

Appendix D



# *Rural Housing Action Plan*



## *2010/2011*



## Introduction

This document sets out the Councils approach to the provision of affordable housing in rural locations. The need for affordable housing in rural settlements is seen as more acute in relative terms with the affordability ratios of market housing often being far higher than in urban settlements. Additionally the sale of former Council stock through Right to Buy, and (since the stock transfer) Preserved Right to Buy, being disproportionately higher in rural settlements. It should be noted that, by contrast, the absolute level of need for affordable housing in urban settlements is higher, but the opportunities exist for greater provision within these localities.

This document sets out the mechanisms available to the Council in providing more affordable housing in rural locations and describes how we intend to use these. In addition this plan is influenced by and contributes towards the councils Corporate Plan (revised in 2009) and the Housing and Accommodation Strategy (last update issued 2008)

## Evidence Base

South Somerset District Council covers a large geographical area consisting of 121 parishes over 96,000 hectares. In a survey conducted in October 2008 almost 31% of resident respondents cited affordable housing as a priority area for improvement. There are over 6,000 households expressing a need for rehousing on the Housing Register and all the anecdotal evidence suggests that this under-represents the level of need in rural areas where many households do not register (as they have the perception that there is nothing to register for). During 2008 and early 2009 the Council participated in a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) covering two sub-regional housing markets, in conjunction with three neighbouring housing authorities, across most of the county of Somerset. In the final SHMA report, the consultants, Fordham Research, identified a need for an additional 659 affordable dwellings per year in order to satisfy the backlog and projected arising need (from demographic trends).

In addition there have been a number of very local parish housing needs surveys conducted to identify needs in a particular parish. It should be noted that the primary purpose of these surveys is to provide sufficient evidence to justify the granting of planning permission outside of the development area [or boundary] ('rural exceptions schemes'). Often such surveys expose the level of 'hidden need' not directly measured by the Housing Register because of the reluctance of eligible households to apply for rehousing through the normal channels. However the overall figures produced through the SHMA take into account such 'hidden need' and it should also be noted that in recent years the greater proportion of new affordable housing in rural settlements has been produced on sites within development areas.

## Affordable Housing Delivered – 2008/09

During the financial year 2008/09 the Council enabled a total of 172 new affordable housing units across the district – of which 112 were for rent and the majority of the remainder were made available on a shared ownership basis. Of this total 44 (26%) were in rural settlements (i.e. those with a population of 3,000 or less) – a decrease in percentage terms from previous years which typically ran at one third of all new affordable housing being in rural settlements. Table one below depicts the locations, numbers and partner landlord for each scheme.

**Table One: Affordable Housing Completions in Rural Settlements during 2008/09**

Location	Rent	Shared ownership	Total	Registered Social Landlord Partner
Buckland St Mary	3	1	4	Hastoe
Curry Mallet	4	2	6	Hastoe
Curry Rivel	0	2	2	SSH (now Yarlington)
Galhampton	0	3	3	SSH (now Yarlington)
Milborne Port	15	0	15	Raglan
South Cadbury	2	1	3	SSH (now Yarlington)
South Petherton	5	6	11	SSH (now Yarlington)
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>44</b>	

## Affordable Housing Delivered – 2009/10

During the financial year 2009/10 the Council enabled a total of 138 new affordable housing units across the district – of which 113 were for rent and the majority of the remainder were made available on a shared ownership basis. Of this total 55 (49%) were in rural settlements (i.e. those with a population of 3,000 or less) – a significant increase in percentage terms from 2008/09. Table two below depicts the locations, numbers and partner landlord for each scheme.

**Table Two: Affordable Housing Completions in Rural Settlements during 2009/10**

Location	Rent	Shared ownership	HomeBuy	Total	Registered Social Landlord Partner
Bruton	10	3	0	13	Hastoe
Milborne Port	6	3	0	9	Raglan
South Petherton	0	0	14	0	Persimmon*
South Petherton	19	0	0	19	Raglan
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>55</b>	

\*Persimmon are a private developer in receipt of HCA funding, not an RSL

In addition to the social landlord homes, the HCA also allocated an unspecified amount to Persimmon, a private sector developer, to develop fourteen low cost home ownership dwellings at South Petherton (on the same site as the Raglan properties). These properties are not managed by a registered social landlord partner but are deemed 'affordable' by providing an intermediate housing solution as defined in Annex B of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006).

## Affordable Housing Funded – Commencing 2010/11

**Table Three: Affordable Housing Programme in Rural Settlements for 2010/11**

Location	Rent	Shared ownership	Total	Registered Social Landlord Partner
Henstridge	10	3	13	Yarlington
Ilminster	12	2	14	Hastoe
Langport	16	2	18	Hastoe
Sparkford	6	2	8	Yarlington
Tatworth	6	2	8	Hastoe
Templecombe	9	0	9	Yarlington
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>70</b>	

Table three above depicts the affordable housing programme as it relates to RSL homes in rural settlements for the period 2010/11 where a capital subsidy allocation has been made either by the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) or by the Council. Some of the above may not complete until the financial year 2011/12. For the sake of clarity only those currently benefiting from a confirmed allocation of funds are shown and by September 2010 the HCA's allocation of funds for the period 2010/11 remained blocked and unallocated following the General Election, a major reduction in available grant and direct Government intervention. It is not known when or if any funding will be made available.

As can be seen, a greater proportion of these planned homes are for rent from a registered social landlord. This is a reflection of the current economic downturn, which has resulted in a lessening in the capability of many households to access shared ownership housing and other intermediate products. In general mortgage lenders have become very cautious and this has reduced the ability for many to access sufficient finance; for example mortgage lenders have typically reverted to higher per centage deposits being required.

## Planning Gain

The tables above include some affordable housing units achieved through the planning gain mechanism, i.e. where a developer is obliged to produce some affordable housing alongside market housing in order to obtain planning permission. The current policy is that all privately developed sites of 15 units or more or ½ hectare in rural areas (i.e. in settlements of 3,000 population or less) are subject to this obligation. Where a site qualifies for the affordable housing contribution the Council seeks 35% to be made available as affordable without access to public subsidy, subject to the viability of the site overall. The SHMA confirms that the proportions of affordable housing within this 35% should be 67% for rent and the rest other intermediate solutions, including shared ownership. However it should be noted that some existing permissions predate the SHMA and these may only be obliged to produce affordable housing on a 50:50 basis.

This policy ensures that where a suitable site is brought forward within the development limits of a rural settlement, a proportion (roughly one third but lower where site viability dictates) is affordable. Where the level of rented housing is insufficient, it may be possible to supplement the planning gain with capital subsidy (from the HCA or from the Council) to increase the rented proportion within the affordable housing being provided under planning gain.

The policy to achieve some affordable housing through planning gain cannot address all the housing need (expressed or otherwise) in rural areas. Development will be limited to those settlements where an opportunity exists and where the developer has decided it makes financial sense to bring the site forward in the present economic climate, otherwise viable sites may well be 'mothballed' due to the developer's perception of the market.

## Yarlington Housing Group – redevelopment opportunities.

Yarlington Housing Group is an independent RSL (Registered Social Landlord) and began life as South Somerset Homes in 1999. It was created to take over ownership of all the remaining council homes under a Large Scale Voluntary Transfer (LSVT), following a positive ballot of tenants. The immediate effect on rural housing has been to remove the Right To Buy from future tenants. Historically the Right To Buy was exercised more frequently in villages and more frequently on family size dwellings, particularly houses.

Those tenants who were council tenants on the day of stock transfer and have continuously remained tenants of South Somerset Homes/Yarlington Housing Group ever since enjoy a Preserved Right to Buy. New tenants (including former council tenants returning to social housing) do not have a Right To Buy but may be eligible for the Right To Acquire. However most RSL properties in rural settlements are exempt from the Right To Acquire.

At the time of the LSVT a significant proportion of the stock to be transferred was constructed using system build techniques, mainly composing concrete elements and generally referred to as 'PRC' housing (Pre-stressed Reinforced Concrete). Historically several systems were used and many of these had gained a poor reputation nationally due to design and construction faults. As a result although such properties were subject to the Right To Buy, eligible tenants often found it extremely difficult to obtain mortgage finance. The Council and South Somerset Homes agreed that, as part of the transfer deal, all PRC housing would be brought up to a mortgageable standard.

After the LSVT had completed, central Government introduced the concept of the 'Decent Homes Standard' with a target for all social rented properties to meet this standard by 2010. It should be noted that meeting the decent Homes Standard was not part of the LSVT transfer agreement because it did not exist at the time. However many of the elements of the Standard had been incorporated into the transfer deal, for example an undertaking to replace outdated kitchens and bathrooms.

Looking at the Decent Homes Standard as well as the need to bring PRC properties up to mortgageable standard, South Somerset Homes developed a new approach of demolition and complete replacement. This had the added advantage of being able to replace dwellings with new homes tailored to the needs of the existing tenants (for example providing a bungalow for an elderly couple occupying a family size house) and redesigning estates to make better use of the overall layout, usually producing an increase in the number of homes provided.

Yarlington Housing Group has thus been in a unique position to increase the provision of housing in some rural settlements. In terms of overall numbers generally only the true additional units are counted as the net gain, but it should also be remembered that occasionally tenants who are decanted out of their old home chose not to return to the site once the replacement property has been built, thus providing another vacancy for somebody else.

Table four below depicts the remaining rural PRC and concrete block construction sites to be redeveloped, i.e. not already funded and shown in the previous tables.

**Table Four: Remaining PRC sites in Rural Settlements due for Redevelopment by YHG.**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Existing homes</b>	<b>Anticipated New Total*</b>	<b>Net Gain</b>	<b>Anticipated Date of Completion*</b>
Bruton	21	34	13	June 2011
Castle Cary	16	30	14	April 2011
Curry Rivel**	8	20	12	November 2010
Ilton	12	40	28	May 2011
Langport	8	17	9	March 2011
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>(August 2011)</b>

\* Subject to planning permission, appropriate funding etc

\*\*Concrete block construction not strictly PRC and thus not subject to obligation to 'remedy' to mortgageable standard

## Rural Exception Schemes

Rural exception schemes are now so well established as a mechanism that this tends to be the type of housing most people think of when referring to new rural housing provision. In fact rural exception schemes, whilst significant, are in effect the last resort and are likely to produce fewer new houses over the forthcoming period than either the planning gain route, or the Yarlinton redevelopment opportunities.

'Exception' refers to the current planning limits. Rural exception schemes are those schemes where planning approval has been gained outside of the existing development area for exceptional reasons. In order to build outside of the development area it is necessary to prove that a housing need exists locally, and that no opportunity exists within the development area to meet that need.

Once planning permission has been gained the site is subject to a Section 106 Agreement controlling the allocation of the dwellings. Typically the s106 Agreement will dictate that houses are let or leased to eligible households who can demonstrate a connection with the settlement or parish. Where no such household can be identified, a typical Agreement will allow the landlord or freeholder to consider eligible households who can demonstrate a connection with certain neighbouring parishes (often referred to as the 'doughnut ring'). Finally, the landlord or freeholder would be able to look for eligible households with a connection to the district.

Currently the Council is co-sponsor of two rural housing enabler posts hosted by the Community Council (based in Taunton). The major sponsor is the County council and the other sponsors are the three other districts in Somerset covered by the two posts. County Council funding is however to be withdrawn in 2011 and the future is uncertain. A separate arrangement exists for West Somerset in tandem with North Devon District Council and Exmoor National park (which straddles the County boundary). The rural enablers assist the process, working closely with Parish Councils and RSL partners to

identify need, conduct local surveys, evaluate alternative sites and bring forward proposed schemes.

Current funding levels allow six parish housing needs surveys to be conducted throughout the district each year. However, during 2008 additional revenue support agreed by the Area East Forum enabled an additional five surveys to be conducted in that part of the district. The table below summarises the surveys completed between January 2003 and September 2009.

**Table Five: Local Parish Housing Needs Surveys completed since January 2003**

<b>Parish/es</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Pop</b>	<b>H Holds</b>	<b>Sustainable Need</b>
Abbas & Templecombe	Oct-08	1462	628	17
Aller	Mar-04	350	170	4
Ash	Sept-09	585	241	6
Barton St David	Aug-08	643	230	18
Beercrocombe	?2003?			0
Broadway	Mar-05	532	260	0
Bruton	Oct-08	2926	1044	24
Buckland St. Mary*	Apr-05	448	191	4
Carymoor group of parishes	Oct-08			0
Charlton Horethorne	Feb-07	582	241	11
Compton Dundon & Littleton	June-05	720	310	6
Curry Mallet	2004			6
Curry Rivel	Aug-06	2151	900	8 to 12
Donyatt	Sep-05	350	150	0
Hardington Mandeville*	May-04	583	228	6
High Ham	Apr-04	830	350	2
Huish Episcopi	Apr-04	1940	850	6
Keinton Mandeville	2003			6
Kingsdon	Oct-08	351	140	0
Long Load	Sept-07	355	140	10
Long Sutton	Apr-04	880	350	3
Marston Magna	Mar-09	446	191	0
Misterton*	June-04	792	317	6 (2 x self build)
Norton Sub Hamdon	Oct-05	720	290	8 to 10
Pitney	Feb-03	430	120	0
Queen Camel	June-07	872	340	14
Shepton Beauchamp	Sep-04	720	350	2
South Cadbury	Oct-04	264	124	2 or 3
South Petherton	Jan-08	3177	1436	16
Sparkford	Aug-05	530	220	6 to 8
Stoke Sub Hamdon	Mar-08	1965	850	10
Tatworth & Forton	Aug-05	2600	1060	10 to 15
West Camel	Oct-08	457	209	0



Parish/es	Date	Pop	H Holds	Sustainable Need
Winsham	2004			

*\* Indicates the survey was not undertaken by the county-wide Rural Housing Enablers and methodology may vary.*

Whilst some level of need has been established in most of the locations in table five above, housing schemes have not been completed in every case. For example, in the cases of Abbas & Templecombe, Bruton and South Petherton there have been suitable sites within the development limits being brought forward which either qualify for contributing affordable housing provision via planning gain, or represent PRC redevelopment by Yarlington Housing Group that will produce additional dwellings (or, in some cases, both). In these examples a portion of those affordable properties produced through the planning gain route have been set aside, at least on initial lets, for eligible households with a local connection in the same way as a rural exceptions s106 Agreement would expect.

In other locations, whilst a need has been established through the local survey route, no solid proposal is forthcoming. There are various reasons why schemes have not progressed, often involving site identification difficulties. At the end of this document we set out to address these blockages

## The Local Development Framework

As with other local planning authorities, the Council is now obliged to produce a Local Development Framework (LDF) consisting of a Core Strategy and other Development Plan Documents (DPD). Whilst the LDF is being prepared, most of the previous Local Plan policies remain as 'saved policies' (including the rural exceptions policy [Policy HG9] and the approach to planning gain described earlier). Within the new LDF Core Strategy the Council will have to find sufficient land to accommodate new dwellings in the district, by 2026.

Some of the required additional dwellings will be on land in rural areas; proposals within the draft LDF are out for public consultation. The consultation period commenced on 8<sup>th</sup> October and is due to end on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2010. Other opportunities for the provision of more affordable housing in rural settlements will be in the Core Strategy through a rural policy, which effectively incorporates the existing rural exceptions policy.

Outside of the new rural policy, if any further growth is approved in some rural settlements it will present the opportunity for more private sector development and may well produce further opportunities for affordable dwellings in these settlements through the planning gain process. The draft LDF contains a proposal to reduce the threshold above which a site will qualify for providing affordable housing through planning obligations.

Table Six (below) lists the proposals for net increases of overall housing provision in rural settlements (subject to the consultation). It is reasonable to

assume that the majority of these will provide up to 35% affordable housing on site.

**Table Six: Rural Parishes with proposed additional housing in draft LDF (subject to consultation)**

<b>Parish/es</b>	<b>Proposed Net Additional</b>	<b>Therefore Net Affordable*</b>
Bruton	120	42
Castle Cary & Ansford	262	92
Ilchester	150	52
Langport & Huish Episcopi	118	41
Martock	150	53
Milborne Port	100	35
Stoke Sub Hamdon	50	17

\*Based on 35% Proposed Net Additional Figure.

Conversely, during the development period for the LDF Core Strategy process, it is possible that some sites identified as suitable for rural exceptions schemes will remain unobtainable because of the aspirations of the current owner to develop them as market housing.

## **The Public Housing Land Search**

Opportunities may arise to address some rural housing need by identifying sites through a public housing land search. This approach may provide the solution in some of the settlements where need has already been identified but little progress made. It may also provide opportunity to provide more affordable housing in some rural locations where parishes have not yet undertaken a local housing needs survey.

The Council instigated a search of publicly owned or controlled land in a project originally funded by South Somerset Together, the Local Strategic Partnership. Clive Miller & Associates were taken on to approach a range of public sector and quasi-public agencies to seek available land and give an initial appraisal of it's suitability for development as affordable housing. In taking this work forward Clive Miller & Associates were asked to be mindful of but not constrained by current planning policy in order to cast as wide a net as possible.

The initial stage of the work was expanded to cover potential sites across the County with match funding from the County Council. In the second stage of work our consultants were asked to narrow down their initial longlist of over sixty potential sites to a smaller shortlist of potential sites for development. This short list was considered by our preferred RSL partners, each of whom is now investigating at least one potential site to bring forward new affordable housing.

## The Way Forward

The Council has set out a clear objective within the Corporate Plan (3.4), viz:

- o With partners, enable the development of four housing schemes in rural communities by 2012

This, in turn, is underpinned by three actions set out in the Improvement Plan adopted following the Inspection of the Corporate Approach to Strategic Housing in 2008, viz:

- 7.1 Publish the rural housing action plan
- 7.2 Facilitate up to six Rural Parish Housing Needs Surveys
- 7.3 Develop a programme for targeting remaining parishes

This document represents completion of the first task. The surveys for the current year have either been undertaken or are currently planned. Parishes yet to be surveyed are highlighted in the appendix. In many cases the timing of the survey should be dependant on the stage at which the parish has reached in developing it's overall parish plan. Taking this into consideration our immediate task is to target at least one parish in each of those wards where no or almost no surveys have been undertaken in the past, in order to achieve a broad geographic spread. However the impact of the County Council funding withdrawal for the Rural Housing Enablers post will have a marked impact and targets are unlikely to be met because of lack of resource

In addition to developing a programme for targeting the remaining parishes, we also need to consider how to address the issues that have slowed down or ceased work in parishes where need has already been established through a local survey.

Table seven (below) identifies which parishes these are and provides only a brief comment on the current issue which may be acting as a blockage to development. Reasons for delay are often quite complex and involve a range of sensitive issues, not least negotiations with current landowners

**Table Seven: Parishes with established local need but no scheme completed to date**

Parish/es	Date	Need	Issue	RSL
Abbas & Templecombe	Oct-08	17	Some need likely to be met through PRC redevelopment due to complete in 2010/11	YHG
Ash	Sept-09	6	Survey very recent	
Barton St David	Aug-08	18	Scheme has progressed but is now subject to obtaining funding/subsidy & purchase of County owned land	Raglan

Parish/es	Date	Need	Issue	RSL
Bruton	Oct-08	24	Needs partially met through completed Hastoe development with remainder to be met by YHG development underway	YHG; Hastoe
Charlton Horethorne	Feb-07	11	Site	YHG
Compton Dundon & Littleton	June-05	6	Approved s106 site not built; stalled by (private) developer.	
Hardington Mandeville	May-04	6	Site; PC support	
High Ham	Apr-04	2	Site currently seeking planning permission	YHG
Long Load	Sept-07	10	Site	Hastoe
Long Sutton	Apr-04	3	Site	YHG
Misterton	June-04	6 (2 x self build)	Lack of site, although one site going to appeal	
Norton Sub Hamdon	Oct-05	8 to 10	Site	YHG
Queen Camel	June-07	14	Site; CLT	
Sparkford	Aug-05	6 to 8	Scheme has progressed but is now subject to obtaining funding/subsidy	YHG
Stoke Sub Hamdon	Mar-08	10	Site	YHG
Tatworth & Forton	Aug-05	10 to 15	Funding in place & scheme about to commence	Hastoe

Almost inevitably any attempt at a definitive list outlining the stages currently reached by proposed schemes and what actions are now necessary would become out of date shortly after publication. In all of the parishes listed in table six there needs to be ongoing discussions between various parties and next step actions agreed from time to time. We shall develop a definitive list for each of the Areas in South Somerset and ensure close working between Area based community development officers, the strategic housing team, the rural housing enablers and the relevant RSL.

“There is one dominant factor that is proving to be the most difficult to overcome and that is the availability of land in a suitable location and at an acceptable price. In most instances it is a failure to find available land that meets financial and planning requirements that is stalling all attempts to provide.”

Cllr Ric Pallister OBE

## Parish Specific Action Plan

Table Eight below sets out the immediate actions to pursue rural housing developments in specific parishes across the district during 2010/11. It is not a definitive or exhaustive action plan because new actions will arise during the year in the light of developing circumstances, for example an announcement of the level of funding available for rural schemes through the Homes and Communities Agency following the Budget and Public Spending Review.

**Table Eight: Initial Action Plan 2010/11 (parish specific)**

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>
Ash	Identify RSL partner; Site investigations	PC; RHE
Barton St David	Seek planning; seek funding	Raglan
Bruton	Seek funding for phase II (Frome Road site)	Hastoe
Charlton Horethorne	Identify site	YHG
Chisleborough	Investigate site	YHG
Compton Dundon	Site to be completed; Identify second site	Developer; PC
Hardington Mandeville	Identify site; identify RSL partner	PC
High Ham	Seek planning permission	Developer; YHG
Horton	Investigate Site	RHE; Hastoe
Long Load	Resolve site issues	PC; Hastoe
Long Sutton	Resolve site issues	PC; YHG
Marston Magna	Investigate site	Hastoe
Merriot	Parish Housing Needs Survey	PC; RHE
Misterton	Identify RSL	Developer
Montacute	Parish Housing Needs Survey	PC; RHE
Norton Sub Hamdon	Identify suitable site	YHG
Queen Camel	Identify RSL partner	PC
Sparkford	Obtain funding	YHG
Stoke sub Hamdon	Investigate site	YHG
Tintinhull	Investigate sites	YHG
Tower Ward	Identify parish for next survey	RHE
West Coker	Investigate Site	Raglan
Windwhistle Ward	Identify parish for next survey	RHE

## Strategic Actions

In addition to the Parish specific actions set out in the table above, we are mindful of the likely reduction in funding from central/regional sources in the current economic climate. There are three major strands to our future strategic approach in this area

- We shall work with partner local housing authorities across the County to produce a viable rural housing programme as part of the new county-wide 'Local Investment Plan' which will form the basis for future investment of public subsidy through the HCA and other agencies.
- We shall work with Parish Councils, RSL partners and the Somerset & Dorset Umbrella Community Land Trust to investigate new forms of provision which may provide cross subsidy of social rented units from other affordable housing units on suitable sites
- We shall work with partner Local Housing Authorities and partner RSLs across Somerset to develop new policies governing allocations of existing rural homes within the Homefinder Somerset system, subject to satisfactory compliance with prevailing housing legislation (notably currently Housing Act 1996, as amended by Homelessness Act 2002). Any such proposed new policies will be subject to wide consultation and approval/adoption by each of the partner local Housing Authorities and landlords within the Homefinder Somerset partnership. The consultation period on proposed changes began on 14<sup>th</sup> October and is due to end on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

## Appendix: RSL stock in Rural Parishes (by Ward)

The table below shows current stock managed by Registered Social Landlords in South Somerset, excluding wards in Yeovil, Chard, Ilminster and Wincanton.

Parish (by Ward) Parishes highlighted are those where no survey has been conducted to date.	2001 census	Yarlington	Total (other RSL)	RSL
<b>BLACKMOOR VALE (East)</b>				
Abbas & Templecombe	1462	107	21	Housing 21, Signpost & Wyvern
Charlton Horethorne	581	20	6	Hastoe
Compton Pauncefoot	132	2	0	
Corton Denham	200	1	0	
Henstridge	1509	87	23	Hastoe, Housing 21 & Signpost
Holton	188	2	0	
Horsington	571	5	6	Hastoe
Maperton	137	0	0	
North Cheriton	242	8	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5022</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>56</b>	
<b>BRUTON (East)</b>				
Bruton	2926	133	24	Hastoe, Knightstone, Magna, Signpost & Wyvern
	<b>2926</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>24</b>	
<b>CAMELOT (East)</b>				
Marston Magna	446	31	0	
Queen Camel	872	49	1	Raglan
Rimpton	253	5	0	
Sparkford	531	21	2	Sovereign
West Camel	457	17	1	Raglan
<b>Total</b>	<b>2559</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>CARY (East)</b>				
Alford		0	0	
Ansford	1019	62	0	
Babcary	223	1	0	
Castle Cary	2178	160	59	Hanover, Jephson, Knightstone, Magna & Signpost
Lovington	180	6	0	
North Barrow	186	0	0	
North Cadbury	871	10	2	Wyvern
South Barrow	159	5	0	
South Cadbury	264	9	0	
Yarlington	115	1	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5193</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>61</b>	
<b>IVELCHESTER (East)</b>				
Chilton Cantelo		0	0	
Ilchester	2123	70	12	Knightstone, Magna & Signpost
Limington	447	6	0	
Mudford	656	48	1	Magna
Yeovilton	943	1	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4169</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>13</b>	

<b>Parish (by Ward)</b> Parishes highlighted are those where no survey has been conducted to date.	2001 census	Yarlington	Total (other RSL)	RSL
<b>MILBORNE PORT (East)</b>				
Milborne Port	2644	135	0	Raglan developing
<b>Total</b>	<b>2644</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>NORTHSTONE (East)</b>				
Barton St David	643	9	0	
Chartlton Mackrell	972	1	0	
Keinton Mandeville	949	8	6	Hastoe
Kingsdon	353	16	0	
Kingweston		10	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2917</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>TOWER (East)</b>				
Bratton Seymour	115	1	0	
Brewham	412	0	0	
Charlton Musgrove	385	4	0	
Cucklington	182	8	0	
Pen Selwood	286	9	0	
Pitcombe	493	3	0	
Shepton Montague	215	2	0	
Stoke Trister	300	1	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2388</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>COKER (South)</b>				
Barwick	1181	121	1	Signpost
Closworth	178	1	0	
East Coker	1702	46	0	
Hardington Mandeville	583	3	1	Hastoe
Odcombe	746	39	0	
West Coker	2035	97	7	Raglan
<b>Total</b>	<b>5258</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>BURROW HILL (North)</b>				
Barrington	434	21	0	
Kingsbury Episcopi	1295	27	26	Knightstone
Muchelney	191	1	0	
Puckington	141	0	0	
Stocklinch	137	4	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2197</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>26</b>	
<b>CURRY RIVEL (North)</b>				
Drayton	346	5	0	
Curry Rivel	2151	111	14	Knightstone
<b>Total</b>	<b>2497</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>14</b>	
<b>HAMDON (North)</b>				
Norton Sub Hamdon	724	31	12	Wyvern
<b>Total</b>	<b>2689</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12</b>	



<b>Parish (by Ward)</b> Parishes highlighted are those where no survey has been conducted to date.	2001 census	Yarlington	Total (other RSL)	RSL
<b>ISLEMOOR (North)</b>				
Beercrocombe	132	5	0	Hastoe, Knightstone
Cury Mallett	299	11	9	
Fivehead	638	31	0	
Hambridge & Wes	545	5	0	
Ilton	823	42	1	Signpost
Isle Abbots	224	5	0	
Isle Brewers	115	4	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2776</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>LANGPORT &amp; HUISH (North)</b>				
Langport	1052	152	21	Knightstone, Magna, Signpost & Wyvern
Huish Episcopi	1874	18	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2735</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>21</b>	
<b>MARTOCK (North)</b>				
Ash	585	20	0	Jephson, Knightstone, Raglan, Signpost, Western Challenge & Wyvern
Long Load	334	3	0	
Martock	4535	168	76	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5454</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>76</b>	
<b>ST MICHAEL'S (North)</b>				
Chilthorne Domer	557	29	0	
Montacute	775	69	0	
Tintinhull	970	87	1	Signpost
<b>Total</b>	<b>2302</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>SOUTH PETHERTON (North)</b>				
Lopen	236	7	0	
Seavington St Mary	361	0	0	
Seavington St Michael	125	2	0	
Shepton Beauchamp	743	47	0	Knightstone, Magna & Signpost; Raglan developing
South Petherton	3177	219	21	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4642</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>21</b>	
<b>TURN HILL (North)</b>				
Aller	351	17	1	Jephson
High Ham	786	9	0	
Long Sutton	804	21	0	
Pitney	365	1	0	
Wearne & Combe PW	191	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2497</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>WESSEX (North)</b>				
Compton Dundon	664	15		Hastoe Hastoe, Knightstone, Raglan & Wyvern
Somerton	4509	138	62	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5173</b>	<b>153</b>		

<b>Parish (by Ward)</b> Parishes highlighted are those where no survey has been conducted to date.	2001 census	Yarlington	Total (other RSL)	RSL
<b>BLACKDOWN (West)</b>				Hastoe
Buckland St Mary	489	5	4	
Combe St Nicholas	1317	53	0	
Wambrook	188	0	0	
Whitestaunton	211	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2204</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>CREWKERNE (West)</b>				Knightstone, Magna, Raglan, Signpost, Sovereign & Wyvern Knightstone
Crewkerne	6728	419	106	
Misterton	792	32	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>7520</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>109</b>	
<b>EGGWOOD (West)</b>				
Dinnington		1	0	
Hinton St George	447	2	0	
Merriott	1966	114	13	Knightstone
<b>Total</b>	<b>2413</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>13</b>	
<b>NEROCHE (West)</b>				
Ashill	515	2	0	
Broadway	597	3	0	
Donyatt	355	14	0	
Horton	813	45	10	Hastoe
<b>Total</b>	<b>2280</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>PARRETT (West)</b>				
Chiselborough	325	5	0	
East Chinnock	487	4	1	Hastoe
Haselbury Plucknett	669	36	0	
North Perrott	249	0	0	
West Chinnock	600	37	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2330</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>TATWORTH &amp; FORTON (West)</b>				
Tatworth & Forton	<b>2580</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>WINDWHISTLE (West)</b>				
Chaffcombe	193	0	0	
Chillington	188	0	0	
Cudworth		0	0	
Cricket St Thomas		0	0	
Dowlish Wake	274	4	0	
Kingstone		0	0	
Knowle St Giles	258	0	0	
Wayford		0	0	
West Crewkerne	561	0	0	
Winsham	752	50	12	Hastoe & Magna
<b>Total</b>	<b>2225</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>12</b>	