footway is also on the other side of the road. <p>(n) – <u>Babylon Hill</u></p> <p>Comments in support of the Option are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site provides a logical eastern extension to Yeovil and can be developed with a range of housing types. Preliminary highway investigations indicate that only limited highway infrastructure/alterations are necessary. Whilst part of the site is in the flood plain there is a significant area that is not. • Some housing in West Dorset could be of mutual benefit will co-operation between the authorities. 	<p>(n) Babylon Hill</p> <p>This site is not in South Somerset and will not be taken forward as a Preferred Option. It is not supported by West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Council.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This, the south west quadrant of Yeovil has very good transport links and would provide opportunities for expansion if the political geography is ignored. <p>Concerns about the Option include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total potential capacity for development across the 14 sites around Yeovil totals 2,925 additional dwellings; and WDDC will have regard to this in considering whether to take forward the option for Babylon Hill. It would appear that the Babylon Hill site will not be required to meet the housing needs of South Somerset or Yeovil. • There are no direct links to the Somerset highway network. Pedestrian and cycle links and connectivity needs to be understood. <p>(o) - <u>Other Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bunford and Lufton 2000 - should have small scale housing in proximity to the strategic employment but with the focus of on increased development within the urban footprint of Yeovil. • Land to the north-west of Brimsmore , Thorne Lane/Tinitnhul Road (Brimsmore Key Site extension) - A 20ha parcel of land to the north-west edge for approx. 400 dwellings at 35dph on 12ha of land; 8ha of green space (40% of total site – garden village standard); good linkages to the full range of facilities to be provided to the Brimsmore site; an off-road footpath/cyclepath linking to the road system to Chilthorne Domer; two road accesses and servicing from the Brimsmore site. The proposed Brimsmore scheme would sit in a low-lying valley between two ridgelines, with planting and ground-modelling meaning housing would mostly be hidden from the wider landscape to the north and west. There would be a landscaped buffer 	<p>o) Other Options Bunford - SSDC Conservation Officers, Historic England and the National Trust have all raised concerns regarding impact on Montacute House arising from the development of land in this area.</p> <p>Brimsmore – This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>between the site and the building known as the “White House”. Separation between the site and Thorne Coffin to be achieved by their own large gardens; a series of private fields which ring the village (60-80m deep or greater) of which two of the fields have continuous rows of trees along the boundary of the proposed scheme; a 40m wide new landscaped buffer strip with extensive tree planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercombe Lane - The possible inclusion of additional land to the north of the A30 may be worth considering. Some of the land was granted O/L approval in 2015 and the remainder is the subject of a recent planning application. • Coombe Street Lane - Land at junction of A37 adjacent to YEO 4. A 2.3 ha site on the northern edge of Yeovil. Grade 3 agricultural land. Available within the plan period and could accommodate 60 plus dwellings. Located within close proximity of local education (1 km and 700m), shops (700m) and recreational facilities (250 m). Regular bus service to town centre. • Lane east of A37 and north of land identified as YEO 4 – The site comprises approx. 20 ha of land in the countryside on the northern edge of Yeovil. Site forms part of one local farm holding comprising semi-improved grassland (Grade 3 agricultural land). Site will be available in the plan period and could accommodate 600 plus units providing a logical extension to option YEO 3 and 4. Site within 1-2km of higher education, close to recreational facilities (250m-500m), neighbourhood shopping outlets (600m-1200m), secondary education (700m-1400m) and a regular bus service to Yeovil. • Eastville Road – The site comprises aged commercial buildings with limited lifespan. No longer capable of viable commercial refurbishment. A new use must be found. Potential for conversion is being explored but retention considered unlikely. Demolition could allow the site to accommodate around 	<p>Watercombe Lane - Planning permission has now been granted and Reserved Matters approved for 97 dwellings (see 13/01869/OUT).</p> <p>Coombe Street Lane and East of A37 – There are no facilities at Yeovil Marsh – considered not suitable in HELAA.</p> <p>Would extend a finger of built development away from Yeovil into open countryside and comprise ribbon development along the A37.</p> <p>Eastville Road - This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>15 houses /40 flats. Sustainable location close to two religious centres schools (350-1,000m), railway station (900m), town centre (350m), supermarket (250m) and commercial/retail employment centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Michaels Road - north of the junction with Victoria Road The site comprises aged commercial buildings with limited lifespan. No longer capable of viable commercial refurbishment. Demolition could allow the site to accommodate around 20 units. Sustainable location adjacent to public recreation and MUGA, close proximity to schools (300-900m), railway station (400m) and close to town centre (1km), supermarket (500m) and commercial/employment centre. • Land adjoining Lufton College – Agricultural land of 5.297ha. Believe adjacent landowners have similar aspirations as to development. • Adjoining proposed land at Lufton College – a site of 5.059ha which forms part of a previous planning application for communing support and leisure use. • Land at Lufton (3.30 ha) and land at Thorne Coffin (9.77 ha) – part of this site is in YEO 1. Two additional omission sites put forward by the landowner for residential and or commercial use. 	<p>St Michael's Road - This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option</p> <p>Lufton College - SSDC Conservation Officers, Historic England and the National Trust have all raised concerns regarding impact on Montacute House arising from the development of land in this area.</p> <p>Land at Lufton and Thorne Coffin- Remote and inaccessible location in area of deeply rural character. Would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Montacute Estate. Any development would be visually intrusive for the foreseeable future. Thorne Coffin - Rural countryside location not suitable for development. Would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the Thorne Lane Conservation Area and Listed</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North of Mudford Road would be available, suitable and deliverable within five years. Two parcels of land were identified as such in the 2017 HELAA. Option YEO5 6.1(e) forms part of this land and adjoining land also identified in the HELAA. However, the option does not make best use of the opportunities here and the overall landscape impact on Yeovil could be improved by a more comprehensive, landscape led design approach. An area of 6.75ha of developable land could be brought forward, including many public and green spaces. The site is well related to the existing urban edge and its impact on Yeovil is one of consolidation rather than a further ribbon projecting into open countryside. There are good opportunities for access. • West of Bunford Hollow, adjacent to YEO10 - could be developed for housing, subject to peripheral landscaping, adding a further capacity of 6.7ha in a sustainable location. • Marsh Lane - very near to YEO3 and YEO4 could be considered for development. 	<p>Buildings. Concerns also expressed about the impact on setting of the Montacute Estate - SSDC Conservation Unit objects.</p> <p>North of Mudford Road - HELAA Site Ref E/MUDF/0004 - . Development area would be reduced by High Visual Sensitivity (PLS). This site is development not taken forward as a Preferred Option. See e) above.</p> <p>Bunford Hollow - HELAA Ref S/BRYM/0013 – There is a very rural character to surrounding area to the north and west. Also unsuitable for large scale development due to proximity of listed buildings and historic estates at Montacute and Brympton d'Evercy.</p> <p>Marsh Lane - HELAA Ref S/YEWI/0010 - Although a relatively sustainable location in principle, its</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cartgate - The A303 plays a significant role in influencing the spatial strategy and location of economic growth. A new mixed use development here should be included to maximise accessibility to the wider transport network, attracting employers and capture tourist spend through the creation of a gateway to the south-west. <p><u>General Comments</u> (Where submitted comments have referred to this section but have related to new infrastructure that should be provided, these are included in Section 6.5 below)</p> <p>Landscape and Agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to protect identities and integrity of the villages closest to Yeovil and to ensure an adequate undeveloped green space between town edge and village. • All the suggested options will only lead to urban sprawl and the digestion of local villages. 	<p>limited accessibility makes the site unsuitable for such a large number of dwellings.</p> <p>Cartgate - HELAA Ref N/MART/0036 - Foldhill Lane is very narrow. Immediately adjacent to A303, but otherwise relatively remote - about 7m (4.3 miles) to the edge of Yeovil. Highways England could potentially object. No pavements. No residential nearby.</p> <p>Comment noted – landscape buffers to development sites may be required. The Peripheral Landscape Study for Yeovil identifies the most visually sensitive areas.</p> <p>Comment noted, but Yeovil needs to grow to fulfill its role as the Principal Town in the District and to meet housing need in the most sustainable location.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Regeneration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sites in Yeovil should be proceeded with as a priority in order to meet housing targets and regenerate the town centre. If possible, sites should have underground car parking with mixed uses above. <p>Amount of Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of proposed houses is too large and based on better economic times with better employment. • Using the Govt's standard OAN methodology, all of the sites will be needed. The two SUEs are not currently counted as commitments – if they are, the overall residual requirement becomes more manageable. Using the lop methodology, there is a requirement for 1,255 dwellings; and using the White Paper method, 2,524, in which case, all of the larger sites will be required. • Large scale development in the form of Key Sites (SUEs) have not been the most effective for delivering flexible housing growth. Significant SEA, viability and major impact issues on communities make these options most unsatisfactory and nor supported by many Parishes. 	<p>The regeneration of Yeovil Town Centre is a key priority for the District. Town Centre parking requirements could potentially be reduced.</p> <p>Yeovil is the Principal Town in the District and is the most sustainable location for development.</p> <p>The need to use the Government's Standard Methodology is acknowledged, but not all the sites will be needed but not all of the sites will be required. The total provision for Yeovil in the Plan Period is proposed to be over 5300, including the SUEs</p> <p>By their very nature, large scale urban extensions will take longer to be implemented because of their complexity and infrastructure requirements, but they are still required in the longer term.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeovil's 2014 to 2034 housing growth should be in balance with the remainder of the District as approx. 30% of the District total, borne out by the SHMA evidence and the under-delivery in the past. 	<p>The amount of housing proposed for Yeovil is about 33% of the District's total requirement.</p>
6.2	<p>Do you think the Council should allocate sites for retail and/or other forms of development in Yeovil Town Centre? If yes, please specify the site and the type of development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some support in principle for the option to allocate sites within Yeovil Town Centre for retail uses and/or other forms of development, but only on the basis that such allocations can be demonstrated as viable and the sites are capable of development in land assembly and ownership terms. It is stated that more town centre retail would reduce pressure for out of town development on the edge of Yeovil, including Babylon Hill. • There is however, also some reluctance over additional retail because of the number of existing vacancies. There is concern that the current market conditions mean that attracting significantly more retailing to the town is unlikely; and it is stated that the future of the Town Centre should be accommodation, leisure and a range of other activities. The utilisation of vacant retail/employment space for conversion to dwellings/flats/apartments which will revitalise the town centre is suggested. A more densely populated centre could create a vibrant place both in the day time and the evening. • It is stated that all of the sites which have been identified as potential allocations in and around the town centre have been around for many years, some of which have previously been allocated in earlier Local Plans. To accord with national policy it is important that such allocation are realistic (para 154 of the NPPF) and deliverable (para 173 of the NPPF). • It is stated that retail is not about the number of retail outlets but the quality; and that there is an excess of retail in the Town Centre and too many of inferior quality. 	<p>The Yeovil 'Refresh' project identifies several key regeneration sites that could include a range of uses including retail and these are allocated in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the retail sector and the role of town centres is changing; and that there is a need to diversify uses in the town centre, including more residential development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The type of retail provision in the Town Centre is beyond the control of the District Council, other than differentiating between comparison and convenience.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that potential uses for the Police Station building should be considered. • A Clarks Village on the Pittards site next to Pen Mill station is suggested. 	<p>Yeovil Police Station is to undergo a renovation and remain in its existing use.</p> <p>Noted. This is for the market to determine.</p>
6.3	Do you have any comments on the development opportunities within and adjoining Yeovil Town Centre?	<p>(Where submitted comments have referred to this section but have related to new infrastructure that should be provided, these are included in Section 6.5 below)</p> <p><u>Site-Specific Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 1 - Cattle Market – Due to its proximity, Yeovil District Hospital (YDH) has a vested interest in the redevelopment of this area. It would be interested in working with SSDC and the Cattle Market landowners to explore opportunities for mixed use development to come forward that includes healthcare or healthcare related uses e.g. admin offices or a step-down care home. • Site 9 - Bus Depot – YDH is currently working with a third party to masterplan and bring forward the Bus Depot site as a mixed-use scheme for key worker staff accommodation. Currently staff are accommodated in a variety of accommodation types across Yeovil. It states that demand for such accommodation is likely to continue given the reliance on overseas workers and shortage of local trained staff. • It is stated that Glovers Walk needs total redevelopment – the Council should explore joint ventures with developers to drive redevelopment. The Cattle Market also needs a shift in strategy. • A multi storey car park is suggested to be included as part of the mix on the Cattle Market site. • It is thought that that the urban village should be made a reality and to ensure as a priority the cattle market and bus depot and old Southern Electricity Board land are developed. 	<p>The Yeovil Refresh and Local Plan Review Preferred Options seek to maximise housing provision on brownfield sites within the town.</p> <p>SSDC are working closely with the landowners/developers of all the Yeovil Town Centre regeneration sites as part of the Yeovil Refresh project in order to develop them for a mix of uses, including residential, that will improve the vitality and viability of the town centre. Resources are being directed towards achieving this main objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An access strategy is being produced as part of the Yeovil Refresh.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Regeneration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent thinks that the LPR should establish the requirement for at least 60% of the Yeovil housing requirement to be met in the urban footprint. • It is stated that initial priorities should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of a visually exciting town centre Improvements to the Borough – a view of the church should be a focal point and the building blocking the view should be removed. The Borough and the top of town should be a traffic free zone which would enable markets and other organised events to take place in the Borough, King George Street and around the Church. No major changes can be made until there is a complete and comprehensive traffic plan for the whole town centre. There needs to be adequate parking close to the town centre. A large number of high quality residential units should be built in the town centre to support growth in leisure activities and night time economy. Night time security should be improved. Council offices could be moved from Brympton Way to the Police Station with the provision of adequate car parking. Use of brownfield sites should be prioritised in Yeovil. Regenerate Olds Garage site, the old Glove Factory on Reckleford/Eastland Road and have a vision for urban regeneration of Wyndham Street/Newton Road area. • It is suggested that the Council should promote specialist shops; and offer rate reductions for local retailers. It is asked whether there are opportunities for more individual retailers; and what is the availability of appropriately sized units? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Old Garage site now has planning permission for an Aldi store. • A development of the former bus depot has now been granted planning permission. <p>Comment noted, but this is unlikely to be achievable.</p> <p>Many of these comments are supported; and are being taken forward in the Local Plan Review and through the Yeovil 'Refresh' project.</p> <p>The type of retail provision in the Town Centre is beyond the control</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that sites have not been developed suggests technical difficulties expensive to overcome. The Council should lead a public/ private sector regeneration project involving the Chamber of Trade to look for resolutions to unblock them. • The Council should be looking at a SPD for the town centre, bringing together local retailers, organisations, employers and residents. <p><u>Access, Transport and Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is thought that development at the bus depot and Olds Garage should take into account congestion along Sherborne Road and A30. • It is stated that the report “delivering 21st century sustainable transport in Yeovil” should be re-visited with a view to allocating Stars Lane car park for development, with an alternative long stay site identified and any new capacity at Olds Garage site for example. Several car parks sites have been excluded on the basis of loss of car parking capacity. However, the Lichfield’s work clearly establishes that there is an excess of car parking capacity in the town. This suggests some car parks have been excluded that shouldn’t be, e.g. Stars lane. Car parking should be on the edge of a centre, accessed by a main road. Use of town centre site for surface level car 	<p>of the District Council, other than differentiating between comparison and convenience. It does not have the authority to influence the market in the way suggested. There is a recognised need to provide units of a size attractive to the market.</p> <p>SSDC are working closely with the landowners/developers of all the Yeovil Town Centre regeneration sites as part of the Yeovil Refresh project in order to develop them for a mix of uses, including residential, that will improve the vitality and viability of the town centre. Resources are being directed towards achieving this main objective.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>An Access Strategy, a Car Parking Action Plan and a Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan are being undertaken as part of the Yeovil Refresh Project.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		parking is not economic. Many centres are moving towards being car free. On the other hand, one comment is that parking spaces should not be used.	
6.4	Should the Primary Shopping Frontage for Yeovil be extended as shown in Figure 6.7?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reaction to this issue is mixed – with some support, but are others against it. It is stated that the primary shopping frontage is a protectionist policy preventing changes of use and investment generally. The town centre needs to adapt to survive, with more leisure, residential and food and drink outlets. 	The revised NPPF 2018 no longer defines or differentiates between Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages; and this will now not be taken forward.
	Yeovil Airfield Flight Safety Zone (Policy YV4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that existing flight safety cones to the west seem to support winged aircraft taking off in the east to west direction and the possibility of fuel dumping soon after take-off. However, there are a significant number of low level helicopter movements over Burton/East Coker which are understood to be test flights. Flight safety matters should be reviewed on a regular basis and whenever there are changes to operating practices or environment (nature of flights, types of aircraft, volumes, flight tracks etc.) 	The Flight Safety Contours are considered to remain appropriate. They will continue to be referred to in the Local Plan Review.
6.5	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Yeovil?	<p><u>Transport, Access and Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several of the development options could result in impacts on the SRN, specifically the A303. It is thought that road infrastructure will require improvement, especially after the Keyford site has been developed. Infrastructure to support new development is often not provided - there is already a daily tail back of vehicles accessing the Quicksilver Mail roundabout. Two Tower and Church Lanes are narrow for passing traffic and the situation will only get worse. A roundabout at the northern exit of the Keyford SUE is needed, including improvements to the adjacent junctions. Further building on top of the Keyford site will impact the road system – Hendford Hill and Forest Hill are busy at the best of times. 	Traffic impacts will be a considered in relation to any planning applications submitted.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear advantages to allocating the expansions of the SUEs as these can make use of the infrastructure already being provided. • One respondent thinks that the aspiration of 30% non-car travel cannot be achieved. • It is stated that there is very limited public transport. Feasibility work for a tramway is suggested. • It is suggested that a Park and Ride Car Park in the A3088 area is essential for restricting traffic growth in the town. It should free up land for the Urban Village to be established. • There is a suggestion that car parks should remain for what they are intended for; and if possible more car parks should be provided to reinvigorate the town centre. • More recent housing developments, built at a higher density (e.g. Wyndham Park) report problems related to parking, bus and emergency vehicle access. There needs to be a realistic maximum housing density that will allow full access to public transport, and safe access for ambulance, fire and police services. Wyndham Park included public transport but 6-7 years after the estate began there is still no bus service. • It is stated that electric bikes are now beginning to take a market share and are relevant to Yeovil, given its topography. There is a need to create more dedicated cycle ways on major desire lines and filtered permeability in residential areas. Recommend the guidance in “Making Space for cyclists” is recommended. • Infrastructure for electric transport is also suggested. • Future development should seek to provide convenient access to the two rail stations as well as access to other sustainable modes of travel. Any development proposal will need to be supported by appropriate and robust transport evidence. • The acknowledgement that rail is an important component of any transport strategy is welcomed. Improvements to connectivity between the Heart of 	<p>A tramway or Park and Ride site are very unlikely to be feasible or viable.</p> <p>An Access Strategy is being produced as part of the Yeovil Refresh.</p> <p>The County Council’s parking standards are referred to in the Local Plan Review preferred Options.</p> <p>Other comments are noted</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Wessex and West of England lines, including the Southern Chord are supported.</p> <p><u>Healthcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that Yeovil District Hospital is already overstretched as the local population has overgrown its capacity. • YDH state that the proximity of the hospital to the Town Centre is advantageous for staff, patients and visitors. The hospital site should be allocated for healthcare issues as a strategic employer. Allocation would protect the hospital from inappropriate neighbouring development and provide YDH with certainty that future healthcare and healthcare related development can occur in the future for the benefit of residents. This could include for a new Primary Care Centre. This would allow YDH and Symphony Healthcare services to work together to provide enhanced scheduled and unscheduled services and improve healthcare provision. The current Yeovil Health Centre has outgrown the space available. Symphony Healthcare Services (SHS) will seek a suitable area of land to be allocation for healthcare purposes. The site should be suitably located and sized to accommodate a primary healthcare building with the required external space for landscaping, vehicle parking etc. • New health care provision should take account of the Dorset 2017 Clinical Services Review, which highlights the relationship between Yeovil and Dorchester. • There are six general practice surgeries in Yeovil, dispersed across the town. Within the sustainable urban extensions at Brimsmore and Wyndham Park, provision has been made for the inclusion of medical services to meet the needs of the residents within each SUE. However, there are a number of factors that would affect the delivery of the new primary healthcare facilities: 	<p>It is acknowledged that NHS England and Somerset CCG are producing a high level Local Estates Strategy. This will fully assess existing health care capacity across South Somerset and will be used to inform any future needs. Initial indications suggest that provision in Yeovil will be highlighted as a priority.</p> <p>There is no need to allocate the Hospital as this is the existing use of the site. Complimentary development would probably be acceptable in principle.</p> <p>There is the opportunity for a new health centre in each of the two SUEs, estimated to be delivered in the medium to long term.</p> <p>The search for an additional health centre is noted and will be supported in principle.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Financial pressures Changes to the NHS model of care Somerset CCG STP Shortage of suitable General Practitioners However, none of the allocations have a critical mass large enough to support a primary care centre, so financial contributions or CIL should therefore be sought.</p> <p><u>Community Facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that communities need a place to meet, focal buildings which themselves are the catalyst for the formation of community groups and social capital. The timing of community buildings, public open space, play facilities etc. is vital to the formation of a community, and to creating a strong sense of belonging and pride, rather than a feeling of neglect which fuels anti-social behaviour and isolation. It is claimed that this was not the case with Wyndham Park. • Education: The need for extra secondary provision is suggested in the South of Yeovil, as there are already 3 secondaries to the north of the town centre. • Clustering new housing to the south of Yeovil would enable the provision of a new secondary school (YEO 6 and 7 plus Keyford site). • The Junior part of the Park School, Yeovil has already moved to Chilton Cantelo, and the land has been sold. The senior school is due to move next year. The two parts of the school are either side of Queensway by the footbridge. There is residential buildings, school buildings and playing fields near the town centre. Are there plans to develop these sites for residential use? school use? • Avon and Somerset Police are endeavouring to find 1000-1500m² for a new Response Hub to serve the SSDC area, which should be in Yeovil or its northern surrounds. 	<p>Healthcare facilities are not included in the District Council's Regulation 123 List and any developer contributions would need to be negotiated through Section 106 of the Act on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>This comment is noted. Community facilities will be sought where it is appropriate and viable to do so.</p> <p>Education is a matter for the County Council. It is currently understood that an entirely new site for an additional secondary school is not being sought.</p> <p>The need for a new Response Hub is noted and will be supported in principle.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Utilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the development of Bunford Park will provide an upgrade to the electricity grid and improvements to the strategic water main network. The north SUE will provide off-site foul sewerage enhancements, water supply and electricity grid improvements, a new primary school and a community hall site, as well as increasing capacity on the highway network. The electricity supply capacity in Yeovil is limited – when charging for electric vehicles and more connected homes and businesses come forward, it will be important that these limitations are recognised. • Wessex Water say that developments by it in Yeovil are part of a wider initiative to rationalise the number of facilities. SCC are currently seeking clarification on which Sewerage Treatment Works will continue to operate. • Wessex Water will assist the LLFA in the provision of a Surface Water Management Plan. • There are concerns about increased risk of flooding, especially in the Barwick area. • Comments on water supply, sewerage and sewage treatment will require updating depending on the extent of further development allocations. <p>Other suggestions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning improvements to Yeovil Crematorium. • Green infrastructure 	<p>The contribution of the Bunford Park and north SUE sites to infrastructure needs is acknowledged.</p> <p>Any additional requirements for electricity supply should be identified through the Updated IDP.</p> <p>This is noted and will be incorporated into the Updated IDP.</p> <p>Noted and supported. Any development that could potentially increase flood risk would require a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>This is noted and will be incorporated into the Updated IDP.</p> <p>Some improvements to parking at the crematorium have already been made. Other measures will be considered in due course as necessary.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			The provision of green infrastructure will be a requirement within the Preferred Options Document.
7.1	Do you agree that it would be more efficient to combine Polices PMT1 and PMT2 into one?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most responses are in favour of combining the Policies, although one states that, because of the particular challenges associated with scale of the development, a separate policy should apply to the CEDA site. • There are concerns that because the CEDA site has not been delivered, both policies should be deleted, although Persimmon state that progress is being made in respect of securing permission for the initial parts of the site and sections of the spine road, which would allow the delivery of the employment land; it is suggested that some re-drafting is carried out to allow flexibility in timescales. • Reference is made to the Crimchard Inspector's comments about the policies not being the most effective way of delivering these sites are referred to and it is suggested that the policies be combined and re-drafted to take a more pro-active approach and allow other sites to come forward. 	These policies have been combined and amended to refer to what development should take place within the CEDA during the Plan period only.
7.2	Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options at for growth at Chard include: 7.2(a) Continued commitment to the	<p>(a) <u>CEDA and Boden Mill</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although proposals for the CEDA site have been at the planning stage for many years, the point is made by Charles Bishop Ltd that a total of 218 dwellings on three parts of the site are now being progressed. It is stated that alternative proposals on other sites will compromise delivery after so long a time spent getting to this stage. • On the other hand, some comment that because nothing has materialised for over 20 years, both the CEDA and the Boden Mill sites should be deleted. • There is other support for continued commitment to the Boden Mill site. • Some flexibility is advocated to allow other sites to be delivered. <p>(b) <u>Development at CHAR 1, CEDA and Boden Mill</u></p>	a) The Local Plan will continue to include the CEDA, but also allocates two smaller sites which should be able to be delivered in the shorter term to meet the settlement's role as a Primary Market Town; and in view of the relatively limited amount of development that has taken place in the town since 2016 – the beginning of the new Plan period. The development of Boden Mill is a key objective of the Chard

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>development of CEDA and Boden Mill redevelopment</p> <p>7.2(b) Development at CHAR 1 and continued commitment to the development of CEDA and Boden Mill redevelopment</p> <p>7.2(c) Another option (please specify).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some general support for this site and it is favoured by the SSDC Conservation Unit in addition to the CEDA, although others feel that brownfield sites should be delivered first. • It is stated that sites such as CHAR1 which are attainable in the short term should be allowed to proceed; it is stated that this would allow the relocation of Chard Town FC, an issue unresolved for 30 years, as well as providing community facilities and a retail outlet. • On the other hand, there are concerns that CHAR1 would exacerbate the shortage in school place availability at Redstart Primary School and of parking. It is also stated that the access would be dangerous due to lack of visibility, limited road width, speed of traffic and lack of a footpath. The site was the subject of an unsuccessful appeal and should only be considered as a last resort. • It is stated that CHAR1 would prejudice the delivery of the CEDA and would not bring forward the delivery of improvements to infrastructure. <p>(c) <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mount Hindrance for mixed use – allows relocation of the football club, public open space, sports pitches and a local centre. • North-east of Crimchard – 30-45 residential units, including starter homes and social housing. Currently used as grass keep; Landscape Study identifies it as of moderate to high capacity for development. • Crimchard, controlled by DWH. A self-contained and deliverable site, having high capacity to absorb development. The appeal Inspector felt it would ‘round-off’ the settlement, but dismissed the appeal because of the CEDA designation in a recently adopted Local Plan. It is stated that there are no technical, ecological or environmental issues that could not be mitigated and no traffic impacts would be severe. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chard Town FC Ground for residential development. • The Post Office car park, which is usually empty. 	<p>Regeneration Plan and the site is allocated in the Local Plan accordingly.</p> <p>(b) The site east of Crimchard (Option CHAR 1) is being taken forward as a Preferred Option (Policy CH2). In determining the previous appeal relating to the site, the inspector expressed the view that the site is sustainable and that it was only the Council’s strategy to bring forward the CEDA site within the then recently adopted Local Plan that justified dismissal at that time.</p> <p>(c) The scale of growth proposed at Mount Hindrance, in addition to the CEDA and other small sites, will not be necessary during the Plan period. A site to the west of Crimchard has been suggested and is also being included as a Preferred Option for a limited amount of development.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>General Comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planned improvements by Highways England to the A358 and A303 corridors; and the new junction to the M5 could support development at Chard. The scale of development at Chard is unlikely to have a significant impact on the SRN. 	<p>Neither the Football Ground nor the Post Office car park would appear to be available at this time.</p> <p>This comment is noted.</p>
7.3	Should a more proactive approach to employment land proposals be taken in locations outside of those identified in the Chard Regeneration Scheme? If yes, can you suggest locations for employment development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very few responses have been received, but there is a general feeling that the commitment to the Chard Regeneration Scheme should remain and that there is no need to allocate additional employment land outside the CEDA. A comment was received that any brownfield sites within the town ought to be used for social housing. 	Comments noted.
7.4	Does Chard need to develop sites outside of the defined Town Centre for retail and other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is general agreement that development sites in the town centre need to be progressed for mixed use with social housing. Out of town developments for such uses are not favoured and no comments in support of these were received. 	The suggestion that the Boden Mill site be used for retail has now been superseded by the objective of securing a leisure-based scheme on the site as set out in the Chard Regeneration Plan. It is now not considered appropriate or justified to

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	town centre uses or focus on improving the existing Town Centre? Which of the options identified above (1, 2 and 3) would you like to see developed and why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some thought that the Boden Street site should be retained as a car park; that the parking around Holyrood Mill should be public; and that A358/Silver Street uses should remain, although with new residential development. • It is stated that access and freight routes should be considered in relation to all town centre sites. Some strategic modelling has been undertaken in relation to site2, but this may need updating and additional land for improvements may be required. • There are comments that the choice of existing shops needs to be improved, including food shops, gift shops, shoe shops and furniture shops. Some feel that the number of beverage and food outlets is already too high. 	<p>extend the town centre with additional retail premises. The objective is to consolidate the retail within the existing designated town centre.</p> <p>Highways issues will be considered in the determination of planning applications where necessary.</p> <p>Providing they are within Use Class A1, the types of retail premises that operate in the town are beyond the control of the District Council.</p>
7.5	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Chard?	<p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The link road in the Key site to alleviate congestion at the Convent Junction. • A railway station at Chard Junction. • There is general concern about the traffic conditions and misplaced highways works. 	<p>The link road is still a feature of the CEDA development.</p> <p>It is unlikely that a railway station will be viable and there are currently no proposals for one. Highways issues will be considered in the determination of planning applications.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sports Centre with swimming pool; and a 3G pitch at Holyrood <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to water mains and off-site sewers to serve allocated sites will need to be provided within agreed timescales. 	<p>A leisure centre with a new swimming pool is a key objective of the Chard Regeneration Plan and this is reflected in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Possible necessary water mains and sewers improvements are referred to in the Local Plan Review.</p>
7.6	<p>Which of the following options should be progressed through the LPR?</p> <p>7.6(a) Continue to encourage the development of the CLR site and to resist alternative very major developments on the edge of the built up area.</p> <p>7.6(b) Identify an alternative location for the</p>	<p>(a) and (b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a fairly frequently expressed view that the CLR site is still subject to viability issues and cannot be relied upon to deliver the required housing in the short to medium term. It is stated that the CLR site should not prevent other development to the detriment of the five year housing land supply; and that alternative options with a more dispersed strategy should be considered. • On the other hand, Taylor Wimpey support the CLR site being taken forward; it is stated that viability has been addressed following further discussions and the grant of a revised permission; and state that there are further opportunities to the south east of the site (plan provided). It is stated that there has been a great deal of work gone into developing the CLR site, which also delivers infrastructure for the town with increased amenity space and employment land. To continue with the development of the CLR should be the preferred option. The standardised OAN methodology and increased time period supports additional need at Crewkerne. A significant proportion of housing and employment need can be met by the CLR site. The CLR site would deliver a new link road – all other sites are in the wrong location to achieve this. 	<p>The comments of Taylor Wimpey are noted, but it should be recognised that there still appears to have been very little progress since the beginning of the consultation period. It must be recognised that there are other opportunities for more limited growth at Crewkerne and that the market should not be stifled by the non-implementation of the extant planning permission on the CLR site. It is not suggested that this should be revoked, but there should be little harm in allowing other developments to come forward.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	strategic growth of Crewkerne; and if so, where could the most appropriate location be?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that 14/02141/OUT allocates development close to the sewerage treatment works – the latest odour guidance measures will need to be considered. 	
7.7	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options for housing growth at Crewkerne include:</p> <p>7.7(a) CREW 1: Land east of Lang Road 7.7(b) CREW 2: Land south of Curriott Hill 7.7(c) CREW 3: Land rear of Penlain</p>	<p>(a) <u>Land east of Lang Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is one of the SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred options. There are, however, concerns about its topography and lack of employment growth. Reassurances would also be required in respect of the access, the need for full traffic modelling, and poor junction between Cathole Bridge Road and the B3165; and the impact on the nearby rail crossing with automatic half barriers. There is some thought that development of the site would increase traffic pressure in the town. There is also some concern about the potential impact on the Local Wildlife Site to the east – a core of the County's Grassland Ecological Network. The owners are able to provide an extended version of this option. Actively preparing a set of base line studies to underpin a more detailed assessment. They recognise that some of the land identified is not suitable for development due to topography but this can be incorporated as part of an overall landscape approach; and they consider that 150 units could be achieved. <p>(b) <u>Land south of Curriott Hill</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that the site has been previously assessed as suitable, available and deliverable in the 2017 HELAA. It is adjacent to the development area 	<p>(a) SCC state that full traffic modelling is needed. Cathole Bridge Road has poor access onto the B3165. Follow through traffic needs to be identified through the estate and junction improvements may be needed. It is also acknowledged that there are issues regarding topography and potential impacts of ecology, but all of these could be taken into account in the preparation of a suitable scheme on a site that is in a relatively sustainable location. Pre-application discussions have also commenced. This is one of the Council's preferred options.</p> <p>(b) The site is in a relatively remote location and a little separated</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>7.7(d) CREW 4: Land west of A356 (Station Road)</p> <p>7.7(e) CREW 5: Land east of Charlton Close</p> <p>7.7(f) CREW 6: Land east of Chestnut Avenue</p> <p>7.7(g) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>of Crewkerne and there are no other policy constraints to preclude its development. It is a sustainable location within walking distance of the services and facilities available in Crewkerne. Its development would fill the gap between existing built form and the B3165 and Cathole Bridge Road, from which access could be gained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, access would be via Lyme Road, with fast traffic and near to a dangerous crossroad. It is critical to know the traffic impact. • Wessex Water state that the site is also adjacent to Maiden Beech Reservoir and booster station and has a number of water mains crossing it. Easements would be required affecting layout and density; and costs of diverting the mains may make the site unviable. <p>(c) <u>Land rear of Penlain</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summerfield Developments (SW) Ltd control land which forms the western part of the site. This forms a logical extension to the existing built up area of Crewkerne. They say it is well located in relation to existing services and facilities; and confirm that the site is available for housing development and considered to be deliverable. They state that BMV agricultural land should not be viewed as a barrier to development. • It is one of the SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred options on landscape grounds. • Historic England considers the site to be sensitive due to proximity to a number of heritage assets. • Concerns have also been expressed about impact on amenity and green space, access and poor visibility; and gradient. 	<p>from the main urban area of Crewkerne. There could also be issues of viability given the presence of water supply infrastructure.</p> <p>(c) The land forms something of a 'green lung' for the town, but this is a very sustainable location close to the facilities in the town centre. The eastern parcel of land has been submitted as an omission site, but this would not be suitable for housing here alone as access could only be achieved through the adjoining commercial estate and would not be appropriate. SCC are concerned about how the site would be accessed as there is poor frontage and visibility. A planning application has been submitted by SSDC for a 60-space Pay and Display car park on land to the west, which if not</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(d) <u>Land west of A356</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of the SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred options on landscape grounds. • The landowners support inclusion of the option. They consider that the site could deliver more than 270 dwellings. It comprises 15ha (36 acres) and is a relatively level greenfield site. The land is suitable available and achievable. Work could commence within five years of allocation. At 15 dwellings per acre and 70% net developable area the site could accommodate in the region of about 385 dwellings. The site is not within a SSSI, SAC or SAP etc. nor is it in any designated landscape. The site is within a Countryside Stewardship targeting area for Lapwing. Owners control the entire frontage with Station Road so it is capable of achieving safe access and egress; and pedestrian and cycle links could be provided. There is a regular bus service which stops along Station Road. Land is within Flood Zone 1. The landscape has been assessed as having a high to moderate capacity; and the valley to the west has the capacity to act as a green wedge and serve as a country park. • Highways England think the scale of the site could potentially impact the SRN. Consideration would need to be given to the need for a right-turn, the proximity to the railway, poor footpath provision and poor visibility. • There is an adjacent Local Wildlife Site – part of the Grassland Ecological Network. 	<p>revised to allow access to the site, would sterilise it. There are Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area adjacent, but a scheme could be designed to take account of their setting.</p> <p>(d) This is a suitable site in close proximity to the train station; and opportunities exist to provide additional parking here where shortage of spaces is acknowledged. There is probably a need for buffers to the railway line and wildlife site, but a sensitive scheme could take these into account. Housing should probably be confined to the northern portion of the site. Land to the west has been submitted as an Omission Site and could provide open space for a development of CREW4, although it would probably be unsuitable for housing itself owing to its prominent location at the top of a steep slope. SCC state that consideration also needs to be given to the right turn, gradient, footpath</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(e) <u>Land east of Charlton Close</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A developer has a legal agreement in place to purchase the site along with adjacent land as shown on the map submitted for the HELAA process. It is stated that there are no development issues or constraints so development could commence on site quickly following planning permission. It's in Flood Zone 1, but adjacent the Conservation Area but could be designed sympathetically. There is an adjacent wildlife site and there are ecological implications of the river flowing through the site. However, development can have a positive effect by providing river bank enhancements, and improving biodiversity. As a small parcel of BMV it is hard to farm economically; the adjacent site is not BMV; and the site lies equidistant between the train station and the town centre, both within reasonable walking distance. • However, some feel that its development would not bring any substantial benefit to Crewkerne; access would need to be considered; and that it would increase traffic pressure in the town centre. <p>(f) <u>Land east of Chestnut Avenue</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that this site of 1.3ha on the north-east edge of Crewkerne has been assessed as being suitable, deliverable, and available for housing in the HELAA (2017), ref. W/MERR/0011), suggesting a yield of about 25 dwellings. It is stated that it is a small-scale extension of the recent housing development to the west, and would read visually as a rounding-off of this existing built form without detriment to the landscape character. • Some feel that it would not bring any substantial benefit to Crewkerne; access would need to be considered; and that it is not in a sustainable location with regard to services. <p>(g) <u>Another Option</u></p>	<p>provision visibility and connectivity.</p> <p>(e) Additional land to the east and south has been suggested as being suitable omission sites (see below). However, owing to steep gradients on part and designation of a County Wildlife Site, this additional land would not be suitable. CREW5 itself could be developed for a limited number of dwellings, but a scheme would need to take account of mature trees and the adjacent listed mill building.</p> <p>(f) The development of the site would probably cause little harm to the character of the area, but it is relatively remote from the town centre. Access could be gained from the adjacent estate to the west.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goldwell Farm for housing - a site of 7.7ha; the site previously refused and upheld at appeal (ref. 13/02941/OUT). The Inspector said that the development would have a significant and adverse impact on the character and quality of the local landscape; that the proposed access arrangements would be contrary to the environmental objectives of saved Local Plan Policies ST5 and EC3; and that future residents of this site would be likely to be reliant on the use of private cars and that therefore the development would fail to satisfy the sustainable transport objectives. • Land to the west of Kingswood Road, immediately north of the Cathole Bridge Road. Access could be achieved via Kingswood Road. (No plan provided). • Land off Weavers Close - A site of 0.88ha would be available for development. It is stated that 23 dwellings could be provided; it adjoins the area identified as CREW4 and is stated could be included with this allocation; and there are no physical constraints, save for a suitable access. The land is well related to the town centre and contiguous with the built up area. It is available immediately – it is also suitable and achievable. • An extension of the CLR site. Taylor Wimpey state that the south-eastern side of Crewkerne is the most suitable for strategic site allocations; an additional area adjacent to the CLR site has been identified as having high to moderate landscape capacity and is located close to the railway station and employment opportunities; and has excellent highway connectivity. It would make the best use of new infrastructure, improve deliverability and viability; and provide greater support for affordable housing. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that Crewkerne is a sustainable location for development, but, as with Yeovil, it is surrounded by BMV agricultural land and only one option site has a moderate-high capacity to accommodate built development. • One Respondent thought that Bincombe Beeches should be mentioned in the consultation as an important enhancement and asset to the town. 	<p>(g) Goldwell Farm has been submitted as an Omission Site. Circumstances regarding the character of the area have not altered since the dismissal of the appeal and it would not be appropriate to allocate the site.</p> <p>Kingswood Road. It not clear what land this relates to.</p> <p>CLR Extension. An extension of the site has been submitted as an Omission Site but this would extend too far into countryside to the east and south. Given the non-delivery of the CLR site, it would not be appropriate to allocate further land.</p> <p>General comments noted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
7.8	Should the Council reduce the employment land requirement for Crewkerne based on the planning approval for the CLR site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One response states that the outstanding amount of employment land has previously been agreed at 3.74 hectares and the CLR is projected to meet that need. 10 hectares, as identified in the Local Plan is optimistic but the town should push for 5-6 hectares of employment land. 	The Council's own assessment has confirmed that the employment land requirements for the town should be 3.74ha and this reduction would be appropriate.
7.9	Should the Council consider allocating additional employment land for Crewkerne? If so where?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that additional employment land could be considered in Crew 4, Crew 5 and also in land beside the CLR; and that this question is a good reason for pushing for as much employment land as possible with the CLR, as there is very little land in Crewkerne suitable for industry. 	CREW 4 would not be ideal for commercial development and would result in further heavy goods vehicles needing to travel through the town centre in the absence of the link road that the CLR site would provide. CREW 5 would not be suitable for the issues outlined above.
7.10	Should the Primary Shopping Frontage for Crewkerne be extended as shown in Figure 7.13?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is concern that the National West Bank building would be included in the Primary Shopping Frontage. It is thought that a policy recognising a greater range of consumer uses is needed. 	<p>The revised NPPF 2018 no longer defines or differentiates between Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages; and this will now not be taken forward.</p> <p>Local Plan Review Policy seeks to prevent the loss of existing retail</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			premises and the presence of a bank will not affect this.
7.11	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Crewkerne?	<p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road system needs to be upgraded with a new road to connect Crewkerne with the A303. • SSDC Conservation Unit state that, from an urban design standpoint, an additional town centre through-road would enhance permeability, and ease traffic congestion/dominance of the main street. Option 7.7(c) CREW 3 offers the potential of an East Street-South Street road via Cropmead, to assist an enhancement of the town centre. • Footpath and cycle path routes into town are needed. • At no point has public transport been included in the LPR. <p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An options appraisal for what type of healthcare development is required and could be delivered in Crewkerne to accommodate the primary healthcare needs of the increasing population will be necessary. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the development in CREW4 went ahead a school would be required. <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Key Site has been assessed for foul water and water supply – alternatives may require upsizing of water/foul infrastructure. 	<p>The new link road that would be included in the CLR site is still supported as an objective. Comments from the Conservation Unit are also supported if feasible.</p> <p>The EA advise that the re-direction of part of the Viney Brook should be redirected.</p> <p>Symphony Healthcare Services advise that primary healthcare practices are operating at or close to capacity; and an options appraisal to meet the needs of an increasing population will be necessary.</p> <p>The availability of school places is a matter for the County Council to address. No comments have been received in this regard.</p> <p>Water/ sewerage comments are noted and will be dealt with on a case by case basis. Wessex Water</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			advise that Crewkerne will need a treatment works scheme.
7.12	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options at for housing growth at Ilminster include:</p> <p>7.12(a) ILMI1: Land at Canal Way 7.12(b) ILMI2: Land east of Shudrick Lane 7.12(c) ILMI3: Greenway Farm, Dowlish Ford 7.12(d) ILMI4: Land at Station Road 7.12(d) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>(a) <u>Land at Canal Way</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 400 people say they favour the development of this site; ILMI 1 is in the direction of Growth and development should be permitted. • It is thought that potential employment is to be provided to the west of the town - housing should be at Canal Way, which is preferable to avoid exacerbating traffic and pollution in Station Road/ Butts. • Persimmon say they have now received consent on ILMI1 and that this should be chosen for growth in a sustainable location in accordance with the new aims and objectives. • It is stated that development should be restricted to what is consented under the approved outline application. A green barrier should remain between Canal Way and Herne Hill. • SSDC Landscape support for the northern half of Option 7.12(a) ILMI 1 from a landscape perspective, but not the south; the field abutting Herne Hill and rising to Mitchells Hill. There are also concerns about the site being immediately adjacent to a LWS – development could exacerbate the fragmentation of the Woodland Ecological Network. <p>(b) <u>Land east of Shudrick Lane</u></p> <p>Objections to the potential allocation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 400 people have signed a document objecting to this potential allocation. They state that: The consultation documents contain many mistakes and misleading statements as highlighted in the Save Shudrick Valley submission. Harmful effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and on heritage assets would outweigh its benefits. Intrinsic character would be destroyed. 	<p>(a) The land at Canal Way is within the current Local Plan Direction of Growth and is the subject of a planning permission for up to 400 dwellings (16/05500/OUT). This extends to the edge of what the Ilminster Peripheral Landscape Study assesses as land with moderate to high landscape capacity. Any further growth towards Herne Hill would encroach into areas of moderate to low capacity. It is therefore probably appropriate to limit development to that the subject of planning permission. This being the case, there is no need to identify further land in the Local Plan Review. SCC</p> <p>(b) Both the previous Local Plan Inspector and that considering the previous appeal relating to this land (14/02474/OUT) found that the development of the site would conflict with Local Plan housing policy at that time and would have some harmful</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>The effect on heritage assets has been omitted; a reason for a previous refusal and fighting an appeal by SSDC.</p> <p>Adverse effects arising from conflict with the Council's housing policies would be significant – Ilminster should not make up for the under-delivery elsewhere.</p> <p>Detail in the document and the HELAA site assessment form is incorrect or misleading, including in relation to designation categories, landscape capacity, site layout and officers' comments.</p> <p>The site is listed as not achievable/deliverable/developable in the Site Status Check List.</p> <p>Sustainable Appraisal has four incorrect ratings.</p> <p>The site has a watercourse rated Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>Adequate land is provided by Canal Way and Hort Bridge to provide in excess of the town's requirements to 2034.</p> <p>Inclusion of the site would be against the Council's Vision statement, landscape policy, historic environment strategy and NPPF.</p> <p>Inconsistency with Langport appeal site.</p> <p>Appeal Inspector's report has been ignored.</p> <p>Peripheral Landscape Study is out of date and should have been reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that the inclusion of the ILMI2 site despite the appeal is inconsistent with the Council's approach in Langport and its northern Direction of Growth. Also, the Goldwell Farm site at Crewkerne and Mount Hindrance sites at Chard have not been proposed as options. The way the site options at Crewkerne are described is also different to that used for Ilminster. The Consultation Document refers to the ILMI2 site as having high capacity, but the Peripheral Landscape Study states that the ILMI2 site has a mixture of low – high capacity. Priority should be given to brownfield sites such as that at Hort Bridge/ Horlicks (ILMI4) and Powmatic - the development of these sites and that at Canal Way would be more than enough for the town. 	<p>impact on heritage assets and the local landscape character, which although less than substantial, would outweigh the benefits of a scheme. The loss of BMV agricultural land was also a consideration.</p> <p>The Ilminster Peripheral Landscape Assessment is still relevant and identifies the relatively level land mostly to the north of the Shudrick Stream as having moderate to high landscape capacity for development.</p> <p>It is immediately adjacent to the town centre and in particular a supermarket.</p> <p>A sensitively designed scheme could address the issues previously referred to and would be the subject of a further Sustainability Appraisal if included as a Local Plan allocation.</p> <p>Whilst the previous appeal Inspector felt that the</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dowlish Wake borders Ilminster and it is claimed that it would be affected by the proposed inclusion of Shudrick Valley in the plan. It is totally opposed because of the law of unintended consequences and the additional traffic it would create through Moolham Lane, Orchard Hill and through to Kingstone. • Historic England considers the site to be sensitive due to proximity to a number of heritage assets. <p>Comments in support of the Option are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the other hand, ILMI2 is supported by the proposed developer. It is stated that: Further housing growth is required across the District and Ilminster is well placed to accommodate growth. Land at Shudrick Lane is available and deliverable; and represents a sustainable site to deliver additional growth in the town. ILMI1 – Ultimately, the Local Plan identifies Canal Way as the preferred direction for growth, but it was a finely balanced issue as to whether this or Shudrick Lane was more sustainable – there is little to differentiate the two. Canal Way will, once progressed, help to deliver existing Local Plan requirements for Ilminster, but the LPR needs to identify options for growth to meet up-to-date housing needs which will be substantially higher. Both sites should be identified for housing. ILMI2 immediately adjoins the south-eastern edge of the built up area of Ilminster, within easy walking distance of the defined town centre. It is also within easy walking and cycling distance of employment uses. Whilst parts are BMV agricultural land, it is classified no higher than other land around the edge of the town; and there are no clear alternatives which would use land of lower quality. The adjoining conservation area to the north would need to be considered, but the previous Inspector found any harm less than 	<p>development of the site would result in an excessive number of dwellings in Ilminster, contrary to the Local Plan strategy, in view of the on-going need for further housing in Ilminster in the new Local Plan period and the consistent under-delivery of housing in the District, the site could be included at the present time as a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>substantial; similarly with the listed buildings in the vicinity. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the public benefits of the development would have outweighed any harm. Public routes through the site will be retained. The previous Inspector also found that the effects on the character and appearance of the area would outweigh the benefits. Shudrick Lane was once identified as the preferred direction of growth.</p> <p>(A late representation has been received seeking to refute these points)</p> <p>(c) <u>Greenway Farm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst some support has been received for this option, others state that it is too far from the town centre, there is a potential archaeological impact on the former Chard & Ilminster Canal; and that it is BMV land, with some landscape sensitivity. <p>(d) <u>Land at Station Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that transforming the old Horlicks factory should be far preferable to spoiling the attractive Shudrick Valley and Canal Way. A very large number of people think that using this brownfield site would regenerate an eyesore; present a more favourable approach to the town; and also help to provide additional flood mitigation works, improve roadways and could help to kick start interest in the employment area. If the Station Road site were added to Canal Way, the housing requirement for Ilminster would be exceeded. • The owner of the site is supportive of its use for residential development. • It is one of the preferred options of the SSDC Conservation Unit. • It stated that there is no sense in allocating housing on employment land at ILMI 4. It has poor access arrangements, poor infrastructure on 	<p>(c) This site is probably too remote from the town centre and is situated in land identified in the Peripheral Landscape Study as having only low to moderate landscape capacity. It is unlikely to be a preferred option.</p> <p>(d) There are on-going discussions and consultation leading to the intended submission of a planning application to provide a residential development that could help to deliver employment development on adjoining land. This should be taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Station Road and poor internal transport. The site represents an important strategic employment opportunity serving the heart of the District. options for employment development adjoining the town as a result of growth should not be lost</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also stated that if the site were to be developed for housing, then an opportunity to access the southern part for employment would still exist from Canal Way; it might make better use of ME/ILMI14/South for the residential use to be located to the south – accessed from Canal way - with the land off Station Road being used for employment. • <u>Another Option</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station Road - ILMI4 has been shown comprising the footprint of the former industrial complex – the brownfield portion of the site. An alternative option would be to allocate a similar scale site on the land to the north of Station Road, also owned by the owners of ILMI4. It would therefore be contiguous with the residential development at Holway House Park and Home Farm Park to the east. Preliminary assessments suggest c100 dwellings could be located on the site with the residual land to the west (up to the River Isle) retained for employment use (office and light industrial) as per the existing allocation. A comprehensive flood mitigation scheme is available which would provide suitable protection to the combined site north and south of Station Road. This scheme was previously submitted to SSDC for review as part of the previous planning app. 09/00051/OUT. • It is claimed that the grant of permission on ILMI1 removes the need to identify a further site. Half way through the plan period Ilminster already has dwellings approvals exceeding the Local Plan target by 58%. Conversely only 2.16ha against a target of 23ha has been achieved for employment land. At this point no further housing land should be allocated on green field sites and development should be concentrated on PDL and infill sites until further economic activity happens. 	<p>Ilminster is a sustainable location for housing growth and development here has made a significant contribution to the District's overall housing requirement, but further development opportunities are limited. As a primary market Town, further housing land needs to be identified if it is to continue in this role in the new extended Plan Period to 2036.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
7.13	<p>Should the Council consider deallocating some of the employment land in Ilminster as it has been allocated for a number of years? If yes, which of the sites should be deallocated and why? Or should the Council deallocate all the sites and allocate alternative ones of a smaller scale? If the Council allocated alternative sites where</p>	<p>Responses on behalf of the owners of the sites in question include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The owner of the ME/ILMI/4 employment allocation acknowledges that the site has not come forward for some time. An application for B1, B2, and B8 uses achieved a resolution to approve at Planning Committee but was not formally granted nor implemented due to site viability and infrastructure cost considerations. Since this time, the local market position has improved and further consideration has been taken to ‘enabling development’ in the form of residential development on a portion of the employment allocation, specifically to the north of Station Road. The residential development of c.100 dwellings is possible on the site and would substantially improve the site viability position, thus improving the prospects of the wider employment allocation coming forward. • Dairygold have expressed an intention to bring the site forward for employment development. This submission provides further evidence that the site is deliverable. The southern portion of the site was in previous residential use and a significant portion of the site is hence classed as brownfield; as noted in para. 7.77, existing employment areas are primarily located to the west of the town, in close proximity to the A303. This site is therefore well-suited; • Much of ME/ILMI/5 is likely to be retained for future use by Powrmatic. <p>Other comments stating that sites <u>should not</u> be deallocated are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The improvements to the A303 and A358 will increase the potential for <i>ME/ILMI4</i> to contribute to economic development –a comprehensive technical review is suggested and seeking of public support for the necessary infrastructure to be provided. • For the town to grow and encourage new employers to come to the town land should be available for them to be built and the proposed Employment allocations are quite unsightly as they have just been left in disrepair, so need to be used. It gives a poor first view of Ilminster when driving in via the 	<p>Land at Station Road should continue to provide opportunities for employment development, although its delivery may require some enabling residential development. This is identified as Policy IM3 and IM4 of the Local Plan Review.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	should these be?	<p>A303. Also if we have an extra population due to the Local Plan we need new employment opportunities for the younger generation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implications of de-allocating land would be fewer jobs and more travelling to work; and people shopping and conducting business elsewhere. <p>The reasons why some people state that they think that sites <u>should</u> be deallocated include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is far too much employment land allocated in Ilminster. The brownfield element of Hort Bridge should be developed for housing, which could fund flood mitigation. • SSDC should consider dropping the employment requirement for the Powrmatic site completely, which would encourage a quicker build-out and provide more homes. • There is no need for smaller scale employment sites because to date these have not been used and have been changed to housing. Ilminster does not need 22ha. • Highways England consider that any reduction in employment land allocations should carefully consider the impact of this in terms of shifting commuting patterns and the potential impact on the surrounding highway network including the SRN. Development should be targeted at sustainable sites which reduce any imbalance between population and jobs in order to avoid out-commuting. 	
7.14	Do you agree that the designated Town Centre for Ilminster should be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people think that it seems logical and a sensible recognition of the status-quo, whilst others state that the boundary should not be extended and that the benefits of this are not clear. 	It is proposed to redraw the boundary in this way to include the entire building as this seems appropriate.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	amended to include the entire Tesco store?		
7.15	Do you agree that there is no need for the Local Plan to make retail allocations in Ilminster?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People generally seem to be in agreement with this. It is stated that planning permission for the conversion of existing town centre retail premises to residential properties should be granted with caution; there is very little space in the town centre to add more retail sites and should larger companies come into the town they may build them on the outskirts of the town which would gradually kill the town centre. There are enough coffee shops and food shops. 	Comments are noted.
7.16	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Ilminster?	<p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport solutions for Ilminster should be addressed. The centre has a one-way system; movement onto A303; Highways England would need to be consulted. • Another town centre car park • A high quality cycleway link from the projected housing growth area to the town centre. • Highways England say that, given Ilminster's proximity to the SRN, they consider it likely that future growth here will have a significant impact on the operation of the SRN, specifically Southfields Roundabout. The scale of development could also raise concerns in relation to the performance of the A303 and would likely result in the need for mitigation. • Lack of public transport makes it difficult for people without cars to get to work outside the town. • The strain put on roads and transport arising from growth is not well articulated. <p>Healthcare</p>	All of these responses will be taken into account in the Updated IDP. Opportunities to improve access will be identified in relation to individual planning applications. Traffic impacts will also be considered at that time.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing primary healthcare practices in Ilminster are operating at or in excess of operational capacity in accordance with national standards. An options appraisal for what type of healthcare development is required and could be delivered in Ilminster to accommodate the primary healthcare needs of the increasing population will be necessary. If a new separate facility is sought. Obligations for primary healthcare should be sought for any future growth in Ilminster. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New First School at Canal Way. • Consideration also needs to be given to middle/ secondary schooling. • Provision for fitness/exercise/swimming facilities. <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood mitigation and highways at Hort Bridge to kick-start the employment land. • There are constraints in the existing potable supply and waste water networks to serve each of the potential sites. Further assessment would be required. • The strain put on water and sewerage arising from growth is not well articulated. • There was one comment saying that no more was required - the infrastructure needed to support Canal Way is challenging enough. 	<p>Healthcare: Symphony Healthcare Services advise that primary healthcare practices are operating at or close to capacity; and an options appraisal to meet the needs of an increasing population will be necessary.</p> <p>Education provision is a matter for the County Council, but a new school site at Canal Way has been identified.</p> <p>Utilities: It is understood that the Ilminster Feasibility Study regarding run-off at Long Close and Heron Way is programmed for 2019/20.</p> <p>The EA advise that the Hort Bridge Flood Alleviation scheme is programmed up to 2024/25.</p>
7.17	Which of the followings options do you think should be taken forward	<p>(a) <u>Land west of Wincanton Business Park</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Option is supported for mixed use in the Area of Search in the Local Plan and identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is well serviced, accessible and connected. A planning application is expected to be submitted. It is 	<p>(a) This site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option, but its extent to the north is being reduced to protect sensitive views as identified in the made</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>through the LPR?</p> <p>7.17(a) WINC 1: Land west of Wincanton Business Park and New Barns Farm for mixed use</p> <p>7.17(b) WINC 2: The Tythings for housing or mixed use</p> <p>7.17(c) WINC 3: Land at Moor Lane for mixed use</p> <p>7.17(d) WINC 4: Land east of Common Road for housing development</p> <p>7.17(e) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>favoured due to development already taking place and the proximity to the A371 making it easy to travel into town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the other hand, some think the site should be used for housing only. • The Wincanton Neighbourhood Plan identifies the higher ground to the west of New Barns Farm (i.e. the northern area of the option) as being a visually sensitive area where development would be visually prominent on the skyline. <p>(d) <u>The Tythings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that The Tythings is a unique development in that it is regarded as a part of the historic development of Wincanton as well as sitting on the principal access to the town centre. Its development and its relationship with the town centre’s viability requires careful and coordinated planning. The site is surrounded by housing so there has to be a move away from manufacturing and the reduction in conflict found elsewhere. The extension of commercial aspects of the site and non-conflicting sales, with high quality housing would seem to be the way forward. It is a brownfield site and current eyesore should be developed as soon as possible. • One Respondent thought that 50 dwellings seems low given the plot size; and that the number of dwellings should be re-assessed with the landowner • There is potential for HE impact given the listed building on the east boundary and local heritage interest factory. Any development would have to take place within the context of a Conservation Assessment to determine the types of uses. • There is no agreement as to whether it should be used for housing only or for mixed use. <p>(c) <u>Moor Lane</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comments that land south of A303 is “divorced from the existing settlement, severed by the A303 and do not adjoin the development area” 	<p>Neighbourhood Plan. The proportion of employment land is also being reduced as it is unlikely that there is sufficient demand for the amount previously proposed.</p> <p>(b) The Tythings is being taken forward as a Preferred Option for a high-density residential scheme. High quality would be sought in connection with a planning application to compliment the objectives of the District Council’s Wincanton Action Plan. The setting of heritage assets would also need to be protected.</p> <p>(c) This site is divorced from the main built up area by the A303 and access is relatively poor. Given Highways England’s</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>are actually considered to be advantageous as, depending on the development proposed they provide a degree of separation between existing land uses. There are examples in the town where employment adjoins residential development and has a negative impact on residential amenity. The A303 sits on an embankment this would allow it to act as noise bund. Some think that businesses should be encouraged to transfer from the north side of the A303 to the south side, with Improved access on/off the A303.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is said that the Document states that flooding is an issue south of the A303, but this is not universally so and where sites are in the flood plain mitigation measures can be applied to make development satisfactory to the Environment Agency. • It is also said that the document states that WINC 3 is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area; but it is requested that this is challenged by SSDC as only in a restricted area is thick Jurassic clay overlain by alluvial deposits; it is not clear which has any value as workable mineral deposits. • Although some of the playing pitches are disused or not used extensively, the Wincanton Recreational trust are said to be endeavouring to increase usage; notwithstanding that, the opportunity to use the land for other purposes is in the thoughts of the Trust and any alternative use. • However, given Wincanton's proximity to the SRN and the scale of potential development Highways England consider it likely that future growth will have a significant impact on the operation of the SRN and would likely result in a need for mitigation. This site raises particular concern in relation to their location immediately adjacent to the A303, and the potential access requirements. The creation of new accesses onto the SRN can impact on its ability to fulfil the function of facilitating the safe and effective movement of goods and people in the support of economic growth by compromising traffic movement and flow. Beyond the access itself, the scale and position of development at these sites has potential to bring significant numbers of 	<p>concerns, the site is not being taken forwards.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>vehicle trips to the SRN especially as their location may increase the likely hood of residents to use the private car.</p> <p>(d) <u>Common Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is only very limited support for this Option and Wincanton Town Council is not in favour of it. • Again, Highways England state that given Wincanton’s proximity to the SRN and the scale of potential development they consider it likely that future growth will have a significant impact on the operation of the SRN and would likely result in a need for mitigation. This site also raises particular concern in relation to their location immediately adjacent to the A303, and the potential access requirements. <p>(e) <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land west of WINC 3 – west of Moor Lane between the A303 and sewage treatment works, is supported by Wincanton Town Council. • Land adjacent to Fire House Mews, with access from Moor Lane. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan needs to be updated to reflect the status of the Neighbourhood Plan. • Housing and employment have to go together and be in balance, as stressed by the Inspector in 2013. The employment in Wincanton has actually deteriorated, with only 1.91ha of employment land completed and committed during the Plan period. The level of self-containment in Wincanton has fallen by promoting outward travel for work, shopping, leisure, etc, contrary to the adopted/proposed strategic objective to deliver a balanced housing market to support sustainable lifestyles and low carbon 	<p>(d) This site is divorced from the main built up area by the A303 and access is relatively poor. The distance to the town centre is also not ideal. Given Highways England’s concerns, the site is not being taken forwards.</p> <p>(e) This site is affected by flood risk and accessibility is poor. It is not being taken forwards.</p> <p>The Local Plan acknowledges the made Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Employment requirements are changing (less employment land is needed) as demonstrated by the District Council’s evidence base, there is potential to allocate employment land to the west of Wincanton Business Park (Policy WN3) the amount of which will be</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>emissions. More housing in the short-term is unsustainable. In January 2015, the Inspector was satisfied that there was no justification at the time for increasing housing provision in Wincanton's DOG in the short-term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Close was scheduled for employment in 1987 and is still not fully occupied and operational; a 20 year time lag between housing and the employment required to make the settlement sustainable. This was highlighted by the Inspector, and it is now much worse, yet no policy has been put in place by the District Council as requested by the Inspector to make the Plan sound and legal. • If a mixed use allocation proceeds as a preferred option, any such allocation should phase development so that employment premises (not land alone) are delivered before more housing land is released for development. 	<p>determined in the Employment Land Review.</p> <p>The District Council's Monitoring Database indicates that much of the growth in employment floorspace has taken place away from established industrial locations, where there seems to have been relatively little commercial demand and high infrastructure costs making it apparently unviable. This is something the Local Plan will try and address. The Local Plan Review includes looking at housing and employment provision in Wincanton, based on its status in the settlement hierarchy and our evidence on housing and employment need.</p>
7.18	There is the capacity to accommodate additional development within or on the edge of	<p>(a) <u>Church Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Option is supported. It would provide a suitable sized site for town centre uses. <p>(b) <u>The existing Town Centre</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only limited support has been received for this option. It is stated that it would have a negative impact on town centre viability. 	Comments noted. One of the objectives of the District Council's Wincanton Action Plan is to consolidate and rejuvenate the town centre; and it is now considered that little would be achieved by extending the town centre further; particularly

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Wincanton Town Centre. Which option should be taken forward through the LPR? Options include: 7.18(a) Allocate Land Between Church Street and Car Park for Town Centre Uses 7.18(b) Do not allocate land for development of Town Centre Uses outside Wincanton Town Centre but explore the options within and adjoining the existing Town Centre</p>	<p>(e) <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorial Car Park - It is not believed it has poor potential. It is in the town centre and a significant size. However any loss of parking spaces would need to be replaced. • It is suggested that the Town Centre should be extended eastwards to encompass existing shops on the High Street approx. 20m east of the junction with the Memorial Car Park entrance. • Carrington Way Car Park - Part of the site is significantly sloping which may preclude development. Were it to be developed any lost car parking would need to be replaced. • Vedler's Hay - Has planning permission for residential uses. It is not understood why it is described as poor for town centre uses as it adjoins the town centre. • The Tythings – Again, it is not sure why it's described as having poor potential apart from distance and separation from existing town centre. • Land between Church Street and Car Park is incorrectly described. Should be 'land north of the High Street and to the west of Carrington Way'. Agreed that this has a reasonable opportunity for town centre development and could encompass land to the west. • The comments about the Travis Perkins site are agreed. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of previously developed land should encourage opportunities to improve green infrastructure, encourage water efficiency and reduce surface water run-off. • It is stated that the comments regarding the town centre are economically out of date and fail to address the problems of the modern market town. Work has started on a review of possible town centre developments. This needs to be completed before any final decision is made. 	<p>given the existing number of vacant premises.</p> <p>These issues are covered by other policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the District Council's Wincanton Action Plan is to consolidate and rejuvenate the</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	boundary further. 7.18(c) Another option		town centre. This is now reflected in the Local Plan.
7.19	Do you agree with the suggested Primary Shopping Frontage for Wincanton?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is mixed reaction to this, with agreement and a suggestion that the Primary Shopping Frontage should be extended westwards to encompass the north parts of South Street, the Marketplace and the eastern most parts of Mill Street; whilst others say that a lot of properties are unsuitable for shops because of wheelchair access; it would be much better for purpose built shops; and that the Primary Shopping Frontage needs to be no bigger than specified in the Plan. 	The revised NPPF 2018 no longer defines or differentiates between Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages; and this will now not be taken forward.
7.20	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Wincanton?	<p>Transport, Access and Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate parking for town centre shoppers and visitors due to the Memorial Car Park being used by so many residents. A combined cycle and footpath to link Wincanton to Templecombe Railway Station with an all-weather surface and motion controlled lighting. No further housing land can be advanced until the District Council has commissioned a transport assessment to objectively and impartially consider the impact of a material and significant increase in traffic using the A303 and local highway network, in consultation with Highways England and the Highways Authority. This should include a review of the operating 	<p>Town centre parking may be an issue that emerges through the formulation of the District Council's Wincanton Action Plan.</p> <p>This would require funding and it is unclear from where this would be sought. There is no evidence that there would be sufficient demand for this to be justified.</p> <p>Highways England have expressed concerns about the potential impacts on the Strategic Road Network; any highways issues will be addressed</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>one-way system and its acknowledged inability to cope with volumes of school traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport links must be improved between the town and the villages, train stations and main town of Yeovil. <p>Retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new shopping centre should be built with flats over. <p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The medical centre in Carrington Way remains unoccupied after the previous practice relocated to a location that many people, especially the elderly – many of whom live in established care homes adjacent to Carrington Way – cannot access. This has been made worse by A&E moving from Verrington Hospital to the remote medical centre. The no longer used medical centre should be offered to a new doctor to service people in the centre of the town. • The existing primary healthcare practices in Wincanton are operating at excess of operational capacity in accordance with national standards. An options appraisal for what type of healthcare development is required and could be delivered. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no further space to increase the capacity of the two Primary Schools. A new school can only be delivered through a significant amount of new housing which is currently unjustified. As such, given the significant 	<p>in the consideration of planning applications.</p> <p>The operation of the public transport system is a matter for the Highway Authority and cannot be required through the Local Plan, other than improvements being sought in connection with specific planning applications. There is no evidence of demand for such a proposal.</p> <p>These are matters for the Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS. They have not identified any issues with capacity.</p> <p>A significant extension to Wincanton Primary School has now been completed and the County Council</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>housing delivered in the town, the Education Authority (SCC) should provide an updated position statement for the IDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued existence of sporting and recreational facilities is of great importance and provision of support to enable this is vital. Could be via CIL or from SSDC itself. <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are constraints in the existing potable supply and waste water networks to serve each of the sites. Further engagement is required with Wessex Water to consider the extent of improvements required. <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many substantial buildings, including listed buildings, in the (Wincanton) High Street have been derelict for more than ten years. They have deteriorated to the extent that they should be demolished in the interests of public safety. Within the current Local Plan, the racecourse is not included within the town's development boundary and there are no specific policies. The wording of Policy EP8 suggests that new and enhanced tourist assets are to be located within a settlement and not in the countryside; they should be easily accessible by sustainable means; and there must be an identified need in the open countryside which is not met by existing facilities. The current wording of the policy therefore fails to meet the needs of the racecourse, which is located in the countryside, in terms of any expansion and development of the site; it needs to be adapted to allow improvement, expansion or development at the site as required, or a specific policy. A new and updated IDP is required. 	<p>have not identified any issues with future demand for places.</p> <p>The requirements for recreational facilities is addressed in the Wincanton Playing Pitch Strategy. Any shortfalls will be identified in the Updated IDP.</p> <p>This is referred to in the Local Plan Review One of the objectives of the District Council's Wincanton Action Plan is to consolidate and rejuvenate the town centre. This is now reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Any development proposal at Wincanton Racecourse will be considered on its merits, including any economic benefits.</p> <p>The IDP is being updated, based on new evidence.</p>
7.21	Due to long-term non-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is general support for this. Additionally, the planning application and subsequent appeal were refused/dismissed between 2008 and 2013 (app 	A further planning application for 27 dwellings has been submitted (Ref.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	delivery should housing allocation HG/CACA/2 (Land west of Remalard Court) be deleted?	<p>ref 08/00189/OUT and appeal ref. APP/R3325/A/13/200209). The road system that was proposed for the Foxes Run development was at all times hazardous for all established and prospective residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nobody seems to have objected to its deletion. 	16/03447/FUL), which has been refused and, at the time of writing, is the subject of an appeal. Any further decision about whether the site should be included in the Local Plan will need to await the outcome of the appeal.
7.22	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward in the LPR? Options for growth at Ansford & Castle Cary include: 7.22(a) ANSF/CACA 1: Land north-west of Ansford for mixed use 7.22(b) ANSF/CACA 2: Land at Higher Ansford for housing</p>	<p>(a) <u>North-west of Ansford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is thought that this is the better site as it includes employment land. It is the preferred option from a landscape perspective; stated to have a safe vehicular access; and also viable and acceptable. One Respondent thinks it should be used for employment only; and there are concerns about possible conflicts with the RoW network. <p>(b) <u>Higher Ansford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is preferred from a landscape perspective. The landowners and development partners say they are willing to develop this without delay. They consider there to be no issues relating to ecology, contamination and archaeology that cannot be readily addressed. They have control of access and the site is in Flood Zone 1. They support housing, affordable housing and business within the area. It is stated to be a highly sustainable location; it is within walking distance from the town centre, with access via Ansford Road to the High Street where day to day needs can be served. The settlement has facilities commensurate with its role as a Local Market Town, including primary and secondary schools, medical and leisure facilities. The site is just over half a mile from the train station. Its south western edge lies in a Conservation Area and there are several listed buildings nearby. No significant landscape designation. 	<p>(a) The site to the north west of Ansford is being taken forward as a Preferred Option. It is, however, landlocked; and access will need to be obtained from adjoining land.</p> <p>(b) Historic England have objected, but the Conservation Officer's is view that a reduced area defining the southern field only may present a development opportunity where the capacity for substantial harm to heritage assets is avoided, whilst the final extent of built form facing the conservation area should be determined by a heritage impact assessment.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>7.22(c) ANSF/CACA 3: Land east of Station Road for housing</p> <p>7.22(d) ANSF/CACA 4: Land north of Ansford Hill for housing</p> <p>7.22(e) Another option (please specify)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets. • There are concerns about access, with challenges for pedestrian connectivity due to the pavement width and position. There are also traffic lights to consider. <p><u>(c) Station Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is stated to be viable and an acceptable area for increased housing with safe vehicular access. It fits in with development already permitted; and Reserved Matters consent has been secured. • There is access to a connected site on Ansford Hill and which would make an ideal extension to this site. • This is preferred from a landscape perspective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets. • The site is said to have a limited frontage and more details about access would be required. <p><u>(d) Ansford Hill</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landowners and development partners are willing to develop the site without delay. They consider there to be no issues relating to ecology, 	<p>Access could be from either Cumnock Road or Maggs Lane.</p> <p>However, the site would represent more of an intrusion into open countryside than the Preferred Options to the west of the settlement, which are in the established Direction of Growth. This would not prevent a planning application being submitted and being considered on its merits.</p> <p>(c) This is being taken forward as a Preferred Option, although access should be from Well Farm rather than Station Road.</p> <p>It is the view of the Conservation Officers that, whilst recognising the significance of both the parish church, and the adjacent conservation area, do not consider this to preclude development, particularly as it joins up sites to either side with the benefit of planning consent.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>contamination and archaeology that cannot be readily addressed. They have control of access and the site is in Flood Zone 1. The landowners support housing, affordable housing and business within the area; and the site are considered to be developable and deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site can offer better links between the train station and the settlement, including land to extend the railway station car park. the operators have stated that the car park is operating at capacity which is choking off demand for new passengers. GWR are investigating options to extend the car park and this option could aid in providing land to extend the car park on both sides of the railway. • The site is within walking distance of the town centre with access via Station Road to the High Street. The route is also covered by a regular bus service. The town centre is said to be vibrant and offers retail and leisure services to meet day to day needs. • However, others feel that this would be detrimental to the market town character of the town, as it is in a prominent location and development would change the nature of the northern approach to Castle Cary. It is stated that development north should stop at the A371 on Ansford Hill. • There are concerns about the near vicinity of rail services, poor access and poor pedestrian links; and about impact on the station footpath or Barrow rail crossing. <p><u>(e) Another Option</u> Specific Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the north east of the train station would be good for employment development as access to the A road, immediate rail access and development would be unobtrusive. 	<p>(d) Although suitable, available and achievable, the site is relatively remote from the shops and services in the settlement's centre. Having regard to the amount of development in the pipeline in Castle Cary already, there is no need to take this additional site forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>This is the preferred site for additional car-parking at the railway station. This should not be prejudiced by any employment</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on the old BMI site is a good proposal and long overdue. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Neighbourhood Plan should be applied to all housing. • Existing permissions and the BMI site should be built out before additional residential development is allocated elsewhere. • The point is made that Castle Cary already has a high number of commitments in excess of the Local Plan target. 	<p>proposal and this is recognised in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>At the time of writing there is a current planning application for a development of the former BMI site and this will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan is at the Submission stage; and whilst a material consideration it carries little weight at the time of writing.</p> <p>The BMI site is addressed above.</p> <p>It is accepted that Castle Cary and Ansford already has a high number of commitments.</p>
7.23	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Ansford & Castle Cary?	<p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The B3153 and Torbay Road/South Cary Lane are overloaded and dangerous, no more HGV traffic is appropriate. Road improvements are required. • Reduce traffic on the B3153 by having a new link road from Castle Cary Station Road to Torbay Road industrial estate. Enforce speed limits and improve visibility on A371 to accommodate increased HGV traffic. • B Roads - Improvements to Satnav issues. HGVs should be encouraged to keep to 'A' roads to help alleviate 'B' roads i.e. at Lydford instruct traffic along the A37 instead of B3153. 	<p>It is recognised that highway issues are considered by the local community to be important matters to be addressed – and these are outlined in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan - but highways impacts will be considered in relation to any planning application submitted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land set aside for the road link between Station Road and the Torbay Road Trading Estate needs to be built. This also provides a link to the new employment land in the Direction of Growth. • A footpath should be provided for Clanville residents; this is long overdue. • Provide additional parking the centre of town for those who live between the town centre and Station Road. Free adequate parking need to continue in the town and be expanded at the Railway station. Car park at Castle Cary Station is inadequate. Now have queues backing out to the A371. Could the land used for Glastonbury Festival parking be used as a permanent car park? • Rail connections need to be improved e.g. ability to travel to Taunton from Castle Cary and arrive in time to start work at 9 am. • A new bridge over the railway at Castle Cary. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the primary school needs to stay in the Town Centre, in situ expansion should be explored. The adverse impact on the town centre traders if the school were relocated would be significant. • Adequate free parking is also an important component of the healthy town centre. • Caryford Community Hall is one large community hall in the town, with its own large car park. It is a popular hall but is operating at capacity in terms of hirings and plans are afoot to extend the hall and improve the kitchen, foyer, and toilets so that it can cope with an influx of new people to the town. • Expand the Health Centre to cope with planned development. • Youth, cadet and scout facilities urgently required. 	<p>The potential need for a new primary school is recognised in the Local Plan and a site identified. The Local aspiration for it to remain in the Town Centre is known.</p> <p>No changes to the parking arrangements are currently proposed.</p> <p>Other comments noted – these may emerge as an issue in the Updated IDP.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor broadband undermines the economic development of Castle Cary and its rural hinterland. <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are constraints in the existing potable supply and waste water networks to serve each of the greenfield sites. <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The town centre needs an ATM. • The Neighbourhood Plan is clear regarding infrastructure requirements, SSDC should support this. • Does the fire station need to be enlarged to cope with growing community. 	<p>The importance of broadband is recognised in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The potential need for a waste water treatment works is recognised in the Local Plan and will be considered in the Updated IDP.</p> <p>Other comments are noted.</p>
	General Langport Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of respondents make points along the lines that the level of existing completions and commitments justifies stopping further large developments above those already approved. The rate of building should be slowed to avoid exceeding the housing target 10 years before the Plan period. Otherwise, medical and other local services will be unable to keep up and provide the same level of service. Langport and Huish has already been subject to extensive development, often unsympathetic to the rural nature of the area and Huish's village setting. 	<p>The rate at which developments are built is beyond the control of local authorities.</p> <p>Further housing sites need to be identified to meet Langport's role as a Local Market Town up the end of the new Local Plan period in 2036</p>
7.24	Do you agree that the site within the northern Direction of Growth (Policy LMT2) that	<p>Comments received in agreement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning Inspectorate (APP/R3325/W/15/3136302), and the local community both agreed that the original decision to include this sensitive site in the direction of growth was flawed. The appeal decision stated that the harm to the heritage asset was not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development. The Planning Inspectorate found that using the site would "<i>not represent sustainable development</i>". This is primarily due to 	<p>The site within the northern Direction of Growth will not now be taken forward because of the impact on heritage assets.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	was subject to the planning application refusal, later upheld at appeal, should not be taken forward as an allocation?	<p>the harm to the stone wall separating Old Kelways nursery site from the ancient hamlet of Wearne – directly and to its setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated in the Council's I&O document (para 7.145), "<i>Langport is already well on track to exceed its target for housing growth</i>" without the need to include this location as part of the proposed Direction of Growth (LMT2) in future revisions of the Local Plan. • The northern DoG is an important part of the soak-away from the hamlet of Wearne and the hill it sits on. Covering this field and directing the drainage into the sewage system, which already is at a maximum, has wider implications on the sewage infrastructure and also on water being directed into the River Parrett when its capacity to cope has already been seen to be questionable. <p>A Respondent disagrees, stating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is wrong to exclude the site for housing. Although the appeal was dismissed for 71 dwellings, it was only on the basis of one reason –it would impact on the adjoining listed wall. Investigations are currently being undertaken to establish whether a new access can be created which will reduce any alteration on the wall. Consideration is being given to reducing the number of dwellings proposed on-site, allowing an increase in open space adjoining the listed wall. 	
7.25	Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR?	<p>(a) <u>Between Somerton Road and Wearne Lane</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of responses quote the reasons why the previous appeal on the site was dismissed and the issues raised in relation to question 7.24. • Other reasons for objecting to the site's inclusion include that: Brownfield sites should be used and compulsory purchase unused buildings. 	(a) There are differences between this site and the site to the north of the listed nursery wall- as per an email of 26th June 2018 from the Conservation Officer.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Options for housing growth at Langport/ Huish Episcopi include:</p> <p>7.25(a) LANG 1: Land between Somerton Road and Wearne Lane</p> <p>7.25(b) LANG 2: Land between Somerton Road and Field Road</p> <p>7.25(c) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>The direction of growth between the railway line and the land at option LANG 1 should not be considered for future residential development as it is the only remaining potential site for a future Langport railway station. Loss of an actively used piece of agricultural land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar reasons for supporting the inclusion of the site to the response in relation to Question 7.24 area are also given. • Other reasons for including the site are stated to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is the obvious extension to Langport and will provide sufficient housing to support the town in the short to medium term. Preferred option from a landscape perspective. The area identified for housing development LANG1 should include a proportion of commercial land. Without it, the future of both Langport and Huish Episcopi is in serious trouble. • The Highways Authority would require details and capacity for the A372 to B3153. <p>(b) <u>Between Somerton Road and Field Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in support of this Option include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred option from a landscape perspective . Huish Episcopi PC fully support development of this option, but has raised concerns regarding 80 dwellings. As this site is undergoing final planning procedures for 94 dwellings, one has to assume that it is already agreed that it will be developed. • No responses appear to be against this Option. <p>(c) <u>Another Option</u> Suggested specific sites that could be included:</p>	<p>(b) This site is being taken forwards as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>(c) 19 Brookland Road: An allocation would not prohibit the site from</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 Brookland Road - where planning for 8 dwellings, granted in 2006, appears to have long elapsed. The site remains a danger and an eyesore. • Land north of Portfield - adjacent to Charlton Close; it has been identified as having moderate capacity for new development, is located in close proximity to the town centre, employment opportunities; and has excellent highway connectivity, including a continuous footpath. It extends to a total of 2.91ha and could deliver about 75 dwellings. The site has no special designations; does not present any physical constraints; and could be accessed from the A378. It is within Flood Zone 1. It is immediately available, suitable and achievable. • Westover Trading Estate -Huish Episcopi PC fully supports the further development of this. • Ducks Hill field – PC would support some sympathetic infill to the southeast along A372. But, Huish should not join up with Pibsbury. • West of Langport - Land next to cricket ground next to railway a good location for a new station. <p>Sites stated that should not be developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land by the railway line on A372 Field Road (currently within a Direction of Growth) – Huish Episcopi Parish Council requests removal of this field from the plan. Land is adjacent to the cricket ground and the school playing fields opposite. PC wish to acquire this piece of land for community recreational purposes. Sadly developers are in discussion with SDDC to bring forward a proposal for residential use. • Land south of the Hanging Chapel – development around this land would affect the spatial aspect around the church. 	<p>coming forward but it would not appear to be available and deliverable.</p> <p>Land north of Portfield: This site is relatively separate from the main built-up area of Langport and has a semi-rural character. Although available, it is less suitable than other options for Langport that could provide an appropriate amount of growth for the town.</p> <p>Further development would not appear feasible due to flooding, covered in application 16/04191/OUT and associated appeal decision.</p> <p>Ducks Hill field: Specific site(s) undefined; no assurance of availability; rural setting with a landscape with a low capacity to accommodate built development.</p> <p>West of Langport for a new station: the LPR will not allocate sites for new stations.</p> <p>Land by the railway line on A372 Field Road: Intent to purchase land</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>for recreational purposes is not sufficient to disqualify a site from future development.</p> <p>Land south of the Hanging Chapel: agreed – site unsuitable</p>
7.26	Should the Direction of Growth to the south-east of the settlement be removed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDC Conservation Unit state that the direction of growth should be removed to ensure no adverse impact upon the Grade 1 Listed church and its setting, whilst Huish Episcopi PC also fully supports the removal of this area. Once response states that the site should be reduced but not removed the allocation - for smaller industrial units. 	Agreed. Remove south-east DOG.
7.27	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Langport & Huish Episcopi?	<p>Transport and Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Parish Council has pledged £5,000 towards a feasibility study to bring a train service back in from Huish Episcopi or Somerton. Many comments have been received in favour of re-opening the railway station. A suitably sized Community Hall catering for events up to 500 attendees, similar to the one at Somerton, together with a bar area, kitchen and office space. Ideally this should be built on the site next to the cricket pitch on Field Road. An outdoor bowling green as promised to the then residents of Huish Episcopi when the original application went in to develop Old Kelways. This could also be ideally sited with the above. A bypass. Improvements to be investigated to avoid new housing resulting in further traffic problems. 	<p>Transport and Accessibility Noted. However, this is not a priority for the LPA and it is unreasonable to assume the site is available for development.</p> <p>This is not a priority for the LPA and it is unreasonable to assume the site is available for development.</p> <p>No substantive evidence has been provided to show feasibility or justification for these.</p> <p>This is not a LPR issue</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of Bow Street and the Hanging Chapel by heavy goods vehicles should be prevented by deterring or barring them. <p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that Langport GP surgery could not keep up with the planned housing growth for Langport & Huish Episcopi and Somerton. • NHS dental treatment is not available to new patients. <p>Utilities/ Flood Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. • Langport and Huish Episcopi suffer sewer flooding from groundwater inundation during periods of prolonged wet weather. Wessex Water recommends considering development subject to a revised SFRA. • Control of flash flood water. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huish Episcopi Primary School is in danger of being oversubscribed. • Huish Academy being in danger of being oversubscribed. • There are three public car parks. Community infrastructure is struggling to cope with the rapidly expanding community. Providing services from the precept gained within the town boundary is unsustainable. Without addressing these needs, any further development in Langport/ Huish Episcopi is unsustainable. <p>Lack of Employment Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many comments were received along the lines that Langport/Huish have provided no significant employment growth in the recent past; and that this clearly means that most of the inhabitants of the new building in both Langport/Huish and Curry Rivel are travelling indeterminate distances to 	<p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. It is a national issue. • Noted. It is a national issue. <p>Utilities/ Flood Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility providers raised no insurmountable issues. • The LPA is commissioning a revised SFRA. • Nationally and locally compliant flood mitigation measures will apply. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCC (Education Auth.) has not raised school oversubscription issues. • SCC (Education Auth.) has not raised school oversubscription issues. • Langport & Huish Episcopi is a sustainable location for new dwellings. New homes mean a greater total precept, contributions, and CIL.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>work. As the Langport/Huish axis looks to be more than meeting it's housing targets, business development is as important in the longer term than just more housing. It is stated that jobs have been (Bank, Post Office and three pubs closed) and gained none; and that much more needs to be done about creating real jobs for local people in and around Langport and Huish Episcopi.</p>	
7.28	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options for growth at Somerton include: 7.28(a) SOME 1: Bancombe Road for a mixed use 7.28(b) SOME 1: Bancombe Road for economic development 7.28(c) SOME 2: Land off Cartway Lane for housing</p>	<p>(a) <u>Bancombe Road for mixed use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people think this is the most suitable site for Somerton's extension; it has the highest landscape capacity to accommodate built development; it is a very sustainable location, in between recent residential development and an employment area; the site is closest of the available options to the heart of Somerton and its facilities. • SSDC Conservation Unit also prefer it in terms of its landscape impact. • However, it is also stated that it is an open field that retains water, in a slightly elevated position above Somerton. • One very detailed response is that the site has some merit if a relief surface water and sewage drainage system were installed. This would involve laying pipes northward for less than 500 metres up across fields to Etsome Road. Both kinds of waste water could be pumped up a small incline allowing them to flow down to the sewage works in Barpool Lane in north Somerton. SOME1 could be developed more easily and the centre of town and the areas to the south and south-east would be relieved of the huge volume of both kinds of water flowing through. Other areas in north-west Somerton could be joined to this system thereafter. • It is stated that the site should be allocated for housing. Given the setting of the site and the District's housing shortage, it is not appropriate to allocate this site solely for economic purposes. It is stated that any future 	<p>(a) <u>Bancombe Road for mixed use</u> Planning permission has been granted for mixed use on some of this site.</p> <p>The utility providers have raised no insurmountable issues</p> <p>The site is not in a flood zone and due flooding mitigation measures will apply.</p> <p>The remainder of the site is allocated for housing. The circa 95 dwellings expected to be delivered on the site are not sufficient for a settlement as sustainable as Somerton.</p> <p>There is no policy basis to enforce any greater percentage of affordable housing than the policy suggests.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>7.28(d) SOME 3: Land west of St Cleers Orchard for housing</p> <p>7.28(e)SOME4 : Land north-west of Bancombe Trading Estate for economic development</p> <p>7.28(f) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>development should be restricted to this Option; it should be for genuinely affordable housing – shared ownership or homes for first time buyers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One very detailed response is that the site has some merit if a relief surface water and sewage drainage system were installed. This would involve laying pipes northward for less than 500 metres up across fields to Etsome Road. Both kinds of waste water could be pumped up a small incline allowing them to flow down to the sewage works in Barpool Lane in north Somerton. SOME1 could be developed more easily and the centre of town and the areas to the south and south-east would be relieved of the huge volume of both kinds of water flowing through. Other areas in north-west Somerton could be joined to this system thereafter. <p>(b) <u>Bancombe Road for economic development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somerton TC (STC) accepts this option; part of the area the subject of a planning application has also been accepted. There should be no new access road to the east of the existing entrance to the business park, but an emergency access track would be welcomed. It is also stated that connectivity to Bradley Hill Lane to wider community is needed. One response states that, should any mixed use element be incorporated into the allocation of the site, it should be limited to suitable, light uses such as B1, to protect the amenity of future residents to the east and existing residents to the south of Bancombe Road. It is a preferred Option of SSDC’s Conservation Unit in terms of landscape impact. <p>Comments not in favour of the allocation are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is too remote from shops, schools, and services, leading to increased carbon emissions. 	<p>(b) <u>Bancombe Road for economic development</u></p> <p>Planning applications for mixed use have been granted (outline and some reserved matters). These parcels are best for residential development.</p> <p>The edge of settlement location is walkable to a number of key services.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is an open field that retains water, in a slightly elevated position above Somerton. <p>(c) <u>Cartway Lane</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is supported and STC accepts this option, subject to satisfactory drainage and road infrastructure; however it is stated that it includes the approved 'Intelligent Land' application and the wording is incorrect. • As the land is in different ownerships it is stated that it is essential that any permissions granted should ensure development of the whole site is possible with road infrastructure linking to individual ownership parcels. • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. <p>However, comments against the inclusion of this Option are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the site's location away from main services and facilities of Somerton, the site is less sustainable option and should not be favoured. • There are concerns about issues regarding connectivity; and routes through the existing housing. It is stated that it is essential that Cartway Lane is widened consistent with HGV use and with a continuous footpath on its eastern side. • As a consequence of the town's natural features (topography, springs, and the Mill Stream), one respondent said that the site should only be included if large, expensive upgrades of drainage infrastructure were carried out. 	<p>(c) <u>Cartway Lane</u> It is noted that the central portion of the site has outline planning permission – a matter which was erroneously recorded in the SOME 3 box of the consultation document.</p> <p>Highways access to the option was not considered to be an issue. However, landowners have not universally agreed that their land is available.</p> <p>The site is walkable to/from key services.</p> <p>Accessibility to and throughout the site is not an issue. Various access options could be considered.</p> <p>The comprehensive development of the land was considered to best opportunity to provide highway improvements.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that the site could not address its own on-site drainage/flooding issues.</p> <p>(d) <u>St Cleers Orchard Access</u> presents issues. Difficulty in</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(d) <u>St Cleers Orchard</u> Comments in favour of this Option are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advance attention would need to be given regarding drainage and road access and advance infrastructure and would be unacceptable otherwise. • It is one of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred Options. <p>Respondents not in favour of this Option gave reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the site's location away from main services and facilities of Somerton, the site is less sustainable option and should not be favoured. • As a consequence of the town's natural features (topography, springs, and the Mill Stream), it should only be included if large, expensive upgrades of drainage infrastructure were carried out • Concerns about issues regarding connectivity; and routes through the existing housing. • One response stated that the site would be greatly enhanced by a future station to the south. • There could be a new access from Langport Road to the north. We would suggest a much bolder new road from the Cartway Lane/ Langport Road junction, over the railway, providing a 'western bypass'. <p>(e) <u>North-west of Bancombe Trading Estate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although comments were received in favour and against this Option, the landowners have advised that the site is unavailable and have objected on the grounds and that it would be detrimental to their farming enterprise and would result in a loss of trees. <p>(f) <u>Specific Sites</u></p>	<p>accessing the site presented by watercourse and park to the south of the David Wilson Homes site; Ricksey Lane could however potentially be widened.</p> <p>(e) <u>North-west of Bancombe Trading Estate</u> Site unavailable – not progressed as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>(f) <u>Specific Sites</u></p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edgar Hall - There is about one hectare of undeveloped land adjacent, not identified in the Review. • Land north of Bradley Hill Lane - It was understood that discussions had taken place between SSDC Cllrs and the County Council about the delivery of a school on the site. The site should therefore be used for a mix of residential and educational uses. • Badgers Cross and Wireless Station sites - If more employment land is required for Somerton, it should be located at these sites due to its access to the road network (i.e. A303 and M5). Somerton Radio Station is surplus to operational need and is available for development now. It is included in the HELAA as suitable and available for housing development. • Etsome Road - Somerton has an elderly population (Settlement Profile, October 2017). A site on the northern edge of the town would be appropriate and suitable for the provision of a retirement village. • Millands and Wessex Rise - There are opportunities on the eastern side of the town too. Western growth is disappointing for a loss of cultivation land and for flood risk. We believe that concentrating major development at the western end of the town is flawed. 	<p>No evidence that the site adjacent to the Edgar Hall is available for development.</p> <p>The site has been purchased by Somerset County Council.</p> <p>Badgers Cross is not a preferable site for employment in Somerton. As only a finite quantity of land is required, the Bancombe Road site is preferred as better located to the settlement.</p> <p>Land north of Etsome Road is unsuitable on landscape grounds.</p> <p>The Millands (or land to the east of The Millands) and Wessex Rise: Development at the site to the east of the Millands site would have to contend with land that has moderate-low capacity and low capacity for built form; being within the Conservation Area; and ROWs running through the site. SOME 1 (remaining) and SOME3 are preferable, but site suitable for</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STC would not be in favour of any expansion at Badgers Cross Quarry. <p><u>General Comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somerton is among the most sustainable settlements in the District so should be given a higher housing target than at present. 	<p>allocation if required. Without a specific site proposed, no allocation can be considered – as suitable, available, and achievable.</p> <p>The TC's objection to further development at Badger's Cross Quarry is noted. No further development is proposed.</p> <p>Somerton is a sustainable settlement, as identified by its situation in the Local Market Town tier. It will be targeted a commensurate scale of growth.</p>
7.29	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Somerton?	<p>Transport and Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although parking facilities have recently been increased, at busy times it is extremely difficult to park which means people are travelling further afield to shop. • The infrastructure locally will not support any further expansion – the roads and pavements are not capable of handling any further increase in traffic and the size of freight vehicles is increasing. • All existing railway stations in Somerset have seen increased passenger numbers in the last 20 yrs. A new station in the Langport/Somerton area 	It is unlikely that a new railway station would be viable. Comments otherwise noted.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>should see high levels of passenger numbers. Councils can apply to DfT for funding from the “New Station Fund”.</p> <p>Flood Mitigation/ Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water flows from springs which emerge at different levels along the lower contour lines at the bottom of Somerton Hill on the B3153. Then it flows into streams and ditches as the land slopes eastwards to Lower Somerton. The major watercourse is the Mill Stream, and together with smaller streams, it passes through estates, under roads and the railway mainline. Drainage infrastructure was last updated in the 1970s-80s, with new drainage pipes being added as new housing and employment estates were developed. There are flooding issues for residents, users of Langport Road, the Recreation Ground, Farm Drive, St Cleers, Sutton Road, Pestors Lane Valley, - i.e. the course of the Mill Stream and its feeder streams as it flows to the Old Mill, Lower Somerton on the B3151 and then to the River Cary. It is not as easy as joining a surface water pipe from a new estate to the old infrastructure in Somerton. A specially designed electric pump had to be installed for the new Northfields Estate to facilitate this before the new estate could be completed but has yet to prove worthy. SOME3 – the railway line acts as a drainage barrier and piping through the embankment would be needed before any development. • Capacity appraisals have been completed for existing planning permission 13/03272/OUT (North of SOME 3) and 15/03585/OUT (Mid of SOME 2) which indicated improvements are required to the downstream sewer network. Further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. <p>Healthcare</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>The Local Plan refers to the foul/ water supply networks.</p> <p>The Local Plan does refer to a replacement surgery as being</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A senior partner in Langport GP surgery is concerned about current and future housing developments in Langport and Huish Episcopi and Somerton. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single primary school site is required due to rapidly expanding population and rising birth rate. <p>Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The town is growing fast, with several new developments either in-hand or in prospect, yet none include any suggestion of preserving or creating open green spaces for family pleasure and relaxation, or for young and old to mix. Somerton has lost a large area of playing fields to development, to the horror of local residents. 	<p>identified in the IDP. This matter can be considered further in the context of the Update IDP, although the CCG have not raised issues with the surgery at Somerton.</p> <p>A new primary school is referred to in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The need for additional open space and sporting facilities is identified in the Local Plan.</p>
8.1	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR?</p> <p>8.1(a) BRUT 1: Land west of Frome Road</p> <p>8.1(b) BRUT 2: Land at</p>	<p>(a) <u>Frome Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Council states it is currently negotiating a long-term lease for its protection but up to five dwellings would be supported. There are now no plans to relocate the surgery here. • However, Historic England considers the site to be sensitive due to the proximity to a number of heritage assets. The site may be visible from the Grade II* Listed Dovecote, which is also an Ancient Monument. Potential impacts on views and setting of the Dovecot should be considered. • There is concern about the potential location of the access; it is a steep road; with poor pedestrian access along the main route from Frome. 	<p>(a) This is a long-standing recognised potential site for housing, even though the numbers that could be delivered are relatively low. There would be no detriment from allocating the site. The listed buildings referred to be Historic England are all some distance away and their setting would not be harmed; there are no concerns from the SSDC Conservation Officers. Part of the Option</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Brewham Road 8.1(c) BRUT 3: Land east of Cole Road 8.1(d) Another Option (please specify</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not normally be good practice to allocate a site of less than 10 dwellings in the Local Plan. A site for 5 dwellings will deliver no affordable housing. It is sloping and visually prominent from long distance views. <p>(b) <u>Brewham Road</u> Comments in support are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two fields are said to be in separate ownership and could be considered as two options. On the one hand, development of the northern field only is supported, but not the south - this would necessitate only a single access and have better links to existing residential development and local services. However, further development here is also supported. There is evidence of a strong local preference for development of land at Brewham Road; this has the support of the Town Council and would be of sufficient scale to deliver meaningful levels of affordable housing and potentially some custom properties. Discussions about the possibility of affordable housing on the southern part are stated to have started. Low density housing would be consistent with its semi-rural location. Legal constraints prevent development of the western end. Development of the southern part of the northern field is supported but it is not known whether it is available. • Part is suggested could be used for horticultural purposes. • Acorn state they have already delivered a bespoke scheme at Cubis in the town. Local stakeholders identified an opportunity to work with Acorn with the community interest at heart, which led to an invitation by the Bruton Trust to consider a development in the town. The land at Brewham Road offers the opportunity to deliver another such development. The capacity of the site will be established through technical and environmental survey work which is being undertaken. It has been identified as having high capacity by the Landscape Study. • This is one of SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred Options. <p>Comments received objecting to the Option include:</p>	<p>includes the site of the previously proposed surgery being promoted by SCC for a business hub.</p> <p>(b) The northern field is unconstrained and buses serve the adjoining residential estate. Direct access is possible from Wyvern Close. The southern field offers relatively limited opportunity given the presence of Flood Zone 2 and a buffer to the watercourses would probably be required. The northern field could be allocated, but not the southern, but this would not prevent a planning application on this piece of land being submitted – potential access conflicts could be resolved if the northern field were accessed from the adjoining estate. The site is a considerable distance from sensitive heritage assets and it is unlikely their settings would be adversely affected. SSDC Conservation Officers have no objections.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are also concerns that the eastern edge of the northern field has been identified as being at high risk of surface water flooding. Additional run-off from the site would compromise the town's flood protection scheme. • It is stated that access would only be from narrow estate roads; and it would be a considerable distance from facilities in the town. • Historic England considers the site to be sensitive due to proximity to a number of heritage assets. The site may be visible from the Grade II* Listed Dovecote, which is also an Ancient Monument. Potential impacts on views and setting of the Dovecot should be considered. • It is stated that 100 houses is far too many for a town the size of Bruton; and that the local infrastructure cannot support an extra 100 houses. i.e. roads already congested in the morning/afternoon. The local doctors already need new premises for the present residents & would not be able to cope with such an influx of at least 200+ people. It is already difficult to park to visit the local shops. The site is unsuitable due to flooding which is evident every winter in the field. It is not aesthetically pleasing as it is on a green field site & will spoil the views of the open countryside. • There are also concerns about the impact on the junction and footway provision. • It is suggested that one of the alternatives at the Brewham Road sites should be reserved until a new surgery site is found. <p>(c) <u>Cole Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the part which lies at the bottom of Bruton Parish is supported in principle by the Town Council as it was identified in the Town Plan Survey and because it lies in the built-up area. It has been clarified by the TC that it is potentially available. <p>However, there are concerns that:</p>	<p>SCC ask how the interaction with the highway would be managed and there are concerns about the junction and footway provision.</p> <p>(c) The site has limited scope for development given its gradient and it would continue the linear pattern of growth away from the town centre where most facilities are located. There is no need to allocate the site if BRUT2 is progressed. SCC confirm concerns about the gradient in the main road and</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no footway provision and road steep. The gradient of the field would conflict with road calming. Challenges with increased road use and drainage. • The scale of development suggested is unlikely to be achieved, being on sloping ground which rises quickly from the back of the road. Other recent developments in the area have resulted in unattractive housing unsympathetic to one of the main approaches to the town. It currently offers views out to open countryside and hills beyond. Developing it would result in continuous ribbon development on the approach to the town. <p>(d) <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that small hubs of additional housing could be sited along a new east-west relief road at Wyke Champflower and Copplesbury, taking traffic away from the town. 	<p>across the site and the conflict with road calming; and state concerns about drainage.</p> <p>(d) Comment noted, but not a feasible or sustainable option.</p>
8.2	Do you think taking a proactive approach to planning applications for employment development in Bruton is enough, or should the Council direct growth in employment land through an allocation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that recent employment growth in Bruton has been through changes of use, so regeneration of existing sites and growth of existing businesses rather than the allocation of employment land should be promoted. No suitable sites have been identified by the TC. It would be more fruitful to focus on developing existing sites if accompanied by better supporting infrastructure. • It is also stated that it is not possible to provide a minimum of 3.06ha of employment land in the town. 	This will not be progressed unless a suitable site can be identified.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	If you would like to see an allocated employment site, where should that be?		
8.3	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Bruton?	<p>Transport and Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that the Council should continue its attempts to promote an east-west footpath along the River Brue and make better use of the Viney's Yard parking area. <p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is apparently funding for the business case to support a new surgery (15/03363/OUT) but additional funding is required to see the new building constructed. It is stated that it is reasonable therefore to seek primary healthcare planning obligations for development bringing future growth to Bruton. A new primary healthcare facility as suggested would ensure that the Review complies with Section 8 of the NPPF, in particular para 70, and para 157. However, it is also stated that the existing surgery does not need improvement; and that funding for a business case to relocate it has fallen through. There are currently no alternative plans. <p>Flood Mitigation/ Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for a surface water management scheme is strongly supported. It is suggested that any development to the east of the town centre would increase this risk. 	<p>These issues will be taken into account in the IDP Review.</p> <p>A new Play Area at Cuckoo Hill has now been delivered.</p> <p>The CCG state that additional capacity will need to be provided to meet the needs from growth, but also that there are no firm plans to invest in a new surgery in the short term.</p> <p>The surface water management scheme is now programmed for 2018/19.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EA require further survey work in respect of potential flooding and will be preparing a surface water management scheme. Further flood protection works may be required, which should be identified in the IDP. • Further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will also be necessary. <p><u>General Comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the 2017 Town Plan sets out a number of desired infrastructure improvements including safe and easy walking routes to the town centre; further improvements to existing sports and leisure facilities at Jubilee Park; and a modern multi-use community centre. It is suggested that as the Town Plan has been endorsed by SSDC, these should be included in the Local Plan. 	Comments noted.
	Bruton General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The photo on the front cover of the 'Bruton Handout' shows a pub that closed many years ago. • The reference to economic activities fails to represent the rapidly evolving Bruton economy which includes the opening of Hauser and Wirth and the cheese making by Wyke Farms Ltd. (This is also true of the Settlement Profile; and there is no mention of tourism). • Bruton has enjoyed success in recent years, has become a highly desirable housing location and has a vibrant economy. The local community , Town Council and developers have been proactive in working together to bring forward proposals which have significant levels of local support. Bruton serves as an example of why setting a specific housing target is a flawed approach. • The Frome-Yeovil road is actually the A359; not the A351 • The normally resident population figure is an overestimate given the number of children in boarding school accommodation. 	These comments are noted and any errors corrected in future documents.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 2016 TC survey found that only 37% of the economically active population were commuters; and the Town's employment self-containment has increased considerably. • Emphasis needs to be placed on the potential offered by the attractiveness of the Abbey Park and its Scheduled Monuments. Bruton makes a considerable contribution to the national exchequer through its schools, tourism and the church. 	
8.4	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options for growth at Ilchester include: 8.4(a) ILCH 1: Costello Fields for mixed use development 8.4(b) ILCH 2: Land North of Troubridge Park for mixed use development 8.4(c) ILCH 2: Land North of</p>	<p>(a) <u>Costello Fields for mixed use</u></p> <p>Comments received in support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. • Huntstowe Strategic Land intend to progress baseline studies to feed into a capacity/concept masterplan over the coming months. The site has moderate-high capacity to accommodate built form, but a more detailed assessment of constraints and potential layouts is required to understand the realistic capacity of the site. This will create a more sustainable community, with improved and much needed facilities, including balancing ponds for SUDs and bio-diversity enhancement; and screening from the A303 etc. <p>Concerns expressed about the Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about the northward extension towards the Lytes Cary Estate. if the site is taken forward, a more compact development that did not extend into the northern most part would be preferred – and it should include boundary vegetation and screening. • There is a potential Historic Environment impact, being adjacent to the Listed Buildings at the southern end of the site. Any building will need to be designed to respect the setting of the heritage assets. 	<p>(a) Given the proximity of Listed Buildings and the potential impact on their setting, this is not a Preferred Option. The Option ILCH2 is preferred to provide the necessary growth commensurate with Ilchester's status as a Rural Centre.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Troubridge Park for housing 8.4(d) Another option (please specify)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. <p>(b) <u>Troubridge Park for mixed use</u></p> <p>Expressions of support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of SSSC Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. • Huntstowe Strategic Land intend to progress baseline studies to feed into a capacity/concept masterplan over the coming months. The site has moderate-high capacity to accommodate built form, but a more detailed assessment of constraints and potential layouts is required to understand the realistic capacity of the site. This will create a more sustainable community, with improved and much needed facilities, including balancing ponds for SUDs and bio-diversity enhancement; and screening from the A303 etc. • One suggestion is that the site could be used as a 'test' site for any future development along the A303 between Podimore and Sparkford roundabouts. It has access to Yeovilton where it has been stated that its underuse could be improved by making it open for industrial/commercial development. Additionally, there is good road access. <p>Concerns expressed about the Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about the northward extension towards the Lytes Cary Estate; and ILCH2 would not be supported. <p>(c) <u>Troubridge Park for housing</u></p> <p>Comments received in support:</p>	<p>(b) and (c) Land north of Troubridge Park is being taken forward as a Preferred Option for residential development. Ilchester GP practice has now merged with Somerton.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. • Huntstowe Strategic Land intend to progress baseline studies to feed into a capacity/concept masterplan over the coming months. The site has moderate-high capacity to accommodate built form, but a more detailed assessment of constraints and potential layouts is required to understand the realistic capacity of the site. This will create a more sustainable community, with improved and much needed facilities, including balancing ponds for SUDs and bio-diversity enhancement; and screening from the A303 etc. <p>Concerns expressed about the Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about the northward extension towards the Lytes Cary Estate. if the site is taken forward, a more compact development that did not extend into the northern most part would be preferred – and it should include boundary vegetation and screening. • There is a potential Historic Environment impact, being adjacent to the Listed Buildings at the southern end of the site. Any building will need to be designed to respect the setting of the heritage assets. <p><u>(d)Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huntstowe Strategic Land consider the Review will need to identify additional land to that which is being considered for growth, as the housing need is larger than is currently being planned for. There is also 19.6ha of additional land adjoining ILCH1 and ILCH2. The total area of land available is 51.2ha excluding the site with outline permission. • The intention is to move forward with a reserved matters application for the permitted site and bring forward the remaining land for phased development which is now available for allocation through the Review process for housing and/or mixed use development. 	<p>(d)The development of the entirety of the two sites put forward would be out of scale with Ilchester's modest size and its status as a Rural Centre.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunstowe Strategic Land and the landowners which to create a legacy development to strengthen and enhance the settlement. • The southern part of Ilchester is physically constrained and therefore growth is likely to be deliverable only to the north due to fewer constraints and a better landscape capacity to accommodate built form. 	
8.5	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options for the siting of a new GP surgery include: 8.5(a) ILCH 1: Costello Fields 8.5(b) ILCH 2: Land North of Troubridge Park 8.5(c) Another site in Ilchester</p>	<p>There does not appear to be any preference for either ILCH1 or ILCH2 and the same comments were received in relation to both. These are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They could be suitable locations for a new primary healthcare building. ILCH1 is better located for serving the existing population of the historic part of Ilchester, whilst ILCH2 is adjacent to the existing consented application for new growth at Ilchester. • Developing the primary healthcare facility within an area of new development will ensure that it is deliverable within the critical mass of population it will serve and ensure that the right land is available at the right time in a sustainable location. • To accommodate the appropriately sized building and the necessary external space for vehicle parking and landscaping, a site of at least one hectare in size is required and this should be level, easily accessible and a regular shape. Ideally, this should be located adjacent to an existing road and be part of the first phase of development to be delivered so that it came forward independent of housing. • The southern part of Ilchester is physically constrained and therefore growth is likely to be deliverable only to the north due to fewer constraints and a better landscape capacity to accommodate built form. ILCH1 and ILCH2 fall in this location and would be appropriate for phased, mixed-use development and required facilities including the required doctor's surgery 	<p>Ilchester GP Practice has now merged with the one at Somerton..</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>which could easily be located in the enlarged master-planned area which would further enhance the town's sustainability.</p> <p>No other suitable sites have been suggested.</p>	
8.6	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Ilchester?	<p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. <p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given Ilchester's proximity to the SRN, Highways England consider it likely that future growth here has the potential to impact on the operation of the SRN, specifically at the A37 junction. Whilst having not specific preference in relation to growth options at Ilchester, development could raise concerns in relation to the performance of the A303. <p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing primary healthcare practice in Ilchester is operating at or in excess of operational capacity in accordance with national standards. A new site and building will be required. Planning obligations for primary healthcare should be sought for any future growth in Ilchester. 	<p>This will be identified in the Updated IDP and considered in relation to any planning application submitted.</p> <p>Highways issues will be considered in relation to any planning application submitted.</p> <p>The GP practice at Ilchester has now merged with the one at Somerton.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
8.7	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR?</p> <p>8.7(a) MART 1: Dimmocks Lane, Bower Hinton</p> <p>8.7(b) MART 2: Land Rear of The Rose & Crown</p> <p>8.7(c) MART 3: Land South of East Street Drive</p> <p>8.7(d) MART 4: Land Off Water Street</p> <p>8.7(e) MART 5: Land to the rear of Lyndhurst Grove</p> <p>8.7(f) MART 6: Land to the North of Coat Road</p>	<p>(a) <u>Dimmocks Lane</u></p> <p>Comments in support of the this Option state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents say they are working with local residents to make a pre-app submission in 2018 for developing bespoke self-build homes on part of this Option – 0.3ha of the 0.6ha site. The site has established hedgerows and adjoins the Conservation Area, but it has low flood risk, no ecological constraints or is BMV Land. The site has moderate to low capacity to accommodate built development and a low density development is being proposed. There is an aspiration to accommodate up to 12 dwellings on site, rather than the 20 approximated by the Council. The site abuts a built up area so it is reasonable to infer that necessary services such as mains water and foul drainage are reasonably available. • The access and highway may need an upgrade. The access to the B3165 cannot currently be achieved in accordance with the Highways Authority’s guidance but there is scope for improvement. • Dimmocks Lane is a restricted Byway serving at least three dwellings. It does not authorise use by members of the public with motor vehicles, except for private rights of way. This issue has not been further investigated. <p>Concerns about the possible allocation are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is outside the guideline distance from village facilities. • SSDC Conservation Unit state that there are potential impacts regarding the setting of the conservation area. • Historic England consider that development of the following sites is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. <p>(b) <u>Rear of Rose & Crown</u></p>	<p>(a) The poor accessibility of the site and the likely harm to the conservation area agreed by SSDC Conservation officers; and relatively low capacity make the site unsuitable for allocation in the Local Plan. This would not prevent the submission of a planning application seeking to address these issues.</p> <p>(b) There are no constraints that would prevent development of the site for mixed use, but given</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>8.7(g) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>Expressions of support state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of SSDC Conservation Unit’s preferred landscape options. <p>Concerns regarding the Option are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the following sites is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • The site is outside the guideline distance from village facilities. • It is in an area of high archaeological potential which will result in delays to delivery. • It could prove difficult to access due to the Public RoW. <p>(c) – <u>East Street Drove</u></p> <p>There does not to be any support for this Option.,</p> <p>Expressions of concern are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Option is said to have met uniquely vigorous and universal resistance in the monthly community consultation. This is a very much valued stretch of countryside, much walked and with fine views of the village, Ham Hill, Ringwell and Hallett Hills, and Grade 2* listed Madey water mill and associated wildlife (otters and wolveroles). • Historic England consider that development of the following sites is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • The site is BMV agricultural land grade 3a. 	<p>the relatively low numbers of dwellings that could be expected to be provided, it is not necessary to allocate the site in the Local Plan. SSDC Conservation officers state that the close proximity of the conservation area will determine a sensitive solution, but as previously developed land, and in being discretely located, they do not consider development is precluded here.</p> <p>SCC state that the access is a public right of way which could prove difficult.</p> <p>(c) The site is relatively remote from the built form of the settlement with no highway access. Its development would also have a harmful impact on heritage assets agreed by SSDC Conservation officers and is not suitable.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also in Flood Zone 2. <p>(d) – <u>Water Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A planning application has already been submitted for this site. <p>Objections to the inclusion of the site state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development here has been dismissed at appeal. • Historic England consider that development of the following sites is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • The site is influenced by the Conservation Area and has a high archaeological potential. <p>(e) – <u>Lyndhurst Grove</u></p> <p>Reaction to the possible inclusion is mixed. Comments in favour include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suitable, available and viable; and could be developed on its own or in conjunction with MART6 or adjoining land. • It is one of SSDC Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options • The Landscape Study identified land to the east of Stapleton Close and Bracey Road as having capacity for built development. <p>Meanwhile, objections are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has poor road and junction access; there are issues with pedestrian links, poor width; and no edgings or footways. • The site is at appeal. • The site is BMV agricultural land grade 3a. 	<p>(d) Planning permission has now been granted for 10 bungalows on the site (17/03874/OUT) and there is no need to allocate the site in the Local Plan.</p> <p>(e) Outline planning permission has now been granted for 35 dwellings on the site (13/01500/OUT) and there is no need to allocate the site in the Local Plan.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(f) <u>North of Coat Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comment in favour of this allocation is that it is suitable, available and viable; it could be developed on its own or in conjunction with MART6 or adjoining land. <p>Concerns about the site are stated to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has poor road access; how would the junctions be accessed; issues with pedestrian links, poor width; no edgings or footways. It extends the village to one field width from Coat – the reason why the Inspector dismissed an appeal on land between Martock and Stapleton. SSDC's Conservation Unit also say there are potential HE impacts with this site where development could erode the separation form Coat. The site is BMV agricultural land grade 3a. <p>(g) – <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coat Road - DWH control land here. A previous approval has lapsed but it remains fully developable; it lapsed because of a legal issue with its acquisition which is now resolved. The site is in the anomalous position of being suitable and deliverable but no reference is made in the Plan nor shown in the IO consultation document. Several of the potential sites are poorly related to services and facilities when compared to Coat Road and are much smaller. The Coat Road site should therefore be allocated. The intervening land should be developed in conjunction with the land to the north as this provides a logical western extension to Martock and can provide an alternative/additional vehicular access to the school. 	<p>(f) SCC express concerns about road access, pedestrian links, road width and no edgings or footways. There is however direct access onto Coat Road and it is likely that this would need to be widened. There would be little visual harm in this respect. The separation to Coat would be retained with a substantial field and long gardens remaining undeveloped. There are few areas adjoining the settlement which are not BMV land - it is inevitable that some would be lost in the growth of Martock, but this need not be an overriding consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coat Road – this site was not included as an Option originally as the planning permission was still extant (15/01021/REM). One must assume that this would be renewed, but there would be no harm at present to include it as an allocation in the Local Plan.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off Stapleton Road - Gladman is working with the landowners to promote their site for mixed-use development (A document “Vision for land at Stapleton Road, Martock” has been provided). It could commence within 5 years of allocation. There are no technical impediments or environmental constraints that would preclude the development; there is a willing landowner; and it has good access to the wider highway network and public transport, cycle and walking links. • Land at Ringwell Hill – A pre-app discussion has been held on the site identified. It could accommodate 25 dwellings. Part of the site is within the Development Area and utilises PDL. Was agreed that the principle of housing on the site is acceptable and further information would be provided on the layout. Anticipated that a planning application will be made early in 2018. • Land off Foldhill Lane – It is stated that this 8.4ha site is in a sustainable location for housing to meet the needs of Martock and the District as identified in the emerging Local Plan. It can deliver circa 200 dwellings of much needed market and affordable housing and aid Martock’s self-containment. Previous planning applications have been refused, but Issues surrounding landscape and topography can be overcome, as shown by the nursing home which breached the boundary of the railway line and has been sensitively designed to integrate with the gently undulating landscape setting; flooding is an issue that affects the Martock as a whole - the site can assist with this issue through the use of SUDs; and the site can contribute a significant amount of housing and, by doing so, the site is would contribute to the housing deficit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stapleton Road – Planning permission has previously been refused and dismissed on appeal on the grounds of significant harm to the spatial strategy and to landscape character and appearance. Hence the site has been deemed unsuitable. • Ringwell Hill - A residential development for 49 dwellings has been dismissed (14/04723/FUL) as being in an unsustainable location. • Foldhill Lane – Planning permission has been granted for 24 dwellings on the western part of the site indicated. There is no need to allocate the site as there are other more sustainable locations in Martock that could be allocated. This would not prevent a planning application for its development being submitted. • Land south of Hills Lane - An additional site has been

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>submitted for a continuation of that south of Coat Road, where the planning permission has lapsed, referred to above. This would be adjacent to the primary school. This would be a logical extension of that which had received permission, although access would need to be from that development as Hills Lane would not be adequate. Improved links to the Primary School could potentially be achieved.</p>
8.8	<p>Do you think that it is appropriate that the currently allocated site ME/MART/2 continues to be designated for employment use?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the land is not suitable for this use; that conditions attached to a previous permission were very restrictive although supported by the parish Council ; and that other employment land at Martock is coming on stream. • SSDC's Conservation Unit support the deallocation as there is a strong HE case against the construction of employment building forms on the site, where site evaluation, slope and visibility all contribute to exacerbate an adverse landscape and visual impact; and impose upon the conservation area. 	<p>In the 14/04723/FUL appeal, the Inspector raised substantial concerns about the likelihood of development for employment use ever occurring given the length of time the site had been allocated. This is significant. The Local Plan Review will identify employment land allocations based upon the evidence set out in the Employment Land Review 2019 (ELR). The ELR will be complete and inform the LPR before consultation in June.</p> <p>The points listed opposite will be considered and a full response will be published alongside the ELR.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
8.9	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Martock & Bower Hinton?	<p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is said that the existing primary healthcare practices in Martock are operating at excess of operational capacity in accordance with national standards. An options appraisal for what type of healthcare development is required and could be delivered in Martock to accommodate the primary healthcare needs of the increasing population will be necessary. <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. 	<p>Symphony Healthcare Services advise that primary healthcare practices are operating at or close to capacity; and an options appraisal to meet the needs of an increasing population will be necessary</p> <p>Improved changing facilities at the Recreation Ground are a SSDC Priority.</p> <p>The Foldhill Lane inlet works including culvert lining are now complete</p>
8.10	Which of the following options should be taken forward in the LPR? Options for housing growth at Milborne Port include: 8.10(a) MIPO 1: Land at Wynbrook Farm	<p>(a) <u>Land at Wynbrook Farm</u></p> <p>There is disagreement about the appropriateness of this allocation. Those in favour state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is best and most sensible option as would be an appropriate number of dwellings and have reasonable access for cars. It is an infill to the village. It is well-located on an established road, serving existing residential areas. It is also stated that this site could be potentially suitable for mixed use of employment with residential. <p>However, there are also strong reservations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDC's Conservation Unit state that there are potential HE impacts, where development impact would adversely affect the well-designed setting of Newtown conservation area. 	<p>(a) This site is not going to be taken forward because its development would have a harmful effect on the adjacent Newtown conservation area.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>8.10(b) MIPO 2: Land north of Manor Road</p> <p>8.10(c) MIPO 3: South of Court Lane</p> <p>8.10(d) MIPO 4: Land north of Wheathill Lane</p> <p>8.10(e) Another option (please specify)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England also considers the site to be sensitive due to proximity to a number of heritage assets. As the sites may contribute to their significance, an appropriate heritage assessment would be required to determine the principle of development. • It is also stated that the site is located to the extreme north-eastern edge of the village and is some distance from the settlement's main services and facilities; and that it is not within 400m of a bus stop. <p>(b) <u>Manor Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This one of SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options • However, it is also stated that a development here would encroach upon quiet roads and views to rural landscapes; it is farmland continually in use. • There are also a number of concerns regarding highways and access. There is no road access – only a Right of Way and track access; Manor Road has cars parked all the way down one side of the road and exit and entry at the top is dangerous due to vehicles parked near the junction; and it is not within 400m of a bus stop. <p>(c) <u>Court Lane</u></p> <p>There is also considerable disagreement about whether this site should be allocated. Those in favour state the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is one of two options that would have the least impact in relation to the changing nature of the village boundaries. • It is one of SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. 	<p>(b) There is currently no access to this site and it will not be taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>(c) Access would be possible from Court Lane although adequate visibility at the western end with the junction to Wick Road would need to be ensured. The site is being taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would provide space for approximately the correct number of homes. <p>On the other hand, reasons for objecting to the site are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would hugely affect the privacy of home owners along Wick Road. • It would spoil natural habitat. • There has been a huge increase in housing in the settlement, but many shops, garden centre and school have been lost. • Objections on highways and access grounds are that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is poorly located in terms of transport links. It is poorly served by narrow roads. Court Lane is currently used as narrow, rural, lane used as a 'rat run' and is not suitable to provide a sufficient access onto. There is no pedestrian access and existing residential properties at either end of Court Lane also restrict any potential for footpaths or road widenings etc. It does not offer very good access in and out of the village. An outline application for 20 homes (14/01055/OUT) was refused in Sept 2014 for five reasons, including: "<i>insufficient evidence that the proposed development would not cause an adverse highways impact in respect of the ability of the local highway network to satisfactorily absorb the increased of traffic generated by the development</i>". <p>(d) <u>Wheathill Lane</u></p> <p>Comments in favour of this site are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is contained by current development. The western part could accommodate up to 40 dwellings that would round off this part of the edge of the settlement. 	<p>(d) This is being taken forward as a preferred Option. The junction with Station Road would require improvement and access to the eastern part should be vis the</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It offers best access in and out of the settlement. It has easy access to playing fields and the village hall which encourages engagement in sport. • It is close to the primary school • It is suitable, viable, available and achievable within 5 years. • It is less built up. • Largest site, so better option to deliver affordable housing. • There is an application pending which includes a convenience store which is much needed in the settlement and will provide local employment. It could also provide a number of small industrial units. • There is an opportunity for good quality development without detriment to the historic core. • The western half only is one of SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. • The site is in separate ownerships, so the Council should treat the land as two separate site allocations – since part would of itself be landlocked, its access would be questionable. <p>Concerns about the potential allocation are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an issue with access at Wheat Hill Lane. • It is well located but unsuitable without significant improvements to the immediate roads, junctions and pavements as well as a range of other public benefits. • It is not believed that over 100 dwellings is appropriate in a village of this size. <p>(e) <u>Another Option</u></p>	<p>land the subject of a current planning application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of development proposed is commensurate with Milborne Port's status as a Rural Centre and would not be out of scale with the settlement.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Station Road - part of MIPO4 and land at Wheathill Way should be taken forward. Given that the settlement's current targets have already been met, four possible further options seems to be very modest growth. To restrict development on well-connected sites in sustainable locations would have a negative impact on the provision of community facilities in this Rural Centre. • East Street/ London Rd for housing or potentially mixed use – Good road access; close to shops and central facilities; the site is capable of development without adverse impact on Milborne Port Conservation Area or historic park; it is developable, available, and deliverable in the short-term and there are no issues with the site and is of a suitable size to meet the housing need for Milborne Port. • South of Wheathill Lane - The site adjoins a recently completed site which shows it is suitable for development; it is within walking distance of the village's amenities; and it is developable, available, and can be delivered in the short-term. • North of Wheathill Lane - Given the development of new houses adjacent, the location is considered suitable for development. • Land at Goldings Lane - The site area is about 3.8ha. The appeal (APP/R3325/W/17/3167634) allowed 46 units off Gainsborough. That site is a short distance to the north on the opposite side of the A30. In that appeal, the Council stated no objection to the principle of extending Milborne Port beyond its current limits as it takes a permissive approach to residential 	<p>Station Road - This site is being taken forward as a preferred Option.</p> <p>East Street – this site is adjacent to historic parkland and its development would have an adverse impact on heritage assets</p> <p>South of Wheathill Lane - Site has road frontage and existing vehicular access. No pavement. Significant hedge along Wheathill Lane. Not considered capable of being accessed in an environmentally sensitive way. The southern part would adversely affect the setting of Venn House.</p> <p>North of Wheathill Lane – this site is not considered capable of being accessed in an environmentally sensitive way due to significant hedge along Wheathill Lane.</p> <p>Goldings Lane – the site is suitable, available and achievable, but is less well located in relation to the rest of</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>developments adjacent to the development areas of Rural Centres. The 2017 HELAA identifies the site (E/MIPO/0003) as having capacity for about 68 dwellings and concludes that it is suitable, available, and achievable. Given the Conservation Area on the eastern side, the site could accommodate circa 60-70 dwellings with a buffer and open space. Pedestrian linkages would be improved as part of the development. Heritage Assets need not be adversely affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the left of Goathill Road (between Goathill Road and Goldings Lane) to be used for employment land. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that a significant number of homes have been built with barely any investment in infrastructure. An examination of infrastructure implications and possible improvements that sites could bring is required. • One comment is that Milborne Port has all but achieved its Local Plan Target of 279 homes. It has absorbed four large developments since 2010 (Tannery, Wheathill Lane and Gainsborough) and has grown by over 21% since 2005. <p>It is said that the rural setting of the settlement is being dismantled with its open aspect and views being lost.</p>	<p>the built up area of Milborne Port than other sites; and is not a Preferred Option. An appropriate scale of growth of the settlement can be achieved without it.</p> <p>Goathill Road - It is understood that the site may not be available for employment purposes.</p> <p>The amount of development proposed is commensurate with Milborne Port's status as a Rural Centre and would not be out of scale with the settlement. Additional land needs to be identified for the new Local Plan period to 2036.</p> <p>Limited infrastructure requirements have been identified in the Local Plan.</p>
8.11	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other	<p>Highways and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milborne port has a number of narrow streets and lanes without pavements – improvements are required to accommodate more houses. <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an examination of demands on school places. 	Highways issues will need to be considered in relation to any planning application.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	infrastructure requirements for Milborne Port?	<p>Utilities/ Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an investigation into foul and surface water drainage capacity. Some assessments have been completed to test capacity within Wessex Water’s networks for development. Minimal cumulative assessments to service proposals at Milborne Port have been undertaken and further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. • Areas of Milborne Port suffer sewer flooding from groundwater inundation during periods of prolonged wet weather. Wessex Water recommends considering development subject to a revised SFRA <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everything possible must be done to maintain existing retail and employment. • Additional affordable homes. 	<p>This is a matter for the County Council. Any shortfall will need to be identified in the Updated IDP.</p> <p>This has been acknowledged in the Local Plan.</p> <p>These comments are noted.</p>
8.12	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options for housing growth at South Petherton include: 8.12(a) SOPE 1: Land South</p>	<p>(a) <u>South of Hospital Lane</u></p> <p>Most comments received are in favour of this potential allocation. Specific points made are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Options would put pressure on West Street, already congested with parking. • The site has the advantage of being joined on three sides by existing homes and the hospital. The site would not impair views to the east. It has potential to provide a new footpath to the medical facilities. Additional public parking is something Persimmon would be prepared to explore. It is identified in the Aecom Appraisal as performing better than any of the other options. it is likely to contribute to a development of over 130 homes. • This is one SSDC’s Conservation Unit’s preferred landscape options. • There are, however, some concerns with access and RoW conflicts. 	<p>(a) Comments are noted. This is a Preferred Option to be taken forward. Access and Rights of Way issues can be considered in relation to a planning application.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>of Hospital Lane 8.12(b) SOPE 2: Land Rear of Lampreys Lane 8.12(c) SOPE 3: Land Rear of Littlehays 8.12(d) SOPE 4: Land Rear of West Street, Partway Lane 8.12(e) SOPE 5: Land off Lampreys Lane/ Behind Moor Villas 8.12(f) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>(b) <u>Lampreys Lane</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few comments have been received expressing support for the inclusion of this site, although it is one SSSC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. <p>Concerns about the site are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site lies on a flood plain. It is said that development of this field would leave a large part of South Petherton in serious danger of flooding. The field is regularly saturated with water. Hele Lane, The Sheep Wash, Burnworthy and St Thomas Mews, lower part of St James Street, Prigg Lane and part of Silver Street would be at risk of flooding. • There are concerns with access and RoW conflicts. • Development here would have a significant negative impact. Traffic movements from these sites would all feed into West Street then exit the village either by the narrow road leading to Lopen Head or St James Street. • development of this field would leave a large part of South Petherton in serious danger of flooding. The field is regularly saturated with water. Hele Lane, The Sheep Wash, Burnworthy and St Thomas Mews, lower part of St James Street, Prigg Lane and part of Silver Street would be at risk of flooding. • Historic England considers the site to be sensitive due to proximity to a number of heritage assets. <p>(c) <u>Rear of Littlehays</u></p> <p>Most comments received are in favour of this potential allocation, with statements that:</p>	<p>(b) Comments are noted. This is not a Preferred Option.</p> <p>(c) Comments noted. This is a Preferred Option to be taken forwards. Access and Rights of</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Options would put pressure on West Street, already congested with parking. • It would have little impact on the village. It is surrounded by development on three sides, so is an infill site. It is visually self-contained, with minimal views from the public domain. • This is one SSSC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. • The site has previously been assessed as suitable, deliverable and available housing land by the 2017 HELAA (N/SOPE/001/10) which identified a potential yield of 11 dwellings. It is viable and remains immediately available for development. • The site is directly adjacent to the development limits of South Petherton. It is within walking distance of all village amenities including retail, a post office, public house, infant and primary schools, a medical centre, hospital and recreational facilities. • A modest housing development delivered at an appropriate density and scale would not harm the settlement pattern or landscape character. And subject to appropriate design, it would not harm the setting of Hayes End Manor (Grade II* listed). • The site would comply with Policy NE2 of the emerging South Petherton Neighbourhood Plan. • There are, however, some concerns about access and RoW conflicts. <p>(d) <u>Rear of West Street, Parkway Lane</u></p> <p>Comments in favour of this site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is supported; and it is considered that land to the south-west of Parkway Farm should also be included – previously assessed as suitable and deliverable in the 2017 HELAA (N/SOPE/0013). 	<p>Way issues can be considered in relation to a planning application.</p> <p>(d) The restrictive covenant on the eastern part of the site would mean that the remainder would appear relatively isolated and an intrusion into open countryside. It is not therefore a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will already have a residential character. It occupies a highly sustainable location. It has been identified as having a moderate capacity and an appropriate low density would not harm the landscape character. • It is stated that the site performs well against Policy NE2 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. • SSDC's Conservation Unit state that the eastern part is a preferred option from a landscape perspective. <p>Concerns about the site are stated to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The owner of Sheria has a covenant on the surrounding field which prevents building on that land. Several potential developers have been informed of this fact and owner has no intention of lifting it, therefore this area should not be identified for growth • There are concerns with access and RoW conflicts. • The site would have a significant negative impact. Traffic movements from these sites would all feed into West Street then exit the village either by the narrow road leading to Lopen Head or St James Street. <p>(e) <u>Lampreys Lane, behind Moor Villas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. • There have been positive discussions with Planners and a portion to the north-east is soon to receive a preferable recommendation for 15 dwellings. It is a highly sustainable location with good linkages to the town centre. There are no landscape or highway objections. <p>However, concerns about the site relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and RoW conflicts. 	<p>(e) Relatively restricted access and flood risk make the entirety of the site unsuitable for development. It is not a Preferred Option.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site lies on a flood plain. • It would have a significant negative impact. Traffic movements from these sites would all feed into West Street then exit the village either by the narrow road leading to Lopen Head or St James Street. <p>(f) <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between Bridge Way and Lightgate Lane - is available; public consultation has been undertaken and a planning application is in preparation. There are no policies or constraints that would restrict its development. • Areas to the east of Hayes End would have less of an impact on the historic core of the village. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general concern that has been expressed is that any development should be limited to meet local need within the capabilities of existing infrastructure; there is a feeling that housing targets have already been exceeded and that only limited development should now be permitted. The bus service is also said to be extremely poor, with residents generally need to drive to Yeovil or Taunton for work. • On the other hand, it is stated that South Petherton is sustainable and whilst it has exceeded the current Local Plan's housing target, it can accommodate further growth given its location, function, and market attraction. • There are a number of Highways-related concerns, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cumulative effect on the town and highways network due to narrow roads. 	<p>(f) Bridge Way – this would represent an unnecessary incursion into open land and the would harm the setting of the existing recreational areas.</p> <p>Hayes End – no such land has come forward and opportunities would appear limited.</p> <p>The scale of growth planned for South Petherton is commensurate with its status as a Rural Centre and would be in scale with the settlement.</p> <p>Highways issues can be considered in relation to any planning application submitted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are massive problems with parking – lack of spaces and crowded streets. - There should be no large housing development due to the extreme lack of parking; and roads are narrow. Parking can obstruct emergency vehicles and everything stops when refuse vehicles pass through. - St James Street is a through route for over half the vehicles in the town, yet it is only one carriageway wide. The situation is worsened by a large bend in the road. - The main road into the town – Hayes End – is often blocked with parked cars, especially outside the junior school, where cars can also prevent drivers from seeing children. - St James Street should be one-way only – up this road and down Silver Street. Then there would be no need for vehicles to reverse to allow vehicles to pass; and more parking spaces could be provided. - A proper pavement outside the Co-op is needed; also a pavement can be built next to Lockets up to the Post Office. - Very thorough and detailed car park surveys have also been provided. 	
8.13	Are there any sites in South Petherton that should be allocated for employment land?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that Lopen has already done its duty to help South Petherton with its employment land. This site is marginal on sustainability. However, another comment is that whilst, South Petherton has failed to deliver employment land, Lopen Head has been allocated in the Local Plan as it was as a sustainable location to meet the employment land need. It is said that there are constraints preventing sites from being brought forward, so given the inability to deliver in South Petherton and the District-wide need, the Lopen Business Park should be extended. • No other sites have been suggested. 	Sites for employment land in South Petherton are very limited and it is recognised that Lopen Head provides valuable opportunities for new jobs. Little harm would result from a slight increase in employment land here. The Local Plan Review will identify employment land allocations based upon the evidence set out in the Employment Land Review 2019 (ELR). The ELR will

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			be complete and inform the LPR before consultation in June.
8.14	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for South Petherton?	<p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment has been completed to test capacity within our networks for development SOPE 1. It was indicated at the time that sufficient capacity existed to serve approximately 65 dwellings. Further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. Statement in 8.79 “there may be water treatment works necessary” is incorrect. Works may be required on water supply networks, not water treatment. 	This is acknowledged in the Preferred Options document.
8.15	Which of the following options should be taken forward through the LPR? Options for housing growth at Stoke Sub Hamdon include: 8.15(a) STHA 1: Land at West Street	<p>(a) <u>West Street</u></p> <p>Comments in favour of this site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is one SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. Some other general support has been received. <p>Concerns expressed include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that this is one of the more intrusive options in the landscape - to develop the site would enlarge undesirable ribbon development outside the core of the village and undermine the rural nature of the village. Highways England are concerned about the impact on A303 and pedestrian links. The Parish Council would not consider favourably the westernmost most part N/STHA/0100 as this would increase the ribbon effect in an already 	The current Preferred Option is that Stoke sub Hamdon should have the status of a 'Village' and no specific allocations will be made.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>8.15(b) STHA 2: Land west of Kings Road</p> <p>8.15(c) STHA 3: Land east of North Street</p> <p>8.15(d) Another option (please specify)</p>	<p>long village, and might well cause parking /obstruction problems in West Street which is narrow at that point.</p> <p>(b) <u>Kings Road</u></p> <p>Reaction to this Option is mixed. Comments in support of the potential allocation state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that this is the better option though the size of the site is questioned - if its capacity for dwellings is 155, it would over-deliver and should therefore be reduced in size. It would support the compact nature of the village and is near the A303 for most direct road access. North Street in Stoke is already hazardous and slow due to the narrow road and parked cars so easy access directly to/from the A303 is vital. It would be less intrusive in the landscape compared with other options. • This is one SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. <p>Concerns about the Option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of the southern part may impact the setting of the grade I Listed Priory building. • Historic England considers that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity • The site is unsuitable due to archaeological interest and the loss of farming land. <p>(c) <u>North Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one SSDC's Conservation Unit's preferred landscape options. There is some other general support. <p>Concerns about the site are stated as being:</p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England consider that development of the following sites is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets in their vicinity. • There is potentially a RoW conflict. • It is unsuitable due to archaeological interest and the loss of farming land. <p>(d) <u>Another Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is said that any future development should be small and not restricted to one area. Stoke has already reached its minimum 5 year housing commitment and with what's already being built, the village is struggling with practical issues such as doctor shortages, leaking water pipes, major sewerage issues, limited and at risk bus services, parking, speeding through narrow roads and insufficient retail and restaurant outlets. • A further site is suggested, to the rear of the Arc Homes site which is currently being built out, and which was identified in the 2017 HELAA as N/STHA/0003 (40 houses). It would be an extension of the existing Arc Homes site. <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments received include that any future development at Stoke should take into account the suitability of construction materials as 'red-brick' estate types would be unsympathetic to the hamstone village; housing being built is too large for local needs and too expensive for young people; and the Council should be encouraging developers to build dwellings to reflect actual local needs. • Another, however, states that the limitation of housing provision in Stoke sub Hamdon is of concern - As a Rural Centre it should contribute more than 55 homes. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
8.16	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Stoke sub Hamdon?	<p>Utilities and Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage – in West Street, where considerable water damage has occurred. The system is old and no longer fit for purpose and cannot support any more building; it must be remedied by Highways, developers and planners. • Water leaks – continual in High Street from the old lead pipes – the whole system needs replacing. • Flooding – ongoing in East Stoke opposite Lake Lane from blocked pipes and natural springs from the Hill. • Further assessment of options in respect of foul/ water supply networks will be necessary. • It should be noted that both Wessex Water and the LLFA are undertaking flooding appraisals within the Stoke Sub Hamdon catchment <p>Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing primary healthcare practices in Stoke sub Hamdon are operating at excess of operational capacity in accordance with national standards. An options appraisal for what type of healthcare development is required and could be delivered in Stoke sub Hamdon to accommodate the primary healthcare needs. Obligations for primary healthcare should be sought for any future growth in Stoke sub Hamdon. <p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that there are limited transport options – residents need to travel to Yeovil for day to day needs. The bus service is very limited and the cost prohibitive. The District should be encouraging the supermarkets to reinstate the free bus service. 	Comments are noted and will be taken into account in the IDP Update. Specific infrastructure requirements for Villages will not be included in the Local Plan.
9.1	Which of the following current	(a) <u>Crewkerne Key Site</u>	a) <u>Crewkerne Key Site</u> The remainder of the employment allocation relating to the Crewkerne

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>allocations for employment development should be taken forward in the Local Plan Review? Option 9.1(a) Crewkerne Key Site (CLR) (KS/CREW/1) Option 9.1(b) Land West of Horlicks, Ilminster (ME/ILMI/3) Option 9.1(c) Land off Station Road, Ilminster (ME/ILMI/4) Option 9.1(d) Land adjacent to Powrmatic, Ilminster (ME/ILMI/5) Option 9.1(e) Wincanton, New Barns Farm (KS/WINC/1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some support for this – it is said that it should be taken forward, albeit reduced to 3.74ha; and that any allocation should be based on up to date employment evidence. • As stated elsewhere in the Crewkerne Section, Taylor Wimpey have given a number of reasons why it should continue to be allocated. • There doesn't appear to be much feeling against taking it forwards. <p>(b) <u>Land west of Horlicks, Ilminster</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some support for continuing to allocate this site – it is stated that it is desirable to focus on the significant brownfield sites along the A303 corridor at Ilminster. • There don't appear to be any objections to the site being taken forwards. <p>(c) <u>Station Road, Ilminster</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated elsewhere in the Ilminster Section, the owners of the land are supportive of a mixed use development of the site. • It is stated that there are excellent links to the A30, A303 and A358; but that it would be worth reviewing whether the sites could be released with help from the public sector. • Many people think it is currently an eyesore and needs to be developed quickly. • There don't appear to be any objections to the site being taken forwards. <p>(d) <u>Adjacent Powrmatic, Ilminster</u></p>	<p>Key Site is taken forward in the Local Plan review as part of Policy EP1.</p> <p><u>b) Land west of Horlicks, Ilminster</u> This site is not carried forward as a Strategic Employment Site as there is only 1 hectare remaining and can be comfortably dealt with through the Development Management process.</p> <p><u>c) Station Road, Ilminster</u> This site is taken forward as a Strategic Employment Site as part of Policy EP1.</p> <p><u>d) Adjacent to Powrmatic, Ilminster</u> This site is not carried forward as a Strategic Employment Site as it is land-locked and any expansion of Powrmatic can be comfortably dealt with through the Development Management process through other policies.</p> <p><u>(e) to (k)</u> The Local Plan Review will identify employment land allocations based upon the evidence set out in the Employment Land Review 2019</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>Option 9.1(f) Wincanton, Land between Lawrence Hill and A303 (ME/WINC/3)</p> <p>Option 9.1(g) Castle Cary, Torbay Road (ME/CACA/3(i))</p> <p>Option 9.1(h) Yeovil Lufton (KS/BRYM/1)</p> <p>Option 9.1(i) Yeovil, South of Airfield (ME/YEOV/4)</p> <p>Option 9.1(j) Yeovil, Bunford Lane (ME/WECO/1);</p> <p>Option 9.1(k) Crewkerne, North of Fire Station at Blacknell Lane (ME/CREW/4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated elsewhere in the Ilminster Section, the owners wish to retain the land for their future use. • There is some other general support for continuing to allocate it. It is stated that there are excellent links to the A30, A303 and A358; but that it would be worth reviewing whether the sites could be released with help from the public sector. • There don't appear to be any objections to the site being taken forwards. <p>(e) <u>New Barns Farm, Wincanton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wincanton Town Council believes that land south of the A303 should be added to the allocations of employment land and that this site should be taken forward. • The developers of the site state that only 0.5ha of the New Barns Farm site remains and will be shortly the subject of a planning application. • It is stated that It is desirable to focus on the significant brownfield sites along the A303 corridor at Wincanton. • There is some other general support. • There doesn't appear to be much feeling against taking it forwards. <p>(f) <u>Land between Lawrence Hill and A303, Wincanton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons for continuing to allocate this land are said to be similar to the other employment allocation in Wincanton. • Again, there don't appear to be any objections to the site being taken forwards. 	<p>(ELR). The ELR will be complete and inform the LPR before consultation in June.</p> <p>Each site listed opposite will be considered and a full response will be published alongside the ELR.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>(g) <u>Torbay Road, Castle Cary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that there is need to maintain the Castle Cary sites to give some diversity of economic opportunity; more employment and space for SMEs urgently needed in Castle Cary; and especially with so much new housing being developed. • There don't appear to be any objections to the site being taken forwards. <p>(h) <u>Lufton, Yeovil</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the site is being actively promoted and applications are expected shortly at Lufton 2000. • There is some other general support, although it is stated that it is within the setting of the Montacute House historic landscape; and that should it proceed, it is asked it be a landscape-led scheme with low level buildings in muted colours. • There doesn't appear to be much feeling against taking it forwards. <p>(i) <u>South of Airfield, Yeovil</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is said that the site is being actively promoted. • There is some other general support • There don't appear to be any objections to the site being taken forwards. <p>(j) <u>Bunford Lane, Yeovil</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the site is being actively promoted 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also stated that the majority of the site has long been identified as a suitable site for employment development. Most of the site has planning permission for employment uses through the extant outline planning permission (07/05341/OUT) for the development of the land for Class B1 use, which included an element of retail floorspace, and the currently undetermined reserved matters application (16/01185/REM). The site is currently subject to a hybrid application for a proposed mixed use development (17/02805/HYBRID). (Detail of the application given.) Therefore, the current allocation for employment development at Bunford land (option j) should be taken forward and extended to reflect the current application for mixed use development site application area. The Peripheral Landscape Studies show it to have moderate-high capacity to accommodate built form. This post-dates the Local Plan Inspector's findings in 2006 where this land was unsuccessfully promoted for employment purposes as part of a larger allocation • It is said that a breadth of economic development uses should be allowed on such sites to enable a viable scheme to come forward to contribute towards the provision of new jobs and meeting the employment land targets in South Somerset, and specifically Yeovil; and that economic development uses could include not only those uses with the B Use Classes, but also public and community uses and main town centre uses (which included retail development, leisure, entertainment facilities, the more intensive sport and recreation uses, office, and arts, culture and tourism development. • There is some feeling that the Bunford Lane employment land should be a Park and Ride and/or residential use; or that it could be significantly reduced. <p>(k) <u>Blacknell Lane, Crewkerne</u></p>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some other general support to continue with is allocation and no objections to it. . <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England considers that any change in employment land allocations should carefully consider the impacts of this in terms of shifting commuting patterns and the potential effects on the surrounding road network including the SRN. • It is stated that it is important that PDL is utilised. The focus for employment development should be on the large brownfield sites. • There is though a belief that there should be a reduction in the overall amount of land for employment; and that due to lower economic growth it is clear that land allocations should be reduced. 	
9.2	Are there any sites that are not currently identified in the HELAA or as Options elsewhere in this document, that would be suitable to allocate for employment development; and if so how	<p>Expressions of support for additional sites are as follows:</p> <p><u>Lopen Business Parks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 5.5 confirms that whilst the Local Plan sought to deliver employment land in the main settlements, it has not happened there but within the ‘Rest of District’. SSDC should take note of this and dilute the large allocations of employment land that are difficult to bring forward, and instead seek to deliver more employment land in rural areas, for example at Lopen. • Lopen has been home to many businesses, operating from two of its business parks. Lopen Head Nursery has been extended recently and has reached its capacity but Lopen Business Parks has considerable opportunity to extend and is an ideal candidate to contribute towards the lacking delivery of employment. <p><u>Huish Episcopi</u></p>	<p>The Local Plan Review will identify employment land allocations based upon the evidence set out in the Employment Land Review 2019 (ELR). The ELR will be complete and inform the LPR before consultation in June.</p> <p>Each site listed opposite will be considered and a full response will be published alongside the ELR.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	much and where?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huish Episcopi PC supports the further development of Westover Trading Estate. <p><u>Yeovil</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploit opportunities at the cattle market, bus depot and SEB depot for housing and/or employment. <p><u>Somerton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is about one hectare of undeveloped land next to the Edgar Hall, not identified in the Review. • If more employment land is required for Somerton, it should be located at the Badgers Cross and wireless station sites due to its access to the road network (i.e. A303 and M5). <p><u>Yeovilton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that land north of Yeovilton should be put forward as an option for development as a Garden settlement. The Garden settlement should be aspirational in terms of promoting economic growth and prosperity, increased numbers of jobs, diversifying the employment sectors and providing significant infrastructure in terms of health, education and sustainable transport. <p><u>Curry Rivel</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West of Curry Rivel would appear to be an area that could be scoped for employment development. Easy access to Taunton and the M5 from here would be an advantage. Small Start-up units, perhaps on the scale of Bowdens Business Centre, would be advantageous as well as being sympathetic to the surrounding landscape. Additionally, there would be minimal impact to village residents as the development would be on the outskirts of Curry Rivel. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Castle Cary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities in the Flax Mill area, Castle Cary. <p><u>Cartgate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new mixed use development at Cartgate should be included to maximise accessibility to the wider transport network, attracting employers and capture tourist spend through the creation of a gateway to the south-west. <p><u>Wincanton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wincanton Town Council believes there should be a strategic employment allocation at Wincanton. • An allocation of land in Wincanton should be added to the list of Strategic Employment sites in paragraph 9.5. Land south of the A303 should be added to the allocations of employment land. <p><u>East Street/ London Rd, Milborne Port</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially East Street/ London Rd, Milborne Port. <p><u>Rural Settlements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reallocation of current employment land to rural settlements would assist in providing suitable and local employment for their residents. <p><u>Dimmer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Dimmer should expressly be <u>excluded</u> as an employment area due to traffic impact on B3153 and those living in Clanville and for sustainability reasons. <p><u>Castle Cary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foxes Run should <u>not</u> be included. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
9.3	Do you agree that Policy EP2, which replicates the requirements of Policy EP11, which applies to all town centre uses, should be deleted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is general agreement with the deletion of policy EP2, although it is also suggested that EP2 and EP11 are subtly different; EP2 primarily deals with office space and EP11 primarily with retail. One policy would be acceptable if it can express both elements clearly and unambiguously. 	Policy EP2 of the adopted Local Plan has not been taken forward in the Local Plan Review. Office development is a main town centre use and is subject to the sequential test in Policy TC5 (Location of Main Town Centres Uses (the Sequential Approach), Policy EP2 is not necessary.
9.4	Do you think the Local Plan should include a policy that refers to new-build commercial developments and changes of use of existing premises in rural areas outside of the Main Settlement Boundaries?	<p>There is general support for this. It is stated, for example, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properly planned and managed commercial development should be supported; many large employers are outside built up areas and have evolved as farms have diversified. There is also a need to make farm diversifications easier as this usually allows them to continue. • The Council needs to encourage sustainable rural employment opportunities. • The existing approach of building on strategic sites is not having the uptake envisaged. • It is also stated that the council needs to adopt a policy that considers the impact on proposals for new employment activities in rural areas. It should also include a statement to clarify that the visual impact and green considerations should be taken in to account at the design and planning stage; and that good design in keeping with the local feel is essential. Also to adequately consider service arrangements. • Policy may need to highlight the conflict that might arise if farm diversification allows development the use of which is subsequently changed through PD without appropriate design. 	A new Policy (EP4: Delivering Employment Land in Villages, Rural Settlements and Countryside) which addresses new build commercial developments and changes of use of existing premises in rural areas is introduced in the Local Plan Review Preferred Option consultation document.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
9.5	Do you agree that no changes be made to Policies EP6, EP7 and EP8?	<p><u>EP6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDDC supports the retention of Policy EP6: Henstridge Airfield in its current form. • There is other general support. <p><u>EP7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is general agreement and it is stated that Policy EP7 needs to be a consideration. <p><u>EP8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the adopted Local Plan recognises the important contribution of the tourism industry to the local economy, but the consultation document does not set out whether these objectives are proposed to be retained. Policy EP8 is supported and therefore it is assumed that supporting paragraphs to the policy will be retained. • It is also stated that Policy EP8 is currently too restrictive as it does not support tourist facilities in countryside locations, which is justified in the NPPF and the more recent guidance in NPPG, which requires LPAs to “consider the specific needs of the tourist industry, including particular locational or operational requirements”. It is considered that Policy EP8 should be amended to support such developments where they are appropriately located and where it can be demonstrated that they would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the landscape. Such activities are important economically and can provide diversified streams of income for the agricultural industry. EP8 should also be amended to give specific support to proposals seeking to convert redundant rural buildings in the countryside to holiday accommodation. It should also refer to tourist accommodation. An alternative form of wording of the Policy has been suggested accordingly. 	<p><u>EP6</u></p> <p>Policy EP6 (now EP7) has been retained in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p><u>EP7</u></p> <p>Adopted Local Plan Policy EP7 (New Live/Work Units) has not been carried forward into the Local Plan Review as it is contrary to the NPPF which is supportive of flexible working practices and specifically mentions live/work units. This policy evolved at a time when residential development was being sought in locations in South Somerset where residential development would not normally be allowed, via live/work permissions and evidence was demonstrating that the majority of those approved were not including an employment element. It is felt that this policy is no longer required as there is sufficient guidance on new residential development in the Housing chapter of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p><u>EP8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan Review retains the recognition of the importance

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments regarding the stated importance of Wincanton racecourse to the tourism economy are also referred to elsewhere in the Section relating to Wincanton. • There is other general support for the Policy. 	<p>of the tourism economy to South Somerset, through EP8 (Tourism).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NPPF is supportive of all businesses in rural areas and the Local Plan Review recognises this in the revised EP policies.
9.6	Do you agree that upper limits of retail development are not in the best interests of regenerating Yeovil and that Policy EP10 should be deleted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is general support for this. It is stated, for example, that there should be no upper limits to retail development in Yeovil; it is considered that this policy is not necessarily in the best interests of regenerating Yeovil; and that it could have a positive impact in deterring out of town developments. 	Policy EP10 has not been carried forward into the Local Plan Review.
9.7	Do you agree that the Council should delete the separate 'Primary Shopping Area' designations in settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is general agreement with this. It is stated that duplication is unnecessary, but, for example that the plan should distinguish between primary shopping areas/town centres and primary shopping areas, as the latter is restrictive. 	<p>The NPPF no longer differentiates between Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that the Local Planning Authority should define the extent of Town Centres and Primary Shopping Areas and make clear the range of uses permitted in such locations. Primary Shopping Areas</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	other than Yeovil; and adopt these Town Centre Boundaries as the basis for applying the Sequential Test?		are important for the sequential test as they define what an edge-of-centre location is (Policy TC5). Primary Shopping Areas have therefore been retained in the Local Plan Review.
9.8	Do you agree that Policy EP13 should be amended to include a criteria which takes account of “the character and nature of the use proposed, including the level of pedestrian activity associated with it and its contribution to the vitality and viability of the centre”?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is also general support for this. It is stated that it makes sense to acknowledge the changed role of town centres and it should be recognised that non-A1 uses can contribute to the vitality and viability of town centres. 	Policy EP13 (now TC7) includes criteria ii. d. which addresses the character and nature of the proposed use, including the associated pedestrian activity.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
9.9	Given that communities can now seek protection of valued local services and facilities through measures provided by the Localism Act, is there still a need to continue to use Policy EP15 in the determination of planning applications?	<p>There is disagreement about this issue, but the majority of respondents think that the Policy should remain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the one hand, it is stated that, given that communities can now seek protection of valued local services and facilities through measures provided by the Localism Act, there is no longer a need for Policy EP15 for the determination of applications involving community services and facilities. <p>However, on the other, it is stated for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Register of Assets of Community Value gives limited protection and is no substitute for effective local planning policies which cover all community facilities. • A policy to protect community, cultural and local assets cannot be effectively replaced by the Localism Act provisions. Nor would that satisfy the NPPF. • Para 70 of the NPPF clearly states that local planning policies must safeguard community and cultural facilities to benefit the health and well-being of the local community. The Localism Act only provides a short window for groups to raise fund to purchase a property listed as a community asset, there is no requirement to sell the site for a reasonable price, and clearly does not safeguard these sites from development. • It is suggested that the policy explicitly includes protection of retail banking facilities. Consideration should be given as to what 'carrots and sticks' might be available to SSDC to ensure that everyone has and retains access. Maybe a 'last bank standing' policy. The same should be applied to Post Offices. • A very detailed representation has been received regarding the need to retain faith facilities and to promote and facilitate new ones. It is stated, for example, that local planning authorities need to develop a greater understanding of how faith groups use space which includes recognition of the differences between and within faith groups themselves. To facilitate this, specific guidance on how 	It is considered that there is a benefit in retaining Policy EP15 (now Policy TC9).

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>faith groups use space needs to be made available, for example, through supplementary planning documents that reflect the contemporary religious landscape. Generating such guidance may benefit from collaboration with the relevant professional bodies and faith groups. Local planning authorities should recognise the legitimacy of places of worship being included within section 106 agreements for new developments.</p>	
9.10	<p>Are there any issues that have been missed from Section 9: Economic Prosperity?</p>	<p>Suggestions for what additional issues the Plan should cover include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local renewable energy infrastructure; protecting regenerative resources for economic prosperity; and sustainable and community transport. • Policy EP4 should be amended to seek explicit support for all employment generating uses and not just those in traditional B uses. This would be in keeping with para 28 of the NPPF which support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses and enterprise in the countryside. • Healthcare Services - Whilst not the main outcome of healthcare buildings, it is important to consider the economic connections of such facilities within settlements. There is a benefit to patients of such facilities being located within easy walking distance of residential area, or close to convenience facilities so that trips can be combined with other day-to-day needs. In order to meet the needs of patients with a single trip, it is often suitable for a retail pharmacy (use Class A1) to be located within the same development as the doctor's surgery. 	<p>Local Plan Review PolicyTA1 deals with low carbon travel and EQ1 climate change.</p> <p>Policy EP4 now refers to “new employment proposals” which is in the spirit of the NPPF.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
10.1	<p>Which of the following options regarding</p>	(a)	<p>The NPPF, 2018 now expects planning obligations set out in Local Plans to be set having undertaken a plan wide-viability assessment only</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>affordable housing should be taken forward in the LPR? 10.1(a) Policy HG3 Provision of Affordable Housing - retain the existing affordable housing target of 35% subject to viability. 10.1(b) Policy HG3 Provision of Affordable Housing - amend the affordable housing target to 34% subject to viability. 10.1(c) Policy HG3 Provision of Affordable Housing - another option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some support to keep the requirements as they are. It is stated that the current target of 35% should be retained as it is regularly negotiated down. • It is suggested that “subject to viability” should be taken out. • It is said that the inclusion of social-rented under the term ‘affordable housing’ makes it possible that none will be provided – it needs its own heading; and a frequent response is that a specific percentage should be identified for social rented too. <p>(b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some disagreement, but it is stated that if the SHMA indicated that the annual need is 33.9% then pedantically 34% must be appropriate; ultimately 1% is unlikely to make much difference. <p>(c)</p> <p>Many comments made in relation to this issue have alternative suggestions. They largely range from approaches based on each individual case; a different percentage; or a focus on larger sites; to viability. They include the following:</p> <p><u>Each case on its own merits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of affordable housing should be depend on the site of a development; public transport may not available frequently enough. • The developers should put forward the number of affordable houses that they can achieve within a particular development. This will allow the developer and the Council to come to a mutually acceptable conclusion. • There will be different market areas across the District, which could result in differential rates. <p><u>Percentage</u></p>	<p>in exceptional circumstances will ‘open book’ viability assessment be undertaken.</p> <p>The SHMA identifies a net annual need for 206 affordable homes in South Somerset; this equates to 28% of the annual housing requirement of at least 726 dwellings per year.</p> <p>A viability assessment of the Local Plan will be undertaken prior to Submission to the Secretary of State. Viability assessment at the planning application stage should only be undertaken in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The proposed thresholds are compliant with the NPPF and the definition of major development. i.e. 10 dwellings or more or a site area of over 0.5 ha.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be appropriate to base any requirement and align the policy on what is actually being delivered. • On the other hand, it is stated that a higher proportion of affordable housing should be key in all developments. • DCLG data suggests that since 2006, 2,320 (gross) affordable homes have been completed in South Somerset - about 210 homes per year. Comparing the 2009 SHMA (659 affordable homes per annum) and the 2016 SHMA (206 per annum) against delivery, there has been a shortfall of 3,570 affordable homes. Given this shortfall, the Council is encouraged to set ambitious but pragmatic targets. <p><u>Larger Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As provision has only been around 20%, there needs to be a focus on identifying sites of sufficient size that would be capable of delivering meaningful levels. • Given the evidence in the Annual Monitoring Report 2017 there needs to be a focus on identifying and allocating sites of sufficient size which would then be capable of delivering meaningful quantities of affordable housing. • A Garden Settlement would provide considerable opportunity to deliver a range of affordable housing. <p><u>Viability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The caveat that affordable housing will be subject to viability should be maintained when considering any revisions to Policy HG3. • Where sites are made unviable by the affordable housing requirements, the policy should have enough flexibility to allow the Council to reduce or remove the affordable housing requirements set out in policy. • The forthcoming guidance on the assessment of viability as part of “Right Homes in the Right Places” consultation will impact on this policy. The approach may have to change as the Plan progresses. 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be support for self-build for affordable homes. • SSDC should consider entering the social sector building programme and with HCA and grant funding making up the shortfall. • There should be encouragement to developers of larger developments to include continuing care communities. • Policy HG3 should be based upon the strongest evidence available to make it a robust policy to implement. 	
10.2	Do you agree that Policy HG4 should be deleted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be a general consensus that, as the Policy is no longer compliant with the NPPG, it is redundant and should be deleted. • There is, however, some very limited support for retaining it. 	Policy HG4 has been deleted as SSDC does not have any settlements that are listed as Rural Settlements under S.157 of the Housing Act 1985 and the threshold of 10 dwellings a site area of over .5 of a hectare is therefore applied in the Local Plan Review – Policy HG2.
10.3	Do you consider that the Council should gather further evidence to support the introduction of the Nationally Described Space Standard?	<p>Opinion on this issue appears to be more or less evenly split.</p> <p>Of those who agree to such a standard comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK has the smallest housing and rooms sizes in Western Europe in new build properties. This leads to problems relating to lack of storage space for things like pushchairs, space for family dining and entertaining – this has implications for public health, and bedrooms where there is only space for a single bed and no storage. Garages are often used as additional storage instead of for cars. • Average house size built by major developers in the south west in 2015 was 88.7sqm versus the minimum space standard of 93sqm (RIBA). 	<p>The SHMA provides the evidence that there is a case for adopting the national described space standard for affordable housing. Therefore a new policy (HG3) has been introduced requiring those space standards for affordable housing.</p> <p>It is noted that the Government has stated its intention to review the standards but at the current time those published in March 2015 with</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers should/must meet space standards for affordable /social housing. • Land prices drive developers to maximum densities and reduced public/private green space. These standards should ultimately be reflected in residual land values so the landowner bears the cost rather than the developer. If known at the outset space standards should not deter housing delivery. <p>However, an equal number of people feel that, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The latest SHMA did not find any strong evidence for SSDC to adopt the Nationally Described Space Standards. In the absence of evidence there is no need to adopt these standards at this time, particularly if it is not an issue within the District. • There is little evidence it has been effective elsewhere anyway. If the standard is used, it will require more land to achieve the same level of housing, it will reduce innovation, reduce densities, and adversely affects viability by increasing build costs; it may compromise the deliverability of infrastructure. • The standard was only recently introduced and the Government has already set out in the White Paper their intention to review it. This only offers uncertainty. 	<p>the addition on notes in May 2016 still apply.</p> <p>Currently the Council does not have the evidence to apply the standards to market housing.</p>
10.4	Do you consider that the current approach of using the SHMA to inform the mix of market and affordable	<p>Again, there is no clear consensus on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people think that the conclusions of the SHMA are well researched and adequate. • Alternative suggestions include the following: Size 	<p>The NPPF, 2018 requires planning policy to set out the requirements for house sizes and types. The evidence in the SHMA has been used to inform the relevant policies in the Local Plan Review.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	housing is still appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - House size, rather than number of bedrooms, should be the basis of the adopted mix. <p>Bedrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the ageing population, the Council should consider more one and two bedroom dwellings; this may result in freeing up larger homes for families <p>Type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bungalows should be included – they are not only about older people downsizing but about them living in a home that enables them to retain their independence long. They are also suitable for disabled people. - There should be fewer ‘Executive’ homes. <p>Starter Homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The percentages of intermediate/ starter homes (one and two bed homes) should be higher. - Two-bed houses are desperately needed for young people and those wishing to down-size. 2-beds should be 40-45%; 3-beds 30-35%. <p>Affordability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some feel that there is a greater need for intermediate products – should be 50/50. - A model to assess the need for affordable rent to buy housing should be adopted. This addresses the primary barrier to home ownership – namely the lack of a mortgage deposit. ‘Rentplus’ is fully funded by institutional investors and provides homes in conjunction with RPs who manage them until they are purchased. Families are able to save for their deposit for longer whilst paying an affordable rent. We recommend to the Council that it awaits the new definition of 	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>affordable housing in the revised NPPF, as indicated in the Housing White Paper, which is likely to include reference to rent to buy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is important the Council takes account of the contents of the 2017 Housing White Paper and the Governments commitments to diversify the types of affordable housing available and accelerating its delivery when considering affordable housing obligations. <p>Building to Local Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some examples are given where developers have not provided locally desired smaller and more affordable homes for younger people and for older ones wishing to down-size, particularly in rural areas. - Every place is different and a flexible approach is needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the other hand, some respondents think that it is for the housing market to determine. Housebuilders will provide what the market wants and are aware of current and future trends. The SHMA is based on sites designed a number of years in the past, which may have been subject to different constraints. • It is stated that the issue with using the SHMA to inform housing mix is that these types of documents quickly become out of date. Once out of date, if the SHMA-prescribed mix becomes out of kilter with actual need. 	
10.5	How do you think South Somerset District Council should address the	<p>(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some support for this. It is stated that National Planning Policy Guidance, updated in July 2017, states that relevant authorities should consider how they can best support self-build and custom housebuilding, including developing policies in their Local plan for such housing and engaging with landowners who own sites that are suitable. 	The SHMA ¹ indicates that demand for self and custom build in South Somerset is highest in the Market Towns and surrounding villages and this reflects the entries and the register. The evidence shows that

¹ Mendip, Sedgemoor, South Somerset and Taunton Deane Strategic Housing Market Assessment, JG Consulting, October 2016 (SHMA)

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>need for self-build and custom housebuilding? 10.5(a) Allocate sites for self-build and custom housebuilding. 10.5(b) Introduce a policy requiring developments above a certain threshold to achieve a specific percentage of self-build and custom housebuilding plots. 10.5(c) Give general support for self-build and custom housebuilding as part of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, another comment, for example, is that it would inflate the value of the land concerned which would be to the detriment of the underlying objective. Therefore it is preferable for self-builders to find their own sites. Many self/custom builders are looking for single plots, so this would probably not achieve its aim. SSDC’s monitoring evidence suggests that it is more than meeting the need for custom and self-build housing within the District, so there appears to be no need to formalise any requirements through policy. <p>(b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appears to be very little support for this. It is stated, for example, that those wishing to build their own homes would not necessarily choose to do so on larger sites; and for the developer, it can bring issues in terms of compliance with required procedures and site management. • It is also said it would increase the uncertainty that this element of housing supply is deliverable and could impact on five-year supply. A prescriptive approach tends not to work, as witnessed at Teignbridge. Self and custom builders prefer single detached plots. There are only 50 people on South Somerset’s self-build register who are seeking serviced plots of land. As the I&O document highlights, at 31 March 2017 there were over 1,150 completed or committed dwellings on single plot sites. South Somerset is therefore more than meeting its need. <p>(c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are more people in favour of this Option. It is said that the Local Plan should give general support for self and custom building as part of the overall housing mix without being prescriptive where it should be located. Given the quantity is difficult to predict. It is probably inappropriate to rely on such housing as a conventional source of housebuilding and only general 	<p>the house building industry has reservations about incorporating self and custom build into projects. They are concerned that the self-builder may not complete the project in a timely manner exposing their conventional purchasers to prolonged building site conditions. They expressed no interest in constructing a custom design.</p> <p>The Preferred Options offer general support for self and custom house building within the mix where they accord with the other policies in the plan. The Council is fulfilling its legal obligation with regards to self and</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p>overall housing mix.</p> <p>10.5(d) Another option (please specify).</p>	<p>support should be introduced to the Plan, supplemented perhaps, by an exceptions policy.</p> <p>(d)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One suggestion is that SSDC not apply a sustainability test to people on the Register and older people and this is supported by the Housing White Paper para A133, para 4.44 – supporting custom build for older people. The Government is intent on diversifying the housing market and specifically want to encourage custom build for the elderly. • Another is that there should be an emphasis on smaller housing on larger plots, allowing the possibility to extend them as families grow. • One respondent also suggests more emphasis be placed on zero carbon/ neutral developments – and that well thought-out eco-builds, especially self-builds that include car-sharing and off-grid set-ups, contribute to reducing the demand on mains services and serve as examples of how to provide housing for people who may otherwise struggle. • It is also suggested that thought should also be given to rental properties as people may not be able to afford to buy. 	<p>custom build homes. obligations for self and custom build homes.</p>
10.6	<p>Is the current approach to the provision of sites for Gypsy, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople use acceptable?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be general agreement that the current approach is acceptable; that, for example, the allocation of plots as part of larger allocations should be avoided as this has been counter-productive elsewhere; and that allocation of sites may require CPO if no sites come forward and there is no publically owned land available. • There is however, some thought that it is not if it's not meeting the full need for site provision. 	<p>In accordance with Planning Policy for Traveller sites, DCLG, August 2015 the Council is required to have a supply of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling showpeople sites to meet its identified need. Whilst residential pitches are being provided, there is a continued need going forward and the Council needs to maintain a proactive stance. There continues to be an outstanding need for transit</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots.</p> <p>The Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA) update, 2013 identifies need up until 2032. The Somerset Councils have agreed to jointly commission an updated GTAA which will inform the Local Plan Review going forward. For the time being LPR Policy HG6 reflects the 2013 update and the requirement to 2032.</p>
10.7	Are you aware of any suitable and available sites with the potential for use as a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople people site, transit or permanent?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No particular suggestions have been received, although SCC state that it is willing to work in partnership with SSDC to explore suitable sites/ pitches which are in public ownership. 	SSDC will continue to explore opportunities to identify and bring forward sites to provide housing for the travelling communities.
10.8	Are there any issues that have been	<u>Specialist Accommodation, Care Homes and Care Communities</u>	

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	missed from Section 10: Housing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that SSDC has omitted to consult on care homes and specialist accommodation; they are important and topical. It is anticipated that during the plan period there will be an increasing pressure for the provision of an appropriate number of housing-with-care homes. Such provision will be fundamental to a sound Local Plan. Other than the proposed retention of Policy HG6 no provision has been made or policy support provided for appropriate market housing for the elderly. It is stated that the current market for housing and the business model for general housing providers is alien to that to deliver housing-with-care; and that this will not be achieved without permissive polices or specific allocations. <p><u>Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside and Housing for Agricultural and Related Workers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revision of Policy HG9 is proposed for temporary on-site accommodation, particularly where valuable livestock are reared on small farms in circumstances where a functional need for a dwelling may be capable of demonstration by way of a sound business plan by a robust appraisal at the outset which may not equate to full-time labour. It is stated that a good balance was struck in the 1991-2011 Local Plan, in Policy HG15, which recognised a worker who might be '<i>primarily employed in agriculture</i>' rather than full-time. • There is support for Policy HG8 as it is important that small dwellings in the countryside are retained. It is said that the loss of smaller and less expensive dwellings is an issue and can, individually and accumulatively, change the character of the countryside. The AONB Team has seen many of these proposals in recent months and supports the retention of Policy HG8. 	<p>The SHMA identifies a particular requirement for two and three bedroom market properties. Policy HG5 (previously HG6) seeks to provide a mix of market housing to meet the needs of the District. The delivery of more two and three bedroom properties will provide the opportunity of older people to downsize into smaller homes within the market.</p> <p>Policy HG8 (previously HG9) has been amended to include the text "...or one primarily employed (not part time)..." as this is considered to be consistent with paragraph 79 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p><u>Other Comments received</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The adopted AONB Management Plan identifies affordable housing as being a need in and around the AONB. • A statement or guidance relating to the provision of bungalows or other single storey development for older residents may be helpful as a number of successful schemes of this type have come forward in recent years. • No mention is made of empty housing. The Council should adopt a more proactive approach. • Building to Lifetime Homes Standard. A policy for energy efficient and home energy generation. Environmental standards. Transport – carpool schemes, electric transport; cycle infrastructure. • The Forestry Commission would support the retention of tied housing (Policy HG9) since affordable housing is a barrier to forestry workers; this provides employment opportunities in rural areas. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A paragraph about bungalows and empty homes is included in the Housing section of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>A reference to Building for Life 12 has been include in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
11.1	Do you agree with the proposed amendments to simplify, restructure and remodel policies TA1, TA3, and TA4 around the new development thresholds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be general support for the proposed amendments. However, SCC does not agree with the changes referred to in para 11.6(ii); the Somerset Parking Strategy should be the point of reference – this states that “in all non-residential developments where 50 or more car parking spaces are to be provided, 16-amp electric charging points will be required in 2% of spaces.” • Others also think there should be more emphasis on electric vehicles – and that there needs to be more electric transport infrastructure and correctly allocated - rapid charging facilities should be at transient locations eg service stations for shorter stay parking to not black access to facilities. Fast 	<p>The Government’s new ‘Road to Zero’ Strategy urges charge points to be provided for all newly built homes and the continuation of this requirement would therefore be line with national policy. Reference should also be made to the SCC Parking Strategy.</p> <p>It is proposed that rapid charging points are also be required at all non-residential developments with 50 spaces or more.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>charge is suitable for shopping and public car parking where long stay is more likely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that in just 23 years' time the Government is proposing to abolish the sale of vehicles with internal combustion engines. • SCC also does not agree with the amendment to reduce the period of use of green travel vouchers to 6 months. 	<p>A period of six months should be an adequate period within which a resident can decide what to redeem a travel voucher for.</p>
11.2	<p>Do you agree with the proposed amendments to Policy TA5 (Transport Impacts of Development) ?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England state that it is not entirely clear what is meant by paragraph 11.15, and what the implications for the Policy would be. Whilst it is sensible that the level of access should be commensurate with the type/scale of development, provision of convenient access by means other than private vehicles is a fundamental aspect of encouraging use of sustainable travel modes, and in general, developments should provide cycle and pedestrian access regardless of size and type unless a particular exception can be justified. <p>Other points raised include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (ii) and (vi) are OK. The requirements of the transport authority need to be reasonable and justified – thresholds should be set from the outset rather than being determined subjectively at some point in time. • Traffic impact should not conflict with the objectives and actions within any relevant Noise Action Plans. • Those who live in rural areas will continue to need to travel by car for a variety of reasons. Socio economic behaviour means more travel by car. • Public transport cannot respond to ever changing work patterns. 	<p>The comments from Highways England are noted, but it would be reasonable to consider pedestrian and cycle access to be provided as commensurate with even minor development.</p> <p>All other comments noted</p>
11.3	<p>Are there any issues that have been missed from Section 11:</p>	<p><u>Walking and Cycling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is said that the Consultation makes no reference to walking and cycling. <p><u>Private Cars</u></p>	<p>All development should be accessible by foot and cycle – See Policy TA4. Noted</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Transport and Accessibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the council needs to be realistic about rural settlements and the use of the motor car in the absence of adequate public transport and local employment opportunities. <p><u>Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is claimed that Policy TA6 does not operate as it is described in the text - when parking has been proposed in excess of the optimal standard, justification has been sought, contrary to the Ministerial Statement. • It is suggested that if parking is free at both ends of a journey, then people will choose to drive. The cost of parking should therefore be made explicit where possible. There need to be alternative choices in place before homes are occupied. On developments purchasers should have a choice around whether they have a garage and on and off parking space - explicitly priced as options well as options such as additional living or storage space instead of parking. • It is also suggested that non-residential establishments should price parking to encourage staff and visitors to use other modes of transport. <p><u>Electric Vehicles</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that it is not necessary or desirable to take local measures to force people to move away from internal combustion -powered cars. Electric cars will very rapidly dominate the market when they have a reliable range. Over the Plan period, there will be an increased take up of electric vehicles – both public and private. • It is asked whether 16A charging points will be enough. • It is suggested that lack of supply capacity will cause an issue with policy TA1. <p><u>A303</u></p>	<p>Noted, but the Policy accords with the SCC Parking Strategy.</p> <p>There are matters for the developer rather than the District Council, which has no influence on the pricing of new homes.</p> <p>These are not matters of planning and land-use.</p> <p>The requirement for charging points will be included in the preferred Options document.</p> <p>The Plan will continue to make reference to the strategic value of the A303; and to the proposed enhancements consulted upon by Highways England.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDDC are keen to stress the importance and relevance of the A303 in a wider south west context and specifically as a major strategic highway running through both South Somerset and East Devon. Devon County Council are also promoting improvements which would tie in with wider improvements along various lengths of the road and the importance of these should be highlighted <p><u>Rail</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that a few of the peripheral settlements in the District could be well linked to the railway network – increased access to stations would reduce congestion. • The Exeter–Waterloo railway line forms a key rail link that runs through East Devon and future improvements to rail services are considered to be of great importance. <p><u>Site Allocations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is said that school and college-related traffic contributes a substantial proportion of peak congestion and that this should be addressed in policies relating to children's travel to and from school and location of new schools. Those living in Keyford and Yeovil 6 and 7 will have to cross town to one of the 3 existing secondary schools. • SCC state that the options for growth have not given enough consideration to highways and transport issues and that detailed traffic modelling should be carried out.. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that focusing more housing on Yeovil would raise the town's self-containment, meaning that more people who work in Yeovil also live in 	<p>No new railway stations are proposed by Network Rail at the present time.</p> <p>Improvements to existing rail services will continue to be encouraged within the Local Plan, but these are essentially the responsibility of the train operators.</p> <p>New schools will usually require Travel Plans to be prepared before opening.</p> <p>Highways considerations will be taken into account in the next stage of Preferred Options. Detailed traffic modelling is not appropriate at this stage and may be required if and when planning applications are submitted.</p> <p>Yeovil is proposed to continue to be the focus for new housing.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		Yeovil. This would limit otherwise increased in-commuting on all the heavily used roads leading into Yeovil, which would otherwise increase as a result of further housing in market towns. It would also help to create a critical mass around the town, allowing bus services to operate regularly and viably.	
12.1	Are there any issues that have been missed from Section 12: Health and Wellbeing?	<p><u>Wincanton Sports Ground</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that reference should be made to the Wincanton sports ground and the need for further support, possibly via the CIL or by the District Council itself. If this fails, appropriate health and wellbeing outcomes would not be provided and policies would fail to deliver protection. <p><u>Sport and Playing Pitches</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is said that there is no Artificial Grass Pitch in Area East, meaning no provision for some 4,000 state school children or local clubs. It is stated that a desperate lack of sporting facilities in Chard, with a population of 13,000 needs to be addressed, including floodlights, clubhouse, changing rooms, parking etc. by locating two new full size grass playing pitches acceptable to step 5 standard, providing a home for CTFC teams. This would enable the Club to become eligible again for participation in the FA Cup, raising the profile of Chard. The Plan is silent on the fundamental issue of the relocation of the Chard Football Club. It is requested that consideration of any sport facility should include noise impact. Sport England state that the importance of sport should be recognised as a key component of development plans and not considered in isolation. In South Somerset, the total economic value of sport is £38.1m, with the wider economic value to health calculated as £59.2m. It is concerned that SSDC do not have a robust and up to date evidence base for sport and recreation, which can help in securing S106/ CIL contributions for new and enhanced places for sport. It says that it would be useful to cross reference to the Sport England/ Public Health England Guidance 'Active Design', which has 	<p><u>Wincanton Sports Ground</u></p> <p>If the Wincanton sports ground is a corporate priority identified through the Playing Pitches Strategy, then it will be funded through contributions.</p> <p><u>Sport and Playing Pitches</u></p> <p>If an Artificial Grass Pitch in Area East is identified as a need in the Playing Pitches Strategy, then funding can be sought through contributions for its delivery.</p> <p>There is no need for a specific policy pertaining to the football club and any aspirations for its relocation. Should an application for the club be submitted, it will be considered on its merits. A football club is not a key service. The Playing Pitches Strategy will identify any sporting facilities needs which may then be funded through developer contributions.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>considerable synergy with the Plan. Sport England promotes the wider use of existing and new sports facilities, such as at schools, to serve more than one group of users – opportunities for joint provision and dual use should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that the Westlands Sports Complex should be considered as the designated Sports Zone for Yeovil. Further expansion of the sport and recreation facilities within the current site would provide inclusive and participative opportunities <p><u>Healthcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a suggestion that a shortage of GP services, particularly in Yeovil, needs to be addressed. Symphony Healthcare Services says it will work with SSDC to confirm where new facilities are required to ensure the Local Plan and new developments reflect the need to deliver these services to support the expanding population. It says that, to respond to the timescale necessary to deliver healthcare services at the right time in the right place for the benefit of the whole community, it may be appropriate to seek a land contribution or financial contributions, on an application-by-application basis. <p><u>Dwelling Design</u></p>	<p>Noise pollution of sports facilities will be considered, as it is presently, in line with policy on amenity and pollution. Such policy need not be tied to a sports policy.</p> <p>Sport England’s concerns that SSDC do not have a robust and up to date evidence base for sport and recreation is noted. The Playing Pitches Strategy will form part of the Council’s evidence base for sport and recreation need and provide a strategy for delivery.</p> <p>Whether the Sports Zone remains an aspiration and whether it should be at the Westlands Sports Complex is a matter for the Playing Pitches Strategy to consider.</p> <p><u>Healthcare</u></p> <p>Contributions for new medical infrastructure could be sought in respect of planning applications where appropriate. New medical facilities required will be addressed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is support for solid load-bearing walls, rails, wet rooms rather than bathrooms, wide doorways and beams that can take hoists in new dwellings so that residents can remain in place if their needs change. There is also support for suitable insulation and ventilation and having appropriate space and number of rooms to meet household needs • It is stated that it is important to have suitable insulation and ventilation and having appropriate space and number of rooms to meet household needs. <p><u>Open Spaces and Footpaths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that Policy HW1 should also include protection of existing open spaces. • It is stated that public footpaths should also be maintained and walking our countryside footpaths encouraged in order to promote health and wellbeing. • It is also suggested that safe footpaths within towns, linking the centres, schools, and sports facilities with new development; this would encourage walking and cycling for all ages; and that these projects should be allowed funding from Section 106 Agreements and CIL. • It is requested that the Council designate Local Green Spaces as defined in the NPPF. <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that then Plan should refer to the benefits of biodiversity to health and wellbeing; and seek to protect/retain/ enhance trees/hedges for improved air quality, noise reduction, summer shade, flood mitigation and access to nature. 	<p><u>Dwelling Design</u> The internal design and construction details are not actually matters for planning or the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Open Spaces and Footpaths</u> Designated Public Open Space could be protected in the Local Plan in line with the NPPF. ' Local Green Space' could also be designated in the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Provision of public rights of way could be included in a Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Open Space would be identified in the Council's emerging Open Space Strategy.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u> These benefits could potentially be referred to in the Local Plan.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attention is drawn to the recent evidence review by Public Health England. Includes the role to trees and green infrastructure for both mental health benefits and impact on climate change mitigation and air quality. 	
13.1	Do you agree that a specific landscape policy should be re-introduced?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There seems to be a significant level of support for a specific landscape policy being re-introduced in order to protect landscape character. It is stated, for example, that NPPG states that one of the core principles in the NPPF is that planning recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The guidance emphasises the importance of the landscape in plan-making and decision-taking. In 2006, the UK Government signed the European Landscape Convention - the first international convention to focus specifically on landscape. It is dedicated exclusively to promoting the protection, management and planning of all landscapes in Europe, and became binding in this country in March 2007. The ELC also encourages the protection of the valued features of the landscape – not just those in nationally protected areas – including through the planning system. The Natural England ‘<i>Guidelines for Implementing the European Landscape Convention Part 2: Integrating the Intent of the ELC into Plans, Policies and Strategies</i>’, suggest that a compliant form of wording of such a Policy should state “<i>The scale and nature of the proposed development and the resulting volume and type of traffic associated with it should not have a significant harmful impact on the character, appearance, and peace and tranquillity, of the local landscape.</i>” The old Local Plan policy E3 (landscape) should be re-introduced but with this additional requirement. There is also agreement with a policy specifically with a view to preserving the Hamstone village environments and the green and agricultural land. It is asked that there should be some protection afforded to dark skies. SSDC’s Conservation Unit state that the lack of such a policy has been highlighted by appellants during a number of appeals and public inquires leaving SSDC in a vulnerable position during cross examination. Experience 	<p>It is agreed that a landscape policy should be included in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>AONBs are referred to in the landscape policy.</p> <p>Other comments are noted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>has shown that Inspectors seem to put more weight on a specific policy than the material considerations in the NPPF. A landscape policy would provide a useful 'hook' for other landscape studies and supplementary guidance such as the peripheral landscape studies. SSDC seems to be the only LPA without a landscape policy in its Local Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that such a policy should cover how to deal with special issues of how the AONB should be handled. The lack of a policy specifically for AONBs is considered a significant omission. • It is also suggested that if a landscape policy is reintroduced, so should a policy protecting BMV agricultural land (akin to the old EC1). The NPPF and explain that LPAs need to take agricultural land quality into account. Full account should be taken of the complete range environmental issues. • It is stated that any such policy should ensure that suitable and sustainable development proposals would not be prevented from coming forward where they include appropriate and achievable mitigation measures. • Those not supporting a landscape policy state, for example, that ambitions for growth are going to be difficult to achieve whilst accommodating national and regional landscape designations and will become more difficult.; and that a restrictive policy tends to restrict investment and such a policy is likely to have a negative impact. There is no requirement for a specific landscape policy because there is no evidence to show that Policy EQ2 is preventing the Council on safeguarding the landscape character of the District. 	
13.2	Is this approach to addressing climate change in South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some general feeling that the current approach is correct, albeit with some reservations about a dispersed development approach being likely to run contrary to the aims set out because of increased commuting from work and services. It is also thought that some elements of EQ1 could be deleted as climate change criteria is dealt with through Building Regulations. 	These comments are noted.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Somerset correct?	<p>Those who feel that a change in strategy is needed make, for example, the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy efficiency, renewable energy and low carbon building materials and technologies should be included. As a rural district, there are many opportunities to fit PV panels to south-facing barns, rather than losing farming land for solar farms. Land needs to be safeguarded for food growing. • There could be a far stronger requirement for all new builds and developments to be as carbon neutral as possible, and more incentives for grey water and other systems that are environmentally friendly. • The stance on wind turbines should be reviewed. • There should be more housing in South Somerset like the One Planet system in Wales which supports a low carbon (or carbon neutral) lifestyle. • Policy EQ1 should be amended so that consideration is given to the impact of proposals for renewable and low carbon energy generation development on the setting of heritage assets. • Holiday accommodation should be recognised as being particularly sensitive to the impacts of renewable energy, as there is a risk that tourists may be deterred by the impacts. 	<p>The detailed specification of construction materials is not something that can be dealt with in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Policy EQ1 already encourages low carbon development.</p> <p>No locations for wind turbines will be suggested in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Policy EQ1 already refers to the potential impact on designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Comments are noted but there is no need to include a policy to this effect.</p>
13.3	Do you agree with the suggested approach for	<p>The changes to the Policy seem to have general support, although the following additional changes are suggested.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p>	<p>Note - Policy EQ7 is now Policy EQ8 in the Local Plan Review.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	pollution control and the revision of Policy EQ7?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AQMA is reviewed annually; it is important that the impact of any development in the AQMA is assessed – the overall objective to improve air quality would then be supported. Traffic emissions are the main contributor to air quality issues. <p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise from aircraft movements arising from airfields has the potential to have an impact on amenity and an assessment on any development nearby is required – impacts over time may vary. Noise contours are a guide to where new development is likely to be adversely affected by aircraft noise and where it may be unsuitable or require more robust noise insulation. It would be useful to have these contours as part of EQ7. <p><u>Contaminated Land</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of potentially contaminated land should form part of the policy. <p><u>Introduction of Sensitive Receptors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to assess the environmental impact of bringing new development to sites where there could be a conflict with existing receptors. This should be covered by the Policy. There is a need to safeguard employment land expected to be used by noisy activities, particularly if noise is not present at the time residential development is encroaching. These must align with EP3 but may need further support from EQ2. • Wessex Water supports the re-wording of Policy EQ7 to control proposed development in already “polluted” areas “(such as new homes next to a noisy or smelly site)”. Wording is suggested to ensure development is not located in close proximity to sewage treatment works. Development must not impact on Wessex Water’s statutory duties under the Water Industry Act 	<p>Policy EQ8 refers to the impact on the AQMA.</p> <p>Policy EQ8 refers to the Airfield Noise Contour Maps.</p> <p>Policy EQ8 refers to Contaminated Land.</p> <p>Policy EQ8 refers to sensitive land uses.</p> <p>Comments are noted but there is no need to include a policy to this effect.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>1991. The access requirements for operational vehicles should be considered with any relevant maintenance activities.</p> <p><u>General Comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy should only be included where impacts and monitoring of development are clear and easily identified. As such, reference to amenity should be avoided, whereas air quality, noise and contamination can all be measured and compared. 	<p>It is considered that Policy EQ8 is sufficiently specific.</p>
13.4	<p>Are there any issues that have been missed from Section 13: Environmental Quality?</p>	<p>The following additional suggestions are made:</p> <p><u>Historic Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment) to ensure that applicants take a proportionate approach to assessing the significance of any heritage assets affected, taking account of their settings. In line with the NPPF and PPG. Suggests amending Policy EQ3 by adding following: <i>“Any assessment of impact on heritage assets and their settings should be proportionate to an asset’s importance and potential impact of the proposal on its significance”</i>. <p><u>Policy EQ2/ Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy EQ2 might also include text that new housing should not conflict with Noise Action Planning objectives. The design of housing development in the district over the last 35 -40 years, has been of poor quality, design, materials, and workmanship, with few exceptions. Houses have been built down to a standard rather than up to a high standard. <p><u>BMV</u></p>	<p>Policy EQ3 has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Comments are noted but there is no need to include a policy to this effect.</p> <p>Comments noted. The NPPF has now put more focus on good design.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A BMV policy should have been an option. It does not matter if a BMV policy duplicates the NPPF – it is too important to be omitted and then overlooked. NPPF para 112 states that local authorities should seek to use areas of poor quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. • The MP for Yeovil, Marcus Fysh has made the following statement: “Grade 1 land is rare and should be protected, especially if it can be used near towns to make relatively affordable locally grown organic foods. It is much more usable than other grades during heavy rainfall, which is important if our weather keeps getting wetter. Because of the implications for national food security I would like it to be given the same planning protection as areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.” <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parrett catchment is a slow reacting catchment due to typography; water is present within the catchment for a considerable time before making its way to sea which is constrained by the tide. This is why control of the volume of flow in the catchment is a key issue for the catchment and the Drainage Board. This can be controlled by effective use of SUDs. • There is no mention of sustainable drainage throughout the document despite the NPPF specifically mentioning that priority should be given to SUDs and the <i>House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS161)</i> explaining that “This statement should be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and may be a material consideration in planning decisions”. In collaboration with other authorities, Somerset County Council has also produced the West of England Sustainable Drainage Developer Guidance which should have been referenced throughout the Issues and Options document. • There is a need to also mention the need for further investigations of downstream conveyance routes, at the time when an application is made, to ensure that existing offsite problems will not be exacerbated by new 	<p>There is no need to replicate national policy. BMV agricultural land is covered in paragraph 170 of the NPPF, 2018.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy EQ1 refers to sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>Comments are noted but it is considered that Policy EQ1 is already sufficient.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>development and to ensure the new developments have an effective route to discharge surface water.</p> <p><u>Trees and Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planting of riparian and floodplain species in Somerset can reduce pollution, protect river morphology, moderate stream temperature and aid flood risk; as well as assisting biodiversity. Tree health issues such as Ash Dieback should be considered. • The framework referred to in the context of Policy EQ6 has not been used for a number of years at it may be more relevant to mention the UK Forestry Standard or the 25 Year Environment Plan. • The role of woodland in contributing to renewable and low carbon energy targets. Woodfuel and timber supplies continue to be important markets, whilst allowing woodland to be brought back into active management. • South Somerset has a comparatively low canopy cover and ambitious targets for woodland creation to address this are encouraged. • Ancient woodland has multiple values and explicit reference should be made to the need to protect it and ancient and veteran trees outside woods. • An ambitious approach to 'net gain' for biodiversity is required. This is supported by the NPPF, the England Biodiversity Strategy; and the woodland Access Standard. The use of the Woodland Trust guide to 'Residential Developments and Trees' is suggested. No person should be more than 500m from accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size; and there should also be an area of no less than 20ha within 4km of people's homes. • The extensive links between woodland and health is now firmly embedded in national Government Policy for health, planning and forestry; and a recent report from Natural England highlights good practice in social prescribing for mental health, in particular, the role of nature-based interventions. • Trees and woodland can reduce flooding. Would recommend 'EA/ Forestry Commission publication 'Woodland for Water: Woodland measures for 	<p>Comments noted. Policy EQ7 recognises the importance of trees and forests.</p> <p>Policy amended accordingly.</p> <p>All other comments are noted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>meeting Water Framework objectives'. Trees can also combat the effects of urban heat island and have a role in improving air quality.</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dorset County Council state that Environmental information should be obtained from it to assess the cumulative impact of development near the County Boundary. • Increase residents' participation/ awareness of food waste recycling in order to produce green electricity – (Anaerobic Digestion). • A significant factor detrimental to environmental quality is traffic speed and parking. Many historic lanes are narrow with the doors of houses opening directly onto them. Modern traffic speeds impact heavily on such communities. There needs to be a programme of highway improvements to reduce speeds. 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted but there is no need to include a policy to this effect.</p> <p>The County Council is the highway authority and this is not a matter for the Local Plan Review.</p>
14.1	Are there any issues that have been missed from Section 14: Implementation and Monitoring?	<p>There has been only a limited response to this question, but the most relevant comments are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue that needs to be addressed is the failure to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. The Council should identify a number of reserve sites which can come forward quickly as and when the need arises. • An indicator of environmental quality might be the number of properties identified as being located within 'important areas' by the noise maps associated with the Environment Noise Directive. • There is an issue of planning permissions having been granted but are not implemented other than in the technical sense to keep permissions alive. It would be beneficial if the Council could bring such land to the open market if the developers have no intention of develop them. Could consider CPO powers. Land subject to permissions could be kept in a Register, listed by parish. 	<p>The Council is working to increase the five-year housing land supply.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is recognised that indicators require further review.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
Glossary		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="645 373 1590 430">• An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty may be designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, not 1947. 	The Glossary has been amended accordingly.