

Draft Core Strategy (incorporating Preferred Options) October 2010
Summary of issues - Part 1 - Introduction, Spatial Portrait, Vision and Settlement Strategy

Policy/Paragraph/Section	Summary of Issues	Officer Comment	Recommendation
Foreword	* Yeovil Urban Extension - proposals have not been well communicated. Response times have been in some instances less than 2 weeks (following public exhibition).	Concerns primarily related to timing of exhibition which represents only one element of the consultation process. Evidence base criticisms are unfounded as Baker update indicates	Foreword will need to reflect changes in evidence base and status of Submission Plan
Introduction			
What is the Local Development Framework? (paras 1.1 – 1.3)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A
Purpose of the Core Strategy (paras 1.4 – 1.5)	*Focus of document is based on proposed spatial policy, this should be the consequence of the Final Strategy and not presented as the Core Strategy.	This is a Strategy for implementation and is the outcome of a considerable weight of evidence. The term Core Strategy is Statutory.	No change.
Stages so far (para 1.6)	* Paragraph 1.4 - Plan period should be at least 15yrs from date of adoption (PPS12 & PPS3). Given that adoption is not expected until Spring/early Summer 2012 the Core Strategy plan period should be rolled forward to at least 2027 in the Reg. 27 version.	Accepted, time scale needs full 15 years and all projections will be rolled forward to 2028 reflect this.	Update document to end date of 2028.
Sustainability Appraisal			
Sustainability appraisal (paras 1.7 – 1.11)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A
Appropriate Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment	* Support the recognition of transport in sustainable development.	Support noted	No change.
Appropriate Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment (paras 1.12 – 1.15)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A

Evidence Base			
Evidence Base (para 1.16)	* The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) for Bracket's Coppice Special Area of Conservation (SAC) concluded that there is a potential significant effect on the movement of Bechstein's bats through the landscape from implementing Policies YV2, YV5, HG6, EP6, EP7, EP8, EQ1, EQ2, and EQ7. The HRA concluded that there would be no adverse effect if certain changes were incorporated, but these policies do not include these changes so the Core Strategy is not Habitats Regulations compliant.	Noted and agreed.	Minor amendments to relevant policies and supporting text to reflect outcomes of HRA on Bracket's Coppice SAC, in order to protect bat species.
	* Title: Appropriate Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment - either one or the other should be used not both. Generally recognised that AA is Stage 2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.	Noted and reference should be amended to refer to HRA rather than AA throughout for consistency	Amend reference to AA to read HRA throughout document
Policy Context			
Policy Context (para 1.17)	* Evidence Base is very limited in relation to the historic environment apart from the Yeovil HEA.	Much evidence exists regarding the historic environment for known assets. The Somerset Historic Environmental Record held at SCC contains considerable data. SSDC Conservation Area Appraisals exist for some of the Conservation areas. PPS5 has also been amended in relation to historic assets.	No change
Local Context	* Yeovil Urban Extension - proposals are not based on current forecast for population growth. Also no up to date traffic analysis.	Further evidence provided on updating population figures and traffic modelling for Yeovil, covered elsewhere	No change
Local Context (para 1.18)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A
Regional Context			
Regional Context (para 1.19)	* Figure 2 contains no reference to the historic environment.	Figure 2 refers to Planning Policy Statements and Planning Circulars. Reference should also be made to the relevant national legislation	Add reference to Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 under 'National and Regional Guidance'
	*Figure 2 should include SFRA under other South Somerset District Council Strategies and Documents. Also no reference to the Waste Local Plan.	Noted and agreed.	Add SSDC SFRA to 'Other Somerset District Council Strategies' and Add Somerset Waste and Minerals plans to 'Somerset County Council'.

National Context			
National Context (para 1.20 – 1.21)	*Figure 2 should include AONB Management Plans - statutory requirement on the LPA and a material consideration.	Noted but should come under other documents as produced by the AONB's themselves and are not regional publications.	Add AONB Management Plans to 'Other Local Documents'.
	* Plan still makes much reference to the RSS. No mention is made of the exciting range of consultation documents coming out of CLG such as Right to Build. Need to simplify local governance and lower the decision levels is not recognised. Why not recognise that more decisions will be taken locally and that most planning decisions relating to modifications to existing buildings or minor developments can and should be taken locally. Parish Councils have been making sensible decisions for roughly 1,000 yrs why not let this grow rather than being stifled.	Any revision will need to take into account the up to date position with regard to the amendments proposed in the Localism Act which have yet to be commenced .	Amend to reflect latest position on Localism Act in relation to local powers
Next Steps			
Next Steps	* No explicit reference to saved local plan policies such as EH1 to EH12 or EC3.	Noted.	Proposed Submission document will refer to those policies that are to be saved.
Spatial Portrait of South Somerset			
Spatial Portrait of South Somerset (para 2.1)	* Support for the RSS remaining a material consideration in decision making. Encouraging that the Council has not sought to dismiss the RSS.	Support noted. At the time of writing the RSS is not withdrawn	Amend Submission plan to reflect latest position on RSS status at time of drafting.
	* Spatial portrait focuses on general planning aspirations and provides no real local identity or qualities within the District. Much could apply to any rural district with a similar settlement pattern, very little to say what gives South Somerset its unique qualities.	Noted.	Proposed Submission plan text needs to better reflect uniqueness of South Somerset.

Geography, Population and Settlement Pattern			
Geography, Population and Settlement Pattern (paras 2.2 – 2.4)	* References in the Draft CS appear to confuse the emerging Draft Revised RSS with the formal RSS (the earlier Regional Planning Guidance 10 which was assigned RSS status under the Planning and Compensation Act 2004). The latter is part of the development plan, whereas the former is a material consideration albeit one with significant weight. This distinction should be clarified in the reg 27 version.	Noted. References should be consistent and reflect up to date housing and population work undertaken by Baker Associates which is part of the evidence base as well. Status of RSS and RPG 10 should be correctly reflected.	Amend text to reflect up to date figures and status of RSS and RPG 10.
	* Core Strategy will have to be updated to reflect the reinstatement of the Regional Spatial Strategy as part of the development plan following the recent CALA Homes High Court Judgement. Coalition will not abolish RSS until November 2011 and the current CLG Business Plan which is after the programmed Reg 27 publication stage and the CS will need to have regard to the policy guidance extant at that time.	Noted. RSS is current at the time of writing.	Amend Submission plan to reflect latest position on RSS status at time of drafting.
	* Yeovil's 'strategically significant' status should not be laboured now that the RSS has been revoked. Yeovil meets very few of the criteria necessary to be considered 'strategically significant' and therefore this should not appear as a positive.	Currently the RSS has not been revoked, and even when it is under the Localism Act, Yeovil remains "Strategically Significant" within the region given its role and function and therefore should remain referred to as a Strategically Significant Town.	No change.
	* Would be interested to see the level of demographic growth expected from the over 65's - would allow an assessment of how important it is that the Council makes provision for elderly person care and accommodation.	Policy HG5 seeks to achieve a mix of market housing based on the evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and successor documents - which will take into account the latest statistical information. It is proposed to add a new policy to address the provision of specialist housing options for older people.	Add the following additional supporting text to paragraph 8.43 : after "Challenging" insert <i>in order to address this need specialist housing options will be required this could include care homes, Extra Care housing and Continuing Care Retirement Communities.</i> Add a new Policy to allow for provision of Care Homes and other specialist housing accommodation.

	* Population growth figures suggest a high household growth figure to 2026.	Up to date housing and population work has been undertaken by Baker Associates "Housing Requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil" which is part of the evidence base	Amend text to reflect up to date figures and roll to 2028.
Housing			
Housing (paras 2.5 – 2.8)	* Significant concern that the revocation of the RSS, and need to ensure that policies relating to the protection of AONBs and their settings, and the historic environment are not lost. This is particularly pertinent to South Somerset which lies within the setting of Dorset AONB, and over a quarter of the district's population lives within 4.5km of the AONB boundary.	Noted. The historic environment and AONB's currently have protection through national policy. Consideration will need to be given if the National Planning Policy Framework changes this.	No change subject to review of final National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
	* Para 2.7 succinctly sets out that affordability is an issue.	Support noted	No Change.
	* Para 2.7 , 3rd line should read "the average house price in 2008..."	Noted	Correct spelling.
Economic Prosperity	* Section out of date re; historic environment with no reference to PPS5, the Government's Statement on the Historic Environment in England (March 2010) nor a wide range of English Heritage guidance.	Following the publication of the Draft NPPF for consultation and with regard to approaching change in National Policy and in line with consultation responses, this needs to be considered further.	No change subject to review of final National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Economic Prosperity (paras 2.9 – 2.19)	* Reference should be made to tourism.	Noted and agreed.	Amend text to refer to rural employment and tourism.
	* Para 2.18 - slowing employment growth over the next 10 years has not been taken into account, including public sector cut backs across defence spending (c30%). Therefore how can housing figures, both for the Yeovil urban extension and across the district be justified?	Up to date housing and population work has been undertaken by Baker Associates "Housing Requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil" which recommends 16,000 houses should be built between 2006-26. This is based on the economic potential of the area and is a robust assessment of the area taking into account the recession and recent projections.	Use findings of 'Housing Requirements in South Somerset and Yeovil' study, and other evidence base, in order to justify housing figures.
	* Add reference to the 3 military establishments in South Somerset and their valuable economic role (suggested text supplied by MOD).	Noted and agreed.	Amend to reflect these important business sectors within text.

	* Need to emphasise importance of Government expenditure, both domestic and overseas, to jobs in Yeovil and a dominant centre for health, education and local government. The local private sector economy is potentially capable of organic growth with positive factors such as stable economy and skill base. (Full text suggested by Cllr Seib).	Noted. Text in this section and Yeovil section should have regard to importance of economic base for Yeovil.	Amend text to reflect Yeovil's economic position and key businesses.
	* Para 2.12 should state Primary Care Trust and not Strategic Health Authority.	Funding and organisation of health provision is changing and Proposed Submission Plan will need to reflect up to date situation.	Amend text to reflect latest situation with regard to health reorganisation.
	* Yeovil is intrinsically linked to the A303 for the inward and outward movement of goods through traffic on the National Freight Route. Why not locate housing and employment development here?	Any new development near the A303 would have to take the form of a free standing settlement. This form of development would conflict with the current settlement strategy for the District which seeks to direct growth towards Yeovil, the market towns and rural centres. A new town would not achieve sustainability objectives for transport or renewable energy or fulfil wider strategic goals. It is also unlikely to be of a scale capable of delivering the necessary infrastructure for viability.	No change.
	* Accept that RNAS Yeovilton and Agusta Westland's are the significant employers in Yeovil - there must be most employment benefit near this location.	Noted and agreed.	Amend text to reflect Yeovil's economic position and key businesses.
Transport and Accessibility			
Transport and Accessibility (paras 2.20 – 2.23)	* Para 2.20 - Yeovil urban extension - environmental, industrial and cultural heritage and varied landscape has not been fully considered.	Noted. Addressed in Yeovil section.	See Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.
	* Para 2.23 further emphasises the need for a traffic survey of Yeovil.	Further evidence work carried out by Parsons Brinkerhoff and published as part of evidence base. Addressed in Yeovil section.	See Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.
	* Para 2.23 - statement re. Chard is at odds with the conclusions of the Chard Regeneration strategy which proposes growth on the eastern side of the town without a distributor road.	Statement is factual and issue addressed within Chard section. Implementation Plan for Chard addressed this and the new roads proposed as part of the Chard Regeneration Plan will relieve the congested junctions within the town.	No change.
	* Transport infrastructure must be improved to accommodate growth as the existing road network will not cope with increased traffic. Despite any public transport improvements we all still rely on our cars.	Noted and modal shift policies seek to offer choices.	No change.

	* The A303 is only duelled as far as Sparkford roundabout causing congestion on the south side.	Statement is factual. A303 is a major Trunk route and controlled by the Highways Agency. Any proposed improvements should be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan although no proposals for upgrade have been identified in the IDP to date (November 2011)	No change.
Health and Well-Being			
Health and Well-Being (paras 2.24 – 2.27)	* Refer to the current levels of sport participation in the District as measured in Sport England's National Active People Survey.	Detail on health and well being set out in Health and Well Being Chapter.	No change.
	* Provides no context by which to judge the contribution that heritage makes to quality of life.	Quality of the historic environment is acknowledged and benefits are numerous. Not considered relevant to single out benefits to quality of life specifically.	No change.
	* By restricting health and well being indicators you can restrict policy outcomes e.g. 25% of adults can suffer from depression at one stage or other and data suggests this is getting worse.	Data used is from ONS and represents a means of comparing areas (Super output areas) The Core Strategy will not replace other plans for health and wellbeing	No change.
	* Details from family breakdown are not included in the spatial portrait.	The relevance of smaller family sizes and need for accommodation to reflect this is set out in the Settlement Role and Function Study and reflected in housing policies. Up to date housing and population work has been undertaken by Baker Associates which is part of the evidence base.	No change. NB Housing policy amendments will reflect latest figures
	* Para 2.26 is too simplistic as most deprived areas in Yeovil have good access to schools and supermarkets. Disagree that new development will overcome existing deprivation problems - new estates have not reduced social deprivation in Yeovil - the emphasis should be on regeneration. For rural areas this means sustainable communities with local facilities and a more balanced approach to housing.	Noted.	No change.
Environmental Quality			
Environmental Quality (paras 2.28 – 2.30)	* East Coker is an example of an historic village but is threatened by the Core Strategy.	Noted.	Issue addressed in Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.
	* This section should be strengthened with factual information, especially in respect of biodiversity and commentary on special qualities and environmental assets.	Noted.	Amend to better reflect biodiversity and environmental assets.

	* Does not set out importance of the historic environment to the distinctive character of the district, and the way this marks it out as one with the richest heritage. Indicates a lack of understanding about the holistic approach PPS5 has adopted to all heritage assets. Should mention the variety of designated heritage assets e.g. not made clear that Ham Hill is an important archaeological site as its influence in dictating the local vernacular architecture of the District.	Noted. Need to acknowledge diversity of heritage assets.	Amend para to acknowledge variety of assets.
	* Para 2.30 - air quality issues associated with traffic congestion will be made worse by the Yeovil urban extension, as congestion will increase on the south side of the town, and prevailing wind is from the south west.	Noted.	Issue addressed in Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70/ Sustainability Appraisal.
	* AONBs represent England's finest countryside and are protected in the national interest for future generations; their primary purpose is to conserve and enhance natural beauty, and there is a statutory duty on local authorities to do this. The Dorset AONB generally abuts South Somerset's southern boundary between Tytherleigh in the west and Closworth in the east, and consideration should be given for the impact of activities within South Somerset that affects the AONB and its setting.	Noted.	Amend reference to AONB Management Plans in Fig. 2 under other documents
	* The Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Management Plan (2009-14) was adopted by SSSC early in 2009.	Noted.	as above
Vision and Strategic Objectives			
Vision and Strategic Objectives (paras 3.1 – 3.2)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A
The Vision for 2016			
The Vision for 2016 (paras 3.3 – 3.10)			
	* Vision should make reference to the desire for residents to lead healthy lives and should seek the infrastructure which supports this. (PCT)	Noted.	Amended text to include reference to healthier lifestyles.
	Reference to carbon neutral living could go further to recognise that sustainable behaviour is good for health. (PCT)	Noted.	Amended text to include reference to healthier lifestyles.

	* (CHARD) Paragraph 3.3 - support the Vision to deliver a more sustainable South Somerset including Chard.	Support noted.	No change.
	* (CHARD) Paragraph 3.8 - support the Vision to secure sustainable patterns of development - concerned that the drive to address physical constraints to growth in Chard is fundamentally undermining the deliverability of the Vision.	Support and comments noted. Chard Regeneration Framework provides methodology to bring forward delivery of growth.	No change.
	* (CHARD) Paragraph 3.8 - The Core strategy does not address the physical constraints, particularly the congestion in the centre of town and given the inability to deliver the Key Site over the last 20yrs there must be serious doubts over the delivery , availability and viability of the latest proposals.	This is addressed in the Chard section of the plan - paragraphs 6.23 -6.71.	Amend text to cross refer to Chard Regeneration Framework.
	* Para 3.9 should be supported by policies in the Core Strategy for farm diversification, tourism, live/work homes and village development.	The Draft Core Strategy policies include those for agricultural diversification, tourism, live/work homes and development in Rural Settlements.	No change.
	* (YUE) Paragraph 3.10 - Yeovil Urban Extension - will not achieve the aims of this paragraph -for the Eco Extension to be fully exemplar it must be served by the most energy efficient and net zero carbon and affordable public transport which is currently available.	Noted. Further details of Urban extension covered in Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.	See Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.
	*There needs to be CO2 emissions targets for public transport vehicles. In the Eco Town they should be zero net CO2 per seat which will require use of innovative technology such as Ultra Light Rail (ULR) - a guide to the technology is attached to the response.	Targets for such emissions laid down by DfT. ULR is covered in Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.	No change.
	* Vision should make reference to South Somerset being primarily a farming area providing food for the whole country.	The SCS makes reference in its vision to high quality locally produced food allowing locally sourced food to reduce food miles.	Expand reference to viable agriculture to pick up SCS threads.
	* Not a comprehensive enough approach towards the Heritage Environment which could undermine the credibility of the Core Strategy. No mention of heritage assets apart from Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings.	Noted. The historic environment and biodiversity currently covered through national policy. It is acknowledged that the historic environment may need to be considered further as part of the wider potential National Planning Policy Framework changes.	No change subject to review of final National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
	*A mix of market and affordable housing is required in rural areas/villages to meet the needs of the whole community and Vision needs to reflect this.	Noted and agreed. Policy SS2 and development management approach will allow this.	No change.
	<u>Support:</u>		

	* Support the Vision. In particular agree that Market Towns and in particular Chard should be the focus for regeneration and growth.	Support noted.	No change.
	*(CHARD) Support the vision for Chard set out in paragraph 3.8. Clear for the Settlement Role and Function Study that it is an appropriate location for significant growth.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Support the vision for 2026 and the aspirations as to how this can be achieved.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Support vision for regeneration and diversification of economy outside Yeovil. Allow sustainable growth in small communities.	Support noted.	No change.
	*Support the vision for rural areas and its emphasis on provision of jobs, facilities and affordable housing, as well as greater sustainable growth.	Support noted.	No change.
Strategic Objectives			
Strategic Objectives (paras 3.11 – 3.14)			
	* Core Strategy fails to meet objective 1 - can't be met through economics alone you need the voluntary sector and churches, this should be recognised more within the Core Strategy.	Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. It is accepted that support from the whole community will be required to achieve the objectives.	No change.
	* Core Strategy should promote new towns and villages with modern infrastructure. Many existing towns in South Somerset are unsuited for further growth as they have historic centres for example Martock, Stoke-sub-Hamdon & Somerton.	Noted. There is a limit to what can be achieved within historic centres but where infrastructure improvements are identified as needed they are identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change.
	*There is no reference to the role that food production has in the economy of the District and the importance of that in terms of food supply for the rest of the UK and elsewhere.	This is set out in para 3.9	No change.
	* Significant omission of a strategic objective to protect and enhance the historic environment and the landscape (contrary to national guidance), in parallel with the biodiversity objective.	Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. The historic environment and biodiversity are currently covered through national policy. It is acknowledged that the historic environment may need to be considered further as part of the wider potential National Planning Policy Framework changes in the appropriate section. Objective 9 seeks to protect and enhance our natural environment and retain the distinctiveness of settlements	No change subject to review of final National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

	<p>* A paucity of acknowledgement of the role played by the historic environment within the Strategic Objectives. Urge that an objective along the following lines should be included: <i>Protecting and enhancing South Somerset's historic environment, ensuring the safeguarding of all heritage assets whilst allowing high quality sustainable design and construction and attractive and better places and spaces throughout the district.</i></p>	<p>Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. The historic environment and biodiversity currently covered through national policy. It is acknowledged that the historic environment may need to be considered further as part of the wider potential National Planning Policy Framework changes in the appropriate section. Objective 9 seeks to protect and enhance our natural environment and retain the distinctiveness of settlements</p>	<p>No change subject to review of final National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p>
	<p>* National policy affords the AONBs and their settings the highest level of protection within the planning system - this exceptional protection should be acknowledged within the Strategic Objectives and throughout the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. Policy for AONB currently covered through national policy. It is acknowledged that the historic environment may need to be considered further as part of the wider potential National Planning Policy Framework changes in the appropriate section.</p>	<p>No change subject to review of final National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p>
	<p>* Although it is appreciated that the objectives are not listed in any order of importance, it is disappointing to see the natural environment at the bottom of the list as this is a cross cutting theme and significantly contributes to South Somerset's unique sense of place, health and well being and boosts the local economy.</p>	<p>Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. Objective 9 seeks to protect and enhance our natural environment and retain the distinctiveness of settlements</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Need to ensure that the objectives conserve and enhance the natural environment through the wise use of natural resources; being based on robust environmental evidence and a thorough understanding of environmental capacity and the cumulative impacts of development; and delivers substantial benefits for the natural environment and people together, including enhancement of biodiversity and landscape, opportunities to access the natural environment and the provision of multi-functional green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Objective SO3 from the Issues and Options has been deleted - now no objectives to ensure the provision of cultural facilities.</p>	<p>Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. Objective 3 of the Draft Core Strategy addresses the provision of services and facilities which would include cultural facilities.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* Paragraph 3.13 - of the 9 objectives only the last will have any inferred consideration of noise.	Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. Noise is considered in the environmental quality section.	See Environmental Quality section.
	* Paragraph 3.13 - Objectives do not include having a "free-flowing road net work" (in balance with other priorities). This could be included in Objective 2 or Objective 4. Important because 9.27 acknowledges that out of town sites are commercially attractive and 10.28 recognises rural South Somerset relies on the car.	Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. Free flowing road network is not a practical proposition	No change
	*Support the strategic objectives if changes in para 5.2.8 of the Sustainability Appraisal are addressed. Suggested wording changes have been included by respondent.	Support noted.	Consider slight adjustment to text but still reflect the SCS objectives. Make changes suggested in para 5.2.8 of the SA Report I.e. need to mention crime and flooding, and addressing climate change.
	Support:		
	*Support for objectives 2, 4, 6,7,8 and 9	Support noted.	No change.
	* Support housing objective, carbon neutral economy and low carbon living is essential, not just for those on low incomes.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Support Strategic Objective 2. RSPB would like to engage with SSDC to encourage a more active lifestyle, drawing on experience of projects on the Somerset Levels and Moors.	Support noted.	No change.
	*ADDITIONAL COMMENTS IN RELATION TO KEYFORD: *Object Point 2 para 3.13 - steep escarpment makes walking etc tricky. *Object Point 3 para 3.13 - housing development should not be weighted on Yeovil. *Observation - Point 9 for para 3.13 - reason to not develop Keyford.	Noted. Objectives are derived from the SCS and are the spatial expression of these. These are Yeovil specific issues and are addressed in the Yeovil section paragraphs 5.1-5.70.	No change.
Settlement Strategy			
Settlement Strategy (para 4.1)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A

Settlement Hierarchy			
Settlement Hierarchy (paras 4.2 – 4.13)	* Support the principle of establishing a settlement hierarchy - the planning rationale for determining settlement hierarchies contained in the RSS conforms with national policy.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Para 4.5 is strongly supported.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Para 4.8, second part of first sentence does not make sense - if development is unsustainable, it is acceptable only if it meets local needs or provides affordable housing, but not if it meets a District or Regional need. Restricting development in a village to local housing and local facilities for the existing population effectively means that the village cannot develop, sustainably or unsustainably.	Reference is made to less sustainable development not to development which is unsustainable. The overarching objective of the settlement hierarchy is to provide for the most sustainable form of development providing the majority of growth in locations best suited to accommodate growth through having a range of existing facilities and services and accessibility. Policy SS2 seeks to provide a balance between meeting the necessary development needs of Rural Settlements whilst limiting the scale of such development.	No change. See changes proposed as part of Policy SS2 paragraphs 4.28-4.39.
	* Support the reference to the principles of the Sustainable Community Strategy, which sees the establishment of Rural Centres as a means of promoting a thriving and diversified economy.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Historic Environmental Assessment has been undertaken around Yeovil, but impact on historic environment should have been undertaken elsewhere in the District to establish if development should be concentrated at Yeovil.	The initial work on Yeovil was based on the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy to carry out a 360 degree search around the town therefore the historic constraints around Yeovil needed to be understood alongside environmental and topographical constraints. Elsewhere the level of growth is such that there is a greater degree of flexibility on the precise location of growth which can avoid those areas of greatest historic importance.	No change.

	* Bakers Settlement Role and Function study is considered to be a simplistic and superficial way of determining where development should occur. Core Strategy should provide basis for exploring the complexities of how and why each settlement functions and how it might change over the plan period.	The Baker study objectives provide for a methodology to identify differing roles and functions of existing settlements based on their relationship to each other and surrounding hinterlands and to look at their future potential in such roles. The original work was based on the 3 settlements classified in the RSS as development Policy A, B and C settlements. Whilst the RSS may be going and terminology may have changed there is validity in considering the roles of different settlements and to use this as a basis on which to assess their potential to provide for future sustainable living and to establish levels of growth which can be accommodated in line with their role and function.	No change.
	* Conceptual leap between old local plan system and LDF has not been made.	Disagree. The current Core Strategy represents a distinct shift in emphasis from a land use based document to spatial approach based on the objectives of the SCS.	No change.
	* Strategy is currently too polarised towards the needs and opportunities of urban centres - some modest re-orientation is required, whilst being careful not to have a dispersal of development.	Noted. Further clarity will be required in the Proposed Submission plan to set out the overall strategy approach and the importance of achieving a balance between the urban and more rural areas.	Amend text to provide clarity on the overall strategic approach and the importance of achieving a balance between the urban and more rural areas.
Determination of the South Somerset Settlement Hierarchy			
Issues and Options Report and Consultation (para 4.14)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A
Evidence Base Review (paras 4.15 – 4.20)	* Settlement strategy has not been informed by any assessment of the historical role and development of the settlement - no reference to PPS5.	PPS5 was not published at the time of the Baker Settlement Role and Function Study which is based on the 3 settlement types classified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as development Policy A, B and C settlements. In looking at the individual settlements and their capacity to accommodate future growth the historic environment and constraints has informed the levels of growth proposed. All of the settlements identified within the document have historic influences to which regard has been made in the individual sections.	No change, but see relevant settlements sections

	* Only function is considered, not quality of life issues.	Quality of life is an important objective for all communities and settlements and is part of the rationale for developing in the most sustainable locations.	No change.
Consideration of the Settlement Role and Function Study (paras 4.21 – 4.25)	* Para 4.23 should be deleted - Langport/Huish Episcopi should be classed as a Market Town.	Agree. Langport/Huish Episcopi now proposed as one of the Market Towns in line with the Baker Settlement Role and Function study.	Amend Policy SS1 To include Langport/Huish Episcopi in the list of Market Towns.
Sustainability Appraisal (para 4.26 – 4.27)	No comments received.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 Settlement Hierarchy	* With more than 50% of the existing population living outside the main urban areas the strategy of concentrating all development within 14 urban and rural centres is over simplistic, too crude and not reflective of how the District has grown and the wider economic, environmental and community needs of the District. Does not mean that past patterns of dispersed growth should be repeated, but it is not appropriate to exclude development that can help to sustain places like Sparkford.	Policy SS2 allows for development outside of the Market Towns and Rural Centres.	Amend supporting text to Policies SS1 and SS2 to ensure the rationale for the settlement hierarchy and appropriate development outside of the identified settlements is clear.
	*The rationale for redefining so many villages (approx 45) as open countryside needs to be made more explicit and supported by evidence - relying on the now revoked RSS is not acceptable. The only explanation is that "development elsewhere in smaller villages is likely to be less sustainable" - if this is because of the reliance on the car the Core Strategy needs to spell this out, as any development that could address car usage to a reasonable level may then be acceptable.	Noted and agree greater clarity required	See responses to Policy SS2 and supporting text, paragraphs 4.28 - 4.39.
	* Accept that concentrations of large scale development such as urban extensions are sustainable, but these will not provide for the needs of an essentially rural district. Therefore the strategy should allow for development in locations other than the 14 identified settlements.	Policy SS2 allows for development outside of the Market Towns and Rural Centres.	No change
	* Saved Structure Plan policies still form part of the Development Plan and have been overlooked - the village designation provided in saved Structure Plan Policy STR3 should be included.	The Structure Plan policies will be revoked alongside the draft RSS as part of the Localism Act and will no longer form part of the Development Plan. Policy SS2 does allow for development outside the identified settlements and these settlements should be accepted to be a tier in their own right.	Change to clarify settlements to which Policy SS2 applies which are effectively a further tier of settlements.

	* Broadly support the settlement hierarchy and the proposal to accommodate just over half the growth in Yeovil. Additional employment land welcomed but there is a need to identify appropriate residential growth to service the employment. The formation of a Local Enterprise Partnership would help this.	Support noted. The Core Strategy looks at providing housing growth based on the likely levels of employment growth in addition to housing needs and levels of growth required to support natural growth within the District. Somerset are part of the new Heart of the South West LEP details of which can be found on the website www.devon.gov.uk/heartofswlep	No change.
	* Settlement hierarchy is supported as it is founded on a robust and credible evidence base, consistent with PPS3, PPS7, PPS12; the Settlement Role and Function study is a thorough assessment.	Support noted.	No change.
	* The broad approach to the settlement strategy is considered appropriate in terms of identifying settlements by role and function, establishing a hierarchical structure and promoting self containment by focusing most development at the most sustainable locations.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Need to consider that services available in settlements will change over time, which will impact on settlements' role and function and its place in the hierarchy - need to ensure some flexibility to enable these changes to be taken into account.	It is acknowledged that services and facilities will vary over time but the provision of additional growth in the most sustainable locations is considered most likely to help retain and support existing facilities and provide opportunities for new facilities based on growth.	No change.
	* Support Yeovil's identification as the main focus for development, on the basis of its role, function, infrastructure provisions and ability to accommodate investment and growth.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Additional clarity should be provided on Chard's role amongst the other Market Towns - it should be identified as a Primary Market Town as in draft Policy HG2.	Chard's role is clearly set out in the relevant section. The table within Policy HG2 includes reference to Primary Market Towns in error but the policy is proposed to be deleted.	See changes under Policy HG2 paragraphs 8.8 to 8.10.
	* Focus of settlement hierarchy fails to properly focus new growth, Yeovil should be attributed more growth, and reduce growth to 14 other settlements.	A balance of growth is required across the district to ensure sustainable development and to increase self containment of settlements. Further information and rationale for the growth going to Yeovil is set out in the Housing Requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil Report.	No change.

	<p>* Distribute development more evenly across the District, similar to 'One Wales: One Planet, a new sustainable development scheme for Wales' which promotes re-population of the countryside with small holdings, helping to solve affordable housing, rural employment, food security and reduce CO2 emissions.</p>	<p>The Settlement Strategy distributes planned growth across the most sustainable settlements in accordance with the Role and Function Study. The Settlement hierarchy has been justified as part of Sustainability Appraisal. Development outside of the planned locations is still possible under Policy SS2 where appropriately justified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Policy is flawed and based on outdated assumptions of sustainability - the Taylor Review identifies that "one size fits all" approach to planning policy was inappropriate and cannot do justice to rural communities, recognising that there needs to be a balance between protecting the environment and allowing development. The core strategy appears to prioritise reduce energy usage and emissions by transport use.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* The proposed settlement hierarchy is too rigid, and would result in a large number of villages where development is currently allowed, in principle becoming open countryside. This is considered to be a short-sighted approach for a predominantly rural district. The provision of open market housing, employment and community facilities is vital in the rural villages otherwise they will become retirement havens for those who do not wish to see change. Provision for reasonable levels of growth can ensure that schools, shops, public houses, employment and other services continue to support these communities.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at Rural Settlements. An allowance for some growth within rural areas has been accommodated within the overall growth strategy but the location for this should be determined under Policy SS2 and should not be predetermined.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* It is suggested that an additional tier of settlement entitled Rural Settlements should be established between Rural Centres and Open Countryside, allowing the identification of rural settlements appropriate for growth, anticipated growth levels and the distribution of growth within these settlements; using the Settlement Role and Function study. This approach would promote appropriate development to support rural communities, and allow a stricter policy stance regarding open countryside and those rural settlements considered inappropriate for growth.</p>	<p>All settlements were considered as part of the Settlement Role and Function study and those identified as having a suitable range of shops and services are included as Market Towns and Rural Centres. Those not identified were not considered to have a sufficient level of shops and services to be considered as Rural Centres. However, Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development in smaller settlements. An allowance for some growth within rural areas has been accommodated within the overall growth strategy but the location for this should be determined under Policy SS2. Settlements to which Policy SS2 applies should be accepted to be a tier in their own right.</p>	<p>No change</p>

	<p>* Solutions such as new towns have been overlooked. A new town around Yeovilton Air Base/Podimore Area could solve many problems, have good connectivity and not have a significant visual impact.</p>	<p>A new town option has been looked at and is not considered appropriate for the following reasons: would conflict with the proposed settlement strategy for the District directing growth to Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres; not part of the vision in the SCS; no sites promoted by developers of sufficient size to accommodate a free standing new town; it would not fulfill renewable energy or sustainable development objectives; as no site been promoted, physical and environmental constraints have not been assessed and could be prohibitive; a new town is unlikely to be viable given the cost of providing necessary infrastructure; current housing projections do not predict a level of growth capable of supporting the critical mass necessary to warrant a new town without a significant alteration to the settlement strategy or expansion of the plan period; a new town at Podimore or Cartgate would not perform well against sustainable transport options or fulfill the employment aspirations for Yeovil, a new town would not fulfill wide strategic goals.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Market Towns - Policy states that provision will be made to increase self-containment and enhance their roles as service centres. However, with the emphasis in Chapter 6 on housing and employment land in most instances, the Draft CS does not show how these outcomes will be achieved. There are no targets for self-containment and it is not clear from Chapter 13 the mechanisms to monitor and review the performance. The reliance on Development Management to deliver employment land and other services does not show how and when these will be delivered and how self containment will increase. With the exception of Chard it is difficult to see how their role as service centres will be enhanced in the absence of clear requirements for and delivery of services and facilities.</p>	<p>The planning system can only go so far in promoting and enabling economic development. A proper balance of housing and employment growth is best able to achieve this together with the Council's role in economic development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* The definitions of Market Towns and Rural Centres are indistinct and blurred.</p>	<p>The definitions used in this document are clear but it is accepted that the terms are used in different contexts for other purposes. Definition for interpretation in the Core Strategy is clear in the text</p>	<p>No change</p>

	* Use of the term 'Market Town' is confusing.	Accepted that the term can be used in different contexts. It is important that the way it is used in this document is clearly and unambiguously defined and this has been done..	No change.
	* Use of the phrase "market towns" in the paragraph identifying Rural Centres could lead to confusion.	Accepted.	Amend text to ensure clarity.
	* The approach to Rural Settlements and areas is considered to lack a coherent strategy - Policies SS1 and SS2 anticipates growth of an indeterminate amount at unknown locations, and no attempt to plan for this at Rural Settlements is made. Acknowledgement of these growth needs within supporting text is welcomed (para 4.28-36), but object to failure to identify anticipated growth levels and the distribution of this growth within a policy.	These settlements were not considered to have the level of shops and services necessary to be considered as Rural Centres in the Settlement Role and Function study. Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at Rural Settlements. An allowance for some growth within rural areas has been accommodated within the overall growth strategy (see revised Policy SS4) but the location for this should be determined under Policy SS2	No change.
	* The principle on which the Rural Centres are defined and strategic policies outlined is flawed as it is over regulated top down governance that takes minimal account of local views - why should Langport/Huish Episcopi be planned in the same way as South Petherton? Vast majority of policies are too detailed, when they should be focussed on strategic issues such as transport policy and the environment.	All settlements were considered as part of the Settlement Role and Function study and those identified as having a suitable range of shops and services are included as Market Towns and Rural Centres and this hierarchy has been tested through Sustainability Appraisal. Langport has now been reviewed and identified as a Market Town not a Rural Centre.	Amend Policy SS1 to identify Langport and Huish Episcopi as Market Town.
	* Rural Centres - The intention to promote greater self-containment has not been carried forward in to policy. Whereas the Draft CS makes provision for housing and employment land in all Rural Centres there is little in the way of provision for other services and activities. Without clear requirements for delivery of these it is unclear how the policy outcome of extending local services will be achieved. How will the Development Management Process deliver this outcome? E.g. Milborne Port: there is no indication of how the 2ha of employment land will be delivered beyond a reliance on the Development Management process. How will retail opportunities be exploited? Delivery mechanisms should be in place. Reg 27 version should include greater self-containment at Rural Centres as a Policy outcome and also include clear mechanisms for the delivery to this.	The planning system can only go so far in promoting and enabling economic development. A proper balance of housing and employment growth is best able to achieve this together with the Council's role in economic development.	No change.

	* Evidence from the Baker Associates study indicates that Chard, Crewkerne, Wincanton and Ilminster are self evidently Market Towns by virtue of their level of containment, services, infrastructure, jobs and population. These are the only four settlements that meet all three criteria to be a Market Town i.e. employment function, retail and community service role, self containment and sustainable travel opportunities.	Disagree. The Baker Role and Function study identifies the most sustainable locations for growth. It is accepted that Market Towns will vary widely in their scale size and role but the study is clear as to how the methodology has been applied.	No change.
	* Langport/Huish Episcopi should be included as a Market Town as it has many shops and businesses, supermarket, secondary schools with sports facilities and swimming pool. Flooding near the centre does not affect other edge of centre sites, and there is a recognised desire for more local industry and employment opportunities and local community facilities which can only be met if classed as a Market Town.	Noted and agreed that Langport/Huish Episcopi has a range of 'strategic facilities' and is identified as a Market Town in the Role and Function Study. Agreed that there are potential sites in Huish Episcopi parish outside areas of high flood risk where development could take place.	Amend Policy SS1 to identify Langport and Huish Episcopi as Market Town.
	* Agree that Somerton should be a Market Town as this will bring more trade, more jobs and will be a great asset to the town. If Somerton stands still it will stagnate, and expansion and looking forward is the only way.	Support noted.	No change.
	* There is no evidence to support the proposal that Somerton will be disadvantaged and will not have enough future development to support its current level of services if it is not a Market Town i.e. does not accept locally significant development.	It is difficult to state precisely the scale of development which will assist in maintaining services but a key issue is the forecast reduction in household size that will cause Somerton's population to reduce by 350 people in 20 years (06-26) if no additional housing was permitted, which could negatively impact on the level of shops and services in the town. Somerton is predicted to require around 170 houses just to maintain population size at current levels due to household changes.	No change.
	* Somerton should be classed as a Rural Centre as it is more comparable to Martock, Langport/Huish Episcopi, Bruton and South Petherton rather than the far larger towns of Chard, Crewkerne, Wincanton.	Somerton has a greater number of jobs, a good provision of shops and services and a relatively good bus service compared to the suggested settlements. Although it is accepted that Langport/Huish does have a greater range of services and is also now proposed to become a Market Town.	No change.

	* Disagree that Somerton should be classed a Market Town because Street in Mendip serves this function in the locality.	Noted, but it is still considered that Somerton performs the role of a Market Town, as recommended in the Settlement Role and Function Study (2009).	No change.
	* Somerton has no more strategically important features than any of the other Rural Centres, and in fact fewer than Langport/Huish Episcopi which has a secondary school, large supermarket, petrol station, and is served by A roads. The banks at Somerton are there for commercial reasons and could relocate to other settlements at any time.	It is accepted that Langport/Huish Episcopi does have a greater range of services, a key reason for the proposal to now categorise it as a Market Town. However Somerton does have a good range of shops and services, more jobs, and a relatively good bus service.	Amend Policy SS1 to identify Langport and Huish Episcopi as Market Town.
	* Somerton does not have sufficient self containment to be classed as a Market Town as it has one of the lowest levels of job containment in the district with more than half its economically active residents work outside the town, and adding another huge swathe of housing will not rectify this without other local services being improved first.	Agreed that Somerton does have a relatively low level of self-containment (37% compared to district average of 51%), but new employment land is also proposed to provide extra job opportunities, not just housing.	No change.
	* Somerton should not be classed as a Market Town due to poor transport links, and it clearly does not have a 'Market Town' standard of public transport to build on. The Baker Report ranked Somerton as bottom of a dozen South Somerset settlements for "public transport opportunities," and it does not have a rail station like some other B settlements.	Somerton does have a relatively good bus service with an hourly frequency to Yeovil, Taunton and Wells (via Glastonbury and Street), although recent cuts mean there will no longer be an evening or weekend service. The Baker report recommended Somerton to be designated as a "Market Town" (RSS Policy B settlement)	No change.
	* Somerton does not contain the 'strategic facilities' in the Baker Report to be classed as a Market Town, as it lacks a secondary school, sports hall, clearly defined shopping area. Somerton also lacks a petrol station.	It is accepted that Somerton does not have some strategic facilities, although they are available nearby in Langport/Huish Episcopi. However Somerton does have a range of shops and services, more jobs, and a relatively good bus service.	No change.
	* Although a number of facilities are present in Somerton that may put it on a par with other Market Towns, the layout of the settlement and lack of suitable sites means that none of these can be expanded into more modern facilities.	Noted. Facilities can be modernised without expansion.	No change.
	* Somerton is a Rural Centre of historical and architectural interest and an attractive place to live and visit, and should not be made a reduced version of Yeovil.	The scale of development proposed is consistent with the size and character of the town.	No change.
	* Support Bruton being a Rural Centre - land off Cole Road has been promoted through the SHLAA process and is considered a sustainable location for growth.	Support noted.	No change

	* Support Milborne Port being a Rural Centre - land off Gainsborough and Station Road has been promoted through the SHLAA process.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Support Martock being a Rural Centre, but rename as Martock/Bower Hinton as it includes the adjoining settlement of Bower Hinton.	Noted - to be amended.	Amend settlement title to Martock/Bower Hinton
	* Support South Petherton's Rural Centre status.	Support noted.	No change.
	*The Rural Centres should be prioritised for growth and improvement, they have aspirations and these should not be denied because the majority of development is going to Yeovil.	A balance of growth is required across the district to ensure sustainable development and to increased self containment of settlements. Sustainability appraisal has suggested 50:50 split in growth between Yeovil and other parts of the district.	No change
	* Templecombe should be identified as a Rural Centre as it is comparable to other Rural Centres with its current range of services and function, it would balance the location of Rural Centres in the District, and would allow for development within the eastern part of the District. There is potential to offer further retail services and employment uses associated with potential development at Slades Hill.	Templecombe does have a relatively good range of services, with all of the 'standard' facilities in the Settlement Role and Function study, but overall it was not considered to meet the criteria to be a Rural Centre, particularly due to a lack of shops. Policy SS2 allows appropriate development at Rural Settlements. The Local Plan Inspector's report did not consider Templecombe a sustainable location for development on the scale proposed previously at Slades Farm.	No change.
	* Templecombe outperforms many of the Rural Centres in terms of employment, and the large manufacturing employer is understood to currently be expanding by 50%. Travel to work patterns can be achieved more sustainably due to the presence of a train station.	Templecombe is home to more jobs than Milborne Port and Stoke sub Hamdon, but was not considered to meet the criteria overall to be considered a Rural Centre, particularly due to the lack of shops.	No change.

	<p>* Extend list of Rural Centres to include: Henstridge, Charlton Horethorne, Kingsdon, North Cadbury, Broadway, Keinton Mandeville, Merriott, East Chinnock, West Coker and Barton St David. These villages are recognised as having a level of services/facilities having been identified as Villages in the Local Plan and met the criteria of Structure Plan Policy STR3. If defined as Rural Centres these places would be able to achieve greater self containment. Scale of growth can be controlled by a site allocations DPD and/or proposals map. This approach would comply with SP Policy STR1. Issue should be tackled by developing more sustainable transport policies rather than singling rural development out as unsustainable. Settlement strategy should provide a positive response in terms of regenerating rural communities.</p>	<p>These settlements were not considered to have the level of shops and services necessary to be considered as Rural Centres in the Settlement Role and Function study. Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at smaller settlements within the district</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Support Ilchester as a Rural Centre.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Object to Ilchester being identified as a Rural Centre, as it is a village.</p>	<p>The definition of a Rural Centre in planning terms is a place that performs a local service role. The Baker Associates Settlement Role and Function Study (April 2009) illustrates that in comparison to other settlements, Ilchester performs such a role and it is therefore rightly identified as a Rural Centre.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Baker Report recognises that North Cadbury, Compton Dundon and Keinton Mandeville have many facilities including a primary school, shop, post office, pub etc.; therefore these villages should accommodate reasonable level of growth including both market and affordable housing. As we move to a changing planning policy context where communities have more power, this needs to be within a properly regulated system where appropriate sites are identified.</p>	<p>These settlements were not considered to have the level of shops and services necessary to be considered as Rural Centres in the Settlement Role and Function study. Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Villages like Shepton Beauchamp need development to keep school, shops, pub going. Need homes in the villages as well as the Market Towns, to ensure employees of businesses in Shepton Beauchamp can live where they work, thereby reducing travelling e.g. Branston employs over 120 workers.</p>	<p>Shepton Beauchamp was not considered to have the level of shops and services necessary to be considered as Rural Centres in the Settlement Role and Function study. Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at smaller settlements.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>*Market housing should also be allowed in Rural Settlements, sustainability is not just about travelling, the development of the community is important - without infilling the gap will widen between those who live in affordable housing and market housing in villages. Policy should make clear that major/significant development will not be permitted, but small-scale will be allowed.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 allows for a mix of affordable and market housing in rural settlements where previously only affordable housing would be allowed as an exception, and the emerging national guidance (NPPF). Whilst focussing on the delivery of affordable housing this gives LPA's the flexibility to set their own approach allowing for a mix of both affordable and market housing. However, it is considered that it is no longer relevant to have a Rural Exception Policy, particularly as Draft Policy SS2 is clear that development to meet housing (particularly affordable housing), community or employment need, can be allowed where justified.</p>	<p>Insert additional guidance on the interpretation of Policy SS2 within the supporting text. Delete the Rural Exception Sites part of Policy SS2.</p>
	<p>*Object to the resistance to any conventional forms of growth at Sparkford, suggest changing Policy by deleting the last paragraph to avoid blanket restriction on development in any unlisted settlement.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at smaller settlements.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*Object at non-inclusion of Curry Rivel as a Rural Centre - Role and Function study specifically notes that all settlements could be regarded as a Policy C settlement to a greater or lesser extent. CR has a population of 2,500 and a range of services which make it appropriate for a Rural Centre.</p>	<p>Curry Rivel was not considered to have the level of shops and services necessary to be considered as Rural Centres in the Settlement Role and Function study. Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at smaller settlements</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*Amend policy to add a list of Village Rural Centres or Village Clusters (to include Sparkford) where some growth will be encouraged, especially were set criteria are met, or subject to a ceiling on overall growth (10% of existing settlement/cluster). Site allocations could then be considered in a later document.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at smaller settlements and it is clear in supporting text that clusters of villages will be considered within the policy.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
Rural Settlements			
<p>Rural Settlements (paras 4.28 – 4.36)</p>	<p>* A carte blanche approach to say no to development in rural areas would not be of benefit to rural villages, balanced development in one area can support other areas.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development at smaller settlements as acknowledgement of their individual needs.</p>	<p>Cross refer to revised Policy SS4 which identifies scale of housing in Rural Settlements.</p>
	<p>* Paragraphs 4.28-36 are supported. Correctly identifies that some development will be acceptable in villages.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Paragraphs 4.35 - welcome the encouragement for new and innovative ways of providing affordable housing.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Rural Clustering			
Rural Clustering (paras 4.37 – 4.39)	* Paragraph 4.38 - agree that home working is increasing in importance. Core Strategy has not fully realised the importance of this and is inappropriately directing growth towards an urban extension.	Comments regarding home working are noted - data on working from home and self-employed is not precise, so establishing a true figure for these people is difficult. Both housing and employment growth are closely linked and the two need to be provided together. The employment land provision being directed to the urban extension seeks to provide opportunities for people to live and work in close proximity from more traditional employment premises, than their home – this does not prevent home working from taking place.	No change.
Policy SS2 Development in Rural Settlements	* Policy SS2 pre-supposes that growth will come about because the community will support it, this is naïve - incomers will often not want their village to grow. Without settlement boundaries future growth will depend on community support.	SS2 indicates that any new development must be of benefit to the community, that is not necessarily the same as stating the community must support it.	No change.
	* Support the policy and wish to see something similar for the Rural Centres.	Support noted. Policy SS1 does set out similar principles for Rural Centres.	No change.
	* Policy should reference Housing Needs survey (2004-05) and Parish Plans.	The Housing Needs Survey 04-05 has been superseded by the Taunton and South Somerset Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessments (February 2009) and accompanying viability assessment. Parish Plans will provide an overview of key issues, but housing need will need to be proven on a case-by-case basis.	No change.
	*Recognise flexibility, but not sure how Council will determine what is justified and commensurate in any given location.	Agree that further explanation of these terms is required to clarify the policy.	Add further supporting text to Policy SS2 to make clear what is 'justified' and 'commensurate;' and how development can 'increase the sustainability of a settlement.'

	* There needs to be more flexibility in allowing development in SS2, otherwise some rural settlements will not remain sustainable, and areas within those villages that should be improved will deteriorate. Allowing only affordable housing due to the way in which residential development will be restricted, will mean that only wealthy incomers and those eligible for affordable housing will be able to come to live in a village - this will smother their vitality and viability.	It is considered that SS2 does provide flexibility; it does not restrict residential development in rural settlements to affordable housing only, although an element of affordable housing is likely to be required in many cases. The criteria in SS2 allows development that will positively contribute to rural settlements, that should promote their vitality and viability.	No change.
	* Rural Settlements policy should identify settlements suitable for limited growth, and pro active criteria towards development based upon the supporting text in para 4.28-39.	SS2 seeks a flexible approach to ensure the development needs of the rural settlements can be met, whilst restricting the scale of such growth - the key will be how SS2 is interpreted.	No change.
	* Object to development as will potentially increase the number of vehicles that pass through Tintinhull - desperately need traffic calming measures in the village.	Tintinhull is classed as a Rural Settlement, so is not identified to see 'strategic' growth. Should any development be proposed under Policy SS2 highways safety and any necessary measures would need to be incorporated.	No change.
	* Broadly welcome the widening of scope in the villages for appropriate development to arrest the general decline in housing, employment and community needs in such locations e.g. Curry Mallet.	Support noted.	No change.
	* It is noted that whilst SS2 generally reflects PPS4 Policy EC6.2, it distinguishes between undefined "housing (including affordable housing)" in PPS4 and identified housing need as discussed in para 4.28 of the draft Core Strategy. It is considered that PPS4 should be more closely followed.	SS2 does broadly reflect PPS4 and it is not considered that this point is substantive enough to warrant a change in policy wording particularly given likely changes in national guidance	No change.
	* The strategy neglects the needs of the smaller villages, such as Curry Mallet which supports a local school, post office/shop, and village hall which are vital to creating a strong village community spirit. Some additional development should be permitted within these villages - the addition of 6 - 12 houses would help to preserve local facilities as once these facilities are lost they will never return and the village effectively "dies". Carbon emissions would increase as a result of the need to access these facilities elsewhere.	SS2 does allow for development in Rural Settlements such as Curry Mallet, providing it meets the criteria set out in the policy. Recent updated research by the Council (covering the period 1991-2010) has indicated that significant levels of development has not supported the retention of facilities in rural settlements in South Somerset.	No change.

	* There is a lack of reference to market housing in SS2 which implies that only affordable housing will be permitted in rural settlements. However, it is unlikely that 100% affordable housing developments will be built due to lack of viability - Policy SS2 should be altered to state that mixed developments of affordable and market housing should be permitted in accordance with Policy HG4 where the other criteria for development in these areas can be fulfilled.	SS2 as worded does allow for a mix of market and affordable housing, providing it meets the relevant criteria set out in the policy. Agree that viability is a key issue in delivering new development.	No change.
	* Language of the policy is extremely negative seeking to control and limit development where it delivers perceived community benefit and in particular affordable housing. What these settlements need is the ability to grow recognising the needs of all elements of the community and not excluding open market housing which is required and recognised in the Taylor Review.	see response above	No change.
	* Add wording to SS2 to clarify that development which 'meets an identified housing need' shall include all forms of tenure.	SS2 as worded does allow for a mix of market and affordable housing, providing it meets the relevant criteria set out in the policy. Additional guidance on the interpretation Policy SS2 will be provided in the supporting text.	Insert additional guidance on the interpretation of Policy SS2 within the supporting text.
	* Modify SS2 to define local need not only within the parish, but also, where appropriate, to take account of the needs of adjacent larger settlements. E.g. West Coker primary school is seeking to increase its numbers and several other benefits could result from allowing additional housing to be built in the village.	In terms of the provision of Rural Exception affordable housing, Policy SS2 includes the note that "...Local is defined as being the parish or immediately adjoining parishes forming a contiguous group around a central parish." It is therefore considered that this point is already addressed. Policy SS2 allows for a mix of affordable and market housing in rural settlements where previously only affordable housing would be allowed as an exception. Given the emerging guidance in the draft NPPF it is considered that it is no longer relevant to have a Rural Exception Policy, particularly as Draft Policy SS2 is clear that development to meet a housing need, particularly affordable housing can be allowed where justified.	Insert additional guidance on the interpretation of Policy SS2 within the supporting text.
	* Agree with the criteria and indicators required for the development of affordable housing solely on 'rural exception sites'.	Support for 'rural exception sites' element of SS2 is noted. However in the light of the emerging national guidance it is proposed to delete the "rural exceptions" part of the policy.	Delete rural exception site section of policy to remove confusion and make policy more concise.

	* Policy assumes that only housing provided as affordable housing can meet local need. By limiting development to rural exception (usually 5 or more dwellings) sites opportunities for providing a single dwelling for someone whose work provides an important service for example are missed. Such an exception could include the provision of a new vicarage.	See response above.	No change
	* SS2 is currently attempting to provide policy guidance on two disparate issues i.e. restrictive policy to be applied in the open countryside, and to permit development at Rural Settlements. It would be more appropriate to use two policies, as the current approach neither provides developers with adequate confidence as to the likely outcome of a planning application at Rural Settlements to promote appropriate development, nor does it provide a restrictive enough stance in relation to preventing inappropriate development.	SS2 seeks to provide a flexible approach to development in rural areas outside Yeovil, Market Towns and Rural Centres, but acknowledge potential uncertainty this could cause and consider further explanation would be helpful.	Add further supporting text to make clear what is 'justified' and 'commensurate;' and how development can 'increase the sustainability of a settlement.'
	* Ethos of the policy is supported, however further direction needs to be provided on how the policy should be interpreted and how it will fit into the Localism agenda. Without more clarity it may be necessary to add to the list of settlements where development should be generally permitted e.g. Curry Rivel, Keinton Mandeville, Merriott, Tatworth and Forton and others.	Agree that further explanation for SS2 would be useful, particularly how the policy will fit into the Localism agenda. Adding to the list of Rural Centres has been considered, but ruled out on the basis that Policy SS2 allows for appropriate development at these settlements, and the lack of evidence justifying additional Rural Centres.	Add further explanation as to how SS2 should be interpreted, and how it will fit into the 'Localism' agenda.
	* Unless the application of Policy SS2 can be interpreted in a way which allows development to continue, rural communities will be sterilised outside of the 14 main settlements and stifle economic and community development, where 50% of the population exist. Core Strategy does not fully acknowledge the PPS3 key housing goal to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford in a community in which they want to live.	Policy SS2 intends to ensure development is provided in Rural Settlements outside the 14 main settlements, where justified. Agree that interpretation will be key. Acknowledge the key housing goal, but the planning system "should deliver housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure" (para 10, PPS3 and emerging guidance in NPPF).	Add supporting text to explain how SS2 should be interpreted, including that housing in rural areas should not be located in places distant from local services (draft NPPF, para 112).

	<p>* Further guidance may be required on how a development can be considered to increase the sustainability of a settlement. This should be in an Affordable Housing SPD. Further guidance on what can be considered a local connection could also be in an SPD - this guidance would decrease the size of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>It has been agreed that further guidance will be provided in the supporting text to Policy SS2 regarding the measures that might be expected to represent an increase in sustainability. Regarding the production of an Affordable Housing SPD this may be beneficial however it's priority would have to be considered in the context of other SPDs the Council may wish to produce in the future.</p>	<p>Consider the requirement for an Affordable Housing SPD in the context of other SPDs the Council may wish to produce in a future Local Development Scheme review</p>
	<p>* There is no distinction between substantial villages (e.g. Norton sub Hamdon, Keinton Mandeville, North Cadbury, Combe sty Nicholas etc) and the open countryside - recommend that the Villages listed in the adopted South Somerset Local Plan as "appropriate locations for development" are carried forward, taking into account environmental constraints and by imposing suitable policies to ensure a mixture and type of development required by that community is delivered on appropriate sites. Include these villages in Policy SS1, or add a much more detailed, robust explanation of why these villages are not acceptable for development be added.</p>	<p>Accept that there is no longer a distinction between some substantial villages and the open countryside, but Policy SS2 does allow locally justified development in Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Explain in supporting text that Rural Settlements exist as a tier in the settlement hierarchy, although not specifically identified, and that locally justified development is acceptable in these settlements.</p>
	<p>* Need to retain sufficient flexibility to allow development in rural locations on a wide variety, size and type of site including places where sustainable, affordable and low impact development can occur for homes, jobs, services agricultural and tourism. Strategy is too polarised towards the needs and opportunities of urban centres, not to suggest that the strategy should be one of dispersing most new development, but should allow for some development in more sustainable villages given the vast and well populated nature of the district.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 allows flexibility by ensuring development is provided in Rural Settlements where it meets the set criteria.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Policy SS2 should be amended in the context of any CIL - if SSSDC adopts a "roof-tax" could some small-scale market housing infill be judged as appropriate to address community infrastructure needs - a growing pot of planning obligation money could be used to develop appropriate community infrastructure such as halls etc.</p>	<p>The provision of CIL should not be used as a justification for new development, although a proportion of CIL should be spent in the neighbourhood where development is located. The Charging Schedule will set out necessary infrastructure that should be funded through CIL.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* Fails to recognise Long Sutton in settlement hierarchy an element of growth should be attributed to allow them to support their own populations and grow organically. Suggest amended wording to policy ... "meets identified needs and demand, particularly for affordable housing."	Long Sutton would be considered a 'Rural Settlement,' meaning locally justified development would be allowed under Policy SS2. Housing "need" refers to those who do not have the finance necessary to purchase a house on the open market, whilst "demand" are the types of houses that the market requires. Therefore adding reference to demand could insinuate inappropriate housing is acceptable.	No change.
	* Impact of traffic on rural communities has not been considered.	New development will be required to take necessary measures to tackle traffic issues.	No change.
	* Policy should be amended to allow additional housing in Rural Settlements (5% maximum of 2011 housing numbers per village, with a minimum of 3).	Agree that a housing figure for Rural Settlements should be added in Policy SS4 as a more realistic approach and to provide more certainty as to the scale of development in Rural Settlements.	Supporting text should cross-refer to revised Policy SS4 which identifies scale of housing in Rural Settlements.
	*This policy will have negative impacts on rural tourism, jobs, agricultural small holdings, self build schemes, scope to erect low impact dwellings and people wishing to live a 'sustainable rural lifestyle'.	The purpose of SS2 is to provide a broad guide as to what development may be acceptable in Rural Settlements, and will allow the suggested developments where appropriate. There are other policies in the Core Strategy dealing with the specific issues identified (e.g. tourism policies EP7, 8).	No change.
	*A policy to allow sustainable 'low cost market housing' is required - recommend changes to Policy SS2.	There is no justification in national policy for 'low cost market housing' and no way of ensuring it is delivered - housing is defined as either affordable or open market (PPS3). There is no reason why low cost market housing cannot be provided through this policy if there is an identified need and brings benefits to the community	No change.

	<p>* Policy will artificially and unnecessarily limit the growth in Sparkford for a very long time - it is not appropriate to completely exclude the provision of conventional and modest forms of development that have helped to sustain places like Sparkford, especially given its proximity to the main road network and availability of land close to it. Railway passes through and consider re-opening the station or a platform. Sparkford is also close to Queen Camel and they should be looked at as one rural centre as they share facilities. The bus service and local facilities require more people to sustain them. Policy needs to be more responsive to local opportunities and to reflect the circumstances and locations where new growth may be contemplated (either because of what it provides, enables or supports or because of who brings it forward and supports it).</p>	<p>Policy SS2 would allow development in Rural Settlements such as Sparkford, where justified. There is no evidence to suggest that the costs associated with re-opening the station would be make it viable. The policy as worded promotes a local response to development i.e. development which is commensurate with the scale and nature of the settlement, and increases the sustainability of settlement.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Affordable housing in isolation cannot increase the sustainability of a Rural Settlement. There is a body of evidence supporting the fact that those in need of affordable housing are less likely to have access to a car. This could lead to accessibility and social exclusion issues. Affordable housing in these locations should be delivered alongside the other types of development listed on the grounds of sustainability.</p>	<p>Agreed, and it is felt that SS2 makes clear that a range of development may be acceptable in Rural Settlements, including employment opportunities, community facilities as well as housing.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* An additional criterion should be added to draw attention to issues associated with noise.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 is a strategic policy to guide development in Rural Settlements, and not specific issues such as noise.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Concerned about the housing and employment growth in the Cary area. South Somerset has access to a potential source of high quality employees due to its proximity to Bristol University, UWE, and local technical schools, however infrastructure does raise concerns and the roads suffer from congestion at critical times of the day. Area needs employer who produce added value goods. Problems are going to increase on the following routes: A37, A59, A60, A371, A359, A360 etc which deters businesses. Provision of jobs should be a key consideration - why are we not attracting more firms to Somerset, particularly those in added value areas and how can we make expansion in the Somerset area economically viable?</p>	<p>Policy SS2 is a strategic policy to guide development proposals in Rural Settlements where no specific growth allocation has been provided. It does encourage development that provides employment opportunities appropriate to the scale of the settlement and the Core Strategy seeks to encourage job provision. The need for infrastructure associated with growth is covered by the IDP</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Policy is confusing and conflicts with advice that Core Strategy policies should be concise. Second part of policy for 'rural exception sites' is superfluous as these settlements are by definition "open countryside". The details of indicators to be used in defining local need should properly be the subject of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that can more readily be kept up to date with national regulatory policies relating to housing need and affordable housing.</p>	<p>Agree that policy could be made clearer and more concise, and there is potential for confusion arising from the inclusion of the 'rural exception sites' policy. The draft National Planning Policy Framework removes references to 'rural exception sites'.</p>	<p>Delete rural exception site section of policy to remove confusion and make policy more concise. Amend wording to be clearer.</p>
	<p>* Would like to see greater emphasis on provision of affordable housing for 1st time buyers particularly in rural areas.</p>	<p>Affordable housing is encouraged in general, but cannot specify that it should be for 1st time buyers although this is likely in most cases.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Concerned about the balance of the strategy and the role of Rural Settlements. Para 2.3 explains that 40% of the Districts population lives in the Rural settlements. Most of the attraction of the district lies in it's countryside and villages. More needs to be known about the incoming population. If it consists largely of job seekers with school aged children the Preferred Option 2 might be right but if a substantial proportion of people are coming to the district to enjoy a pleasant retirement then some of the sustainability arguments may be wrong. Strategy seems to see older people as a burden requiring services and contributing little but retired peoples income must generate a substantial part of the Districts' gross product. The abolition of Development Areas will work against a positive attitude to these members of the community.</p>	<p>The abolition of Development Areas will not prohibit development in Rural Settlements - SS2 sets the criteria against which proposals will be judged.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* SHLAA identifies substantial number of sites that could accommodate housing in what is now to be defined as countryside. Difficult as Parish Councils were not consulted and may not know who has proposed some of the sites. More houses may be required in Rural areas unless SHLAA sites are taken into account.</p>	<p>No requirement to consult specifically on the SHLAA as it forms part of the evidence base that informs the Core Strategy and is available as part of the Evidence Base on the Council's website. SHLAA identifies only what land is available for development at a specific point in time and is not saying that is where development should go or will go. Agree that a housing figure for Rural Settlements should be added in Policy SS4 as a more realistic approach and to provide more certainty as to the scale of development in Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Supporting text should cross-refer to revised Policy SS4 which identifies scale of housing in Rural Settlements.</p>

Scale of Growth for the District and the Main Settlements			
Housing (paras 4.40 – 4.46)	* Paragraph 4.41 - False rationale. Figures are now out of date as ONS are projecting population growth to 2018 of 0.65% to 0.7%. There has been relatively little in migration to rural areas. Current level of housing in SSDC 71,400 would be projected to be a requirement for 79,200 dwellings by 2016. This is an increase of 7,800 dwellings, significantly less than the Council calculations. The 2008 projections were primarily a result of inward migration. The indigenous birth-rate induced growth was relatively static. Population has grown but there has been little growth in the numbers employed. Net migration is likely to decline meaning a further reduced demand for housing.	Up to date housing and population work has been undertaken by Baker Associates (including addressing the issue of inward migration) - Housing Requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil (January 2011) which is part of the Core Strategy evidence base. Internal workshops for officers and members have been held to discuss and explain the methodology and findings of this work. The Core Strategy will reflect the outcome of the findings of this ongoing work. It is accepted that a strong and robust evidence base is required justify any growth figure. The RSS will not be revoked until the Localism Act is commenced. The relevance of smaller family sizes and need for accommodation to reflect this is set out in the Settlement Role and Function Study and reflected in housing policies.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall District requirement in line with economic and household growth projections
	* Paragraph 4.42 sets out a reasonable summary of options considered. Clear from the SA that a figure of lower than 16,600 would fail to meet the needs of the community. Acknowledge that provision of infrastructure and adverse impact on environmental quality is a concern.	Noted. See response above.	Noted. See response above.
	* Para 4.44 - Agree that prudent to recheck the economic, population and household projections, in this economic downturn to ensure realistic deliverability.	Noted. See response above.	Noted. See response above.
	* Para 4.44 - In re-visiting figures, factors that should be considered are: lower demand for new dwellings, increased levels of home working and small scale live/work units, decline in manufacturing and 'focussed single site' activities and greater need for affordable housing in rural areas.	Noted. See response above.	Noted. See response above.

	* Paragraph 4.44 - whilst accepting this is not a publication plan concerned that the Council are now undertaking a review of the 16,600 figure. Context for the Development Plan has not changed following the General Election and the direction provided by the RSS remains a material consideration. Accept the reasons for not providing RSS level of growth in Yeovil due to constraints. However it is not considered appropriate to review this information at this stage of the plan process particularly as will already be over 5 yrs into the plan period.	Noted . See response above.	Noted. See response above.
	* The review following the revocation of the RSS has not focussed on local issues of need and environmental quality	See response above. Environmental quality and local issues have been addressed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process.	Noted. See response above.
	*It is clear that the figure of 8,400 dwellings is based on local representation, so remains constant irrespective of the overall District figure. Support 8,400 for Market Towns and Rural Centres.	See response above.	Noted. See response above.
	*Figure of 16,600 is safe, middle ground in trying to meet household projections whilst protecting the environment and balancing the provision of jobs and homes within the District.	See response above.	Noted. See response above.
	* Preferred approach for 'balanced growth' is noted and would appear to tie in with the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB's view on affordable housing.	Noted. See response above.	Noted. See response above.
	* The decision to focus growth on Yeovil is out of kilter with the statement in the spatial portrait - namely the town is located within a highly sensitive landscape and growth is nearing its natural limits.	See response above. Whilst the growth of Yeovil may be constrained it is the largest and most sustainable settlement within the District. National Guidance in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework focuses on achieving sustainable development. Growth proposals for Yeovil have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Noted. See response above.
	* Conclusions in paras 4.42-4.46 are not based on a sound and even handed approach to policy requirements in PPS5 and SEA Regulations.	See response above. The Sustainability Appraisal complies with SEA Regulations.	Noted. See response above.

Policy SS3 District Wide Housing Provision	* 16,600 new homes is considered to be a significant oversupply. Revise to a)8,000 b)60% of 16600 (i.e. 9,960)	Up to date housing and population work has been undertaken by Baker Associates (including addressing the issue of inward migration) - Housing Requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil (January 2011) which is part of the Core Strategy evidence base. Internal workshops for officers and members have been held to discuss and explain the methodology and findings of this work. The Core Strategy will reflect the outcome of the findings of this ongoing work. It is accepted that a strong and robust evidence base is required justify any growth figure. The RSS will not be revoked until the Localism Act is enacted which will not be until April 2012. The relevance of smaller family sizes and need for accommodation to reflect this is set out in the Settlement Role and Function Study and reflected in housing policies.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall District requirement in line with economic and household growth projections
	*Housing need is based on 2004 population figures which were high and not representative - do not believe the estimates, should be revised.	See response above.	See response above.
	*ONS predicts population growth only from net migration until 2026 at 0.625%. Average growth in population will only realistically be 7,600 people. What model do you use to come up with 13,600 and 16,600?	See response above.	See response above.
	* Consider that the overall housing target figures for the district were conceived at a time when the economic prospects of the country look very different - peak market conditions. Housing figures should be re-assessed using up-to-date data from the 2012 census.	See response above. Assume respondent means the 2011 census which will be published in 2012. These figures will be assessed internally as a bench mark.	See response above.
	* Consider that Government cuts to the public sector and general economic outlook, this will reduce the demand for housing within Yeovil for which local jobs rely.	See response above.	See response above.
	* Figure for growth provided by central gov are unrealistic and housing targets have now been scrapped. Bath and North East Somerset DC are now using figures half the original. SSSDC should reappraise the figures.	See response above. Bath and North East Somerset DC had their Examination suspended and told to provide robust evidence for their revised housing figures. SSSDC have also updated our evidence base.	See response above.

	* Population growth in the District over the last 10 years has been twice the National average, further growth will continue this trend which should not be supported.	See response above.	See response above.
	*PPS12 requirement for Core Strategies to be consistent with national policy and PPS3 requires local authorities to assess an appropriate level of housing. The Core Strategy is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy as it does not plan for the RSS level of growth.	See response above.	See response above.
	* The CALA Homes High Court judgement has clarified that the RSS remains part of the Development Plan until such time as it is revoked formally through legislation - the implications of this should be carefully considered prior to moving forward with non compliant policy content. Contrary to the RSS Proposed Changes.	See response above.	See response above.
	*The evidence base of the draft RSS remains unaffected by the forthcoming Localism Bill & associated Ministerial letter. The strategy of concentrating growth at higher order, more sustainable settlements is still consistent with national planning policy.	See response above.	See response above.
	* Object to the housing provision of 16,600 dwellings as this is significantly too low representing a 16% reduction from the RSS Proposed Changes figure of 19,700. The method of identifying future growth levels through projecting past build rates is considered to be flawed as previous build rates are heavily influenced by the policy framework in place during the periods examined. Whilst historic build rates are a reasonable indication of delivery rates achieved they should not form the basis, in isolation, of the total housing figure.	See response above.	See response above.

	<p>* Adequate regard has not been given to the ONS population and household projections. 2006 ONS projections demonstrate a growth of 22,000 households to 2016, when a 3% allowance is made for second homes and vacancies the overall requirement rises to 23,000 dwellings for South Somerset (1,150 dwellings per year). The preferred strategy of 16,600 represents only 72% of predicted housing requirements. A failure to provide adequate housing will have the most impact on lower income families who are just above qualification for affordable housing. Updated ONS data (2008) continues to show projected levels of population and household growth that proposed in the draft Core Strategy. Para 3.17 of Baker Associates Paper (2007) suggests 19,000 dwellings (annual average of 950) Rep refers to scenarios A, C and E in that paper. Additional work being undertaken by Baker Associates (2010) based on latest ONS/DCLG projections should show an increase in numbers not a decrease.</p>	See response above.	See response above.
	<p>* Amend to 19,700 dwellings, to reflect the latest population and household forecasts and to ensure the delivery of a large number of affordable homes and also assist in delivering infrastructure improvements.</p>	See response above.	See response above.
	<p>* SS3 should be reworded to 19,700 dwellings, with some 10,050 dwellings at the Market Towns, Rural Centres and identified Rural Settlements; and some 9,650 dwellings at Yeovil. This maintains 49% development focus at Yeovil and 51% elsewhere.</p>	See response above.	See response above.
	<p>* Concerned that the policy is not sound as it does not meet the District's housing need.</p>	See response above.	See response above.

	<p>* Concerned regarding the deliverability of key allocations and the distribution of growth across the District. Concerns regarding the deliverability of 3,700 dwellings in Yeovil urban extension during the plan period. Eco town will commence in 2015, estimate 50 completions within the first year followed by 100 in 2016 and 150 by 2017. Therefore approx 1,500 dwellings will be delivered in the plan period a shortfall of 2,200. PPS3 (para 62) requires the provision of a 'housing implementation strategy' as the Core Strategy includes strategic allocation it should include such a strategy with targets and trajectories. Obstacles to delivery should be identified and contingency measures set out.</p>	<p>See response above. The housing trajectory is set out in the Council's Annual Monitoring Report. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will help to assess the deliverability of key allocations. Also see Yeovil section.</p>	<p>See response above and also Yeovil section.</p>
	<p>* The SA process makes it clear that under-provision against 16,600 would have serious negative consequences.</p>	<p>Noted. See response above.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
	<p>* District wide housing provision does not meet the community's projected need for new homes on the basis of limited economic growth. There appears to be no comprehensive evidence base to support the chosen figure. Under providing housing will also have a negative impact on the District's economic aspirations for growth. It is suggested the performance of the economy is carefully monitored and housing levels increased as necessary in future reviews of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
	<p>* The reduction in housing figures by over 3,000 will potentially lose the Council around £28m in revenue from the New Homes Bonus scheme - this is a material consideration which the Councillors and the public should be allowed to comment on.</p>	<p>See response above. It is agreed that this is something members will need to bear in mind when considering the planned growth for the District but this also needs to be balanced against evidence and the views of local people.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
	<p>*(YEOVIL) The District wide target is too low, either raise the overall target or recalibrate and afford more growth (60% starting point) to Yeovil.</p>	<p>See response above. A Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken looking at different options for the distribution of growth District Wide i.e. a greater concentration of development at Yeovil (75% to 25%), a low proportion of development at Yeovil 25% to 75%) and Medium Scale development at Yeovil 37% to 63%) this showed that a split of approx 50:50 as set out in the Draft Core Strategy is the most sustainable approach.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

	* (YEOVIL) Over half of the District's growth is outside of Yeovil, this is unsustainable.	See response above. A Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken looking at different options for the distribution of growth District Wide i.e. a greater concentration of development at Yeovil (75% to 25%), a low proportion of development at Yeovil 25% to 75%) and Medium Scale development at Yeovil 37% to 63%) this showed that a split of approx 50:50 as set out in the Draft Core Strategy is the most sustainable approach.	No Change
	* (YEOVIL) Yeovil target should raise from 8,200 to 9,000 on sustainability grounds.	See response above.	No Change
	*Object to Policy because it makes no positive framework for development outside of Market Towns and Rural Centres.	Policy SS2: Development in Rural Settlements sets out the approach to development outside of Market Towns and Rural Centres.	No Change
	* (RURAL SETTLEMENTS) Need a more balanced approach to development allowing for limited development in villages to help support local services e.g. Barrington has no shop or post office, limited bus service, pub is up for sale, and the primary school has to recruit children from nearby villages.	Policy SS2 sets out the approach to development outside of Market Towns and Rural Centres, this includes the provision of community facilities.	No Change
	* (RURAL SETTLEMENTS) Increase to draft RSS figures and include villages such as Long Sutton that have good facilities and are sustainable.	Policy SS2 sets out the approach to development outside of Market Towns and Rural Centres this would include villages such as Long Sutton where development can be justified.	No Change
	* Should include a windfall allocation.	It is now proposed under Policy SS4: Delivering New Housing growth to include a figure for Rural Settlements, however National Guidance in Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments says that windfalls should not be included within the first 10 years of housing supply unless it can be specifically justified.	Amend Policy SS4 which identifies scale of housing in Rural Settlements.
	*If the figures are reviewed and less housing is required, would Brownfield sites and smaller developments be better than an urban extension.	Brownfield land is targeted in preference to greenfield sites in Policy HG3	No change
	* Figure of 16,600 dwellings is broadly supported together with the split between Yeovil and the rest of the District. Whilst providing a level of certainty the use of "at least" provides some flexibility.	Support noted. See response above.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall District requirement in line with economic and household growth projections
	* Support 50-50 balance between Yeovil and elsewhere in the district.	Support noted.	No change

	*Proportion of housing between Yeovil, Market Towns and Rural Centres is supported.	Support noted.	No change
	* If 10,000 or 16,600 homes planned in the area south of Yeovil assuming an average household size of 3 will mean that the population of Yeovil will increase by 30,000 on top of existing commitments.	The proposed levels of growth for the district and percentage appropriate for Yeovil needs to be based on economic and household projections and a robust evidence base.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall District requirement in line with economic and household growth projections
	* The planning benefits of new provision of nil subsidy affordable housing through large scale Greenfield allocations is outweighed by the significant negative environmental impacts.	Noted. Greenfield allocations will be required to meet overall housing requirements and have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	No change
	* Should be made clear that the 16,600 is considered to be the minimum level to ensure housing supply and flexibility. Suggest amendment to the policy to include 'at least' before 16,600 , 8,400 and 8,200, 'will be provided at the' before "Market" and 'will need to be justified' after "settlements". This change would make the policy consistent with Policy SS4.	Agreed that Policy SS3 should be consistent with Policy SS4. Also agreed that Policy wording could be simplified.	Adjust wording of SS3 to reflect SS4 wording that housing provision will be made for "at least"...
	* Council needs to consider how to deal with the backlog of delivery that has arisen during the Local Plan Period.	Much of this is due to current market conditions and it is expected that Key sites such as Thorne Lane will be coming forward in the next few years based on the housing trajectory work. Lyde Road Key site has already come forward. Recent monitoring data shows that 1059 dwellings were built in South Somerset between April 2010 and March 2011. Housing delivery will continue to be monitored over the plan period.	No change.
	* The region (and smaller towns in particular) needs time to cope with, and assimilate growth of this magnitude ,particularly where infrastructure constraints start to significantly impact the quality of life of existing residents.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will inform the Core Strategy on this issue.	No change. Use data from IDP where appropriate to inform individual settlements
	* Query the 'Dwelling Size and Type' data - 60% high occupancy, coupled with 32% detached homes, seems to go against the data put forward in Affordable Housing Section.	The 32% detached homes relates to the possible profile of market housing as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) (SHMA) this is not the same as the requirements for affordable housing as they are not the same. Affordable housing has a specific definition in planning terms which does not include market housing. The SHMA sets out the suggested profile for market and affordable housing.	No change.

	* Stage 2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment assessed the impact on the Somerset Levels and Moors as 'Low'. RSPB do not agree with this and believe parts experience high levels of disturbance. Believe that the assessment of visitor use and behaviour is superficial. Particular concern are 'in combination' recreational pressures on SL&M from draft settlement policies.	The Somerset Levels and Moors Habitats Regulations Assessment states that unless new residents in Yeovil and other larger settlements have a particular interest in visiting the Levels and Moors i.e. bird interest, new residents are not expected to be visiting the site in any significant numbers. Additionally, bird species are not concentrated in areas where visitors tend to be due to a lack of suitable habitat. Natural England and Somerset County Council did not have any criticisms of the Somerset Levels and Moors HRA; indeed the HRA specifically states that "consultation with Natural England revealed that levels of recreational disturbance throughout the site are currently low" (section 5.1.1, 6.1). Do not agree with RSPB objections to the findings of the HRA, subject to final confirmation by Royal Haskoning who will be reviewing the Proposed Submission plan.	No change
Development outside Yeovil (paras 4.47 – 4.52)	Paragraph 4.52 - would prefer a strategy where development already identified in the SHLAA or Core Strategy, rather than simply a direction of growth and scale of growth.	The Core Strategy does set out strategic allocations in Yeovil and Chard. The SHLAA only identifies what land is available for development and not what should be allocated. Core strategies are not expected to do more than indicate directions for growth. There is the option of producing an allocations Development Plan Document should it be required in the future. This approach offers a degree of flexibility.	No change.
	*Object to the scale of growth at Wincanton - goes beyond the need to provide balanced growth. Due to impact on A303 and distance from rail corridors.	Agree. It is now proposed to reduced the level of housing growth at Wincanton - see responses under Wincanton section paragraphs 6.110 - 6.115.	See recommendations under paragraphs 6.110 - 6.115 below.
	*Support development in Chard and Market Towns.	Support Noted.	No change.
	*Support 300 dwellings over the plan period to Rural Centres.	Support noted. However it is now proposed in Policy SS4: Delivering New Housing Growth that a figure for additional dwellings should be included for Rural Settlements	See recommendations under Policy SS4: Delivering New Housing Growth.
	* (CREWKERNE) Crewkerne could take more growth.	See responses in Crewkerne section - paragraphs 6.80 - 6.85.	See recommendations under paragraphs 6.80 - 6.85.
Policy SS4 Delivering New Housing Growth (and para 4.53)	* Approach will ensure a sustainable outcome across the District.	Support noted.	No change.

	* Numbers are probably as good a guess as can be achieved at this time. It is however essential to recognise that changes will have to be made before the 20yr period comes to an end.	Support noted.	No change.
	*Object as the growth that is allowed must comply with SS2.	Policy SS2 is quite rightly a relatively restrictive policy that applies to Rural Settlements, but in Yeovil, Market Towns, and Rural Centres development is supported to meet their needs and support their role and function.	No change.
	*A locally derived housing figure, ignoring national planning policy will exacerbate the need for affordable housing as the cost of housing increases. Under providing housing will also have a negative impact on the District's economic aspirations for grow.	The revised housing figures have been arrived at through analysis of evidence of the economic need for the district and with regard to household projections and affordable housing need.	No change.
	*Too much housing is focussed on the South of the District and not enough in the North, North-East.	The level of growth for the respective towns and rural centres is based upon the hierarchy of settlements, which determines an appropriate level of growth for sustainable development of those settlements	No change.
	* Although there is an acknowledgement that the figures are indicative, the numbers in the table are overly precise in the context of the Core Strategy e.g. residual figure of 281 for Somerton.	Noted.	This will be a matter for final editing
	*Concentrating all general development within 14 urban and rural centres is over simplistic and not reflective of the wider economic, environmental and community needs of the District.	Policy SS2 allows for development in Rural Settlements to ensure the needs of the more rural areas are met. It is accepted that the identification of additional housing in addition to existing commitments at Rural Settlements would provide a more realistic approach.	Amend SS4 to make allowance for growth in rural settlements
	*Focusing just 7% of all growth in the 100+ settlements while Yeovil takes 49% of growth does nothing for addressing rural sustainability, nor does it benefit the inhabitants of Yeovil or its rural hinterland.	Policy SS2 allows for development in Rural Settlements to ensure the needs of the more rural areas are met. It is accepted that the identification of additional housing in addition to existing commitments at Rural Settlements would provide a more realistic approach. The distribution between Yeovil and the rest of the district has been subject to sustainability appraisal and is considered the most appropriate approach.	Amend SS4 to make allowance for growth in rural settlements
	* Suggest that 2-3,000 houses be identified and spread throughout the Rural Settlements.	See response above.	Amend SS4 to make allowance for growth in rural settlements

	* An additional 3,100 dwellings need to be provided, to be distributed throughout the different settlement categories which all have capacity for this additional growth, including modest growth in several of the rural settlements.	The potential for growth of the rural settlements has been recognised and provided for in policy SS2. Under the legislation provision for 'windfall' housing could not be included, however evidence within the SHLAA identifies potential land that is available.	Amend Policy SS4 to make reference to growth in rural settlements
	* It would be better to spread any future development between every village and hamlet thereby increasing their size by a dozen or so houses, which wouldn't impose fundamental changes to their look or character but would increase overall housing provision in South Somerset.	Policy SS2 allows for the development needs of Rural Settlements to be met, whilst necessarily restricting the scale of such development due to a relative lack of jobs, shops and services. A dispersed approach did not perform well in the Sustainability Appraisal.	Amend SS4 to make allowance for growth in rural settlements
	* Should consider distributing housing between all the towns and villages, as and where required by local inhabitants ('neighbourhood' planning process rather than a 'top down' approach).	The distribution between Yeovil and the rest of the district has been subject to sustainability appraisal and is considered the most appropriate approach.	No change.
	* SS4 should be reworded to cater for 19,700 dwellings as follows: Yeovil- 9,200 dwellings; Market Towns- 6,500; Rural Centres- 2,700; Rural Settlements- 1,300.	The overall housing total has been revised in line with the Baker's Report and the identified need to ensure sustainable growth.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall economic and household growth projections
	* There is a need for an additional 3,000 (on top of the 2,340 proposed) dwellings plus outside of Yeovil to meet the DCLG/ONS projection of 22,000.	The overall housing total has been revised in line with the Baker's Report and the identified need to ensure sustainable growth.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall economic and household growth projections
	* Object - as policy stands 70% of new homes will be in Yeovil and Chard, just over 12% in Crewkerne & Wincanton, Just over 10% in Ilminster, Somerton, Martock and the rest meaning less than 10% in the remain small towns and villages. Almost 25% of growth is proposed at Keyford - this would involve building a medium sized town with 3,700 houses for up to 8,000 people.	The overall housing total has been revised in line with the Baker's Report and the identified need to ensure sustainable growth for the settlements within South Somerset.	Amend Policy SS3 to provide for an overall economic and household growth projections
	* Only 7,600 - 8,000 new homes are needed for the whole of South Somerset. Population growth will only be from net migration at an annual rate of 0.625%.	This is less than has been achieved during the previous plan period and contrary to the economic and household projections on which the District's growth is based.	No change.

	<p>* Since there is no Site Allocations DPD process, it is considered important there is clarity on directions of growth for the other market towns - reference to directions for growth could be set out in Policy SS4 (as per earlier Committee versions - it is not clear why these references have been deleted) or, alternatively, it is recommended that a new 'Directions for Growth at the Market Towns' policy be prepared that lists those directions for each of the towns specified in Policy SS1, with the exception of Chard which is subject to more detailed policies.</p>	Noted.	Include new policy to show the directions of growth for Market Towns.
	<p>* Policy not sound - not based on a sound and even handed approach to policy requirements in PPS5 and SEA Regulations.</p>	All policies have undergone a sustainability appraisal including issues on the historic environment.	No change.
	<p>* Solutions such as new towns have been overlooked. A new town around Yeovilton Air Base/Podimore Area could solve many problems, have good connectivity and not have a significant visual impact.</p>	<p>A new town option has been looked at and is not considered appropriate for the following reasons: would conflict with the proposed settlement strategy for the District directing growth to Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres; not part of the vision in the SCS; no sites promoted by developers of sufficient size to accommodate a free standing new town; it would not fulfill renewable energy or sustainable development objectives; as no site been promoted, physical and environmental constraints have not been assessed and could be prohibitive; a new town is unlikely to be viable given the cost of providing necessary infrastructure; current housing projections do not predict a level of growth capable of supporting the critical mass necessary to warrant a new town without a significant alteration to the settlement strategy or expansion of the plan period; a new town at Podimore or Cartgate would not perform well against sustainable transport options or fulfill the employment aspirations for Yeovil, a new town would not fulfill wide strategic goals.</p>	No change.

	<p>* Stage 2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment assessed the impact on the Somerset Levels and Moors as 'Low'. RSPB do not agree with this and believe parts experience high levels of disturbance. Believe that the assessment of visitor use and behaviour is superficial. Particular concern are 'in combination' recreational pressures on SL&M from draft settlement policies.</p>	<p>The Somerset Levels and Moors Habitats Regulations Assessment states that unless new residents in Yeovil and other larger settlements have a particular interest in visiting the Levels and Moors i.e. bird interest, new residents are not expected to be visiting the site in any significant numbers. Additionally, bird species are not concentrated in areas where visitors tend to be due to a lack of suitable habitat. Natural England and Somerset County Council did not have any criticisms of the Somerset Levels and Moors HRA; indeed the HRA specifically states that "consultation with Natural England revealed that levels of recreational disturbance throughout the site are currently low" (section 5.1.1, 6.1).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* YEOVIL - A review of population projections should negate the need for an Urban Extension to Yeovil. It is not needed and is not sustainable.</p>	<p>Economic and population projections have been reviewed during this process and will be again before the Publication document. At this time it is not considered that there is a need to change the policy on the basis of the projections.</p>	<p>No change to the principle. Level of growth to be based on robust economic and population projection data.</p>
	<p>*YEOVIL - The level of infrastructure required would be less if development was spread across the District, the scale of development for Yeovil will incur huge infrastructure costs (draft Yeovil Infrastructure Report recognises vast unaffordable infrastructure cost). Infrastructure assumptions not based on the likely financial/fiscal environment in the next 15yrs, so not realistic.</p>	<p>Infrastructure to support new development would be required wherever the development took place. Dispersed development would be less likely to secure adequate funding to secure the necessary infrastructure and likely to duplicate infrastructure and consequently be more costly overall</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* YEOVIL - SSDC has no plan to manage windfall housing. This could lead to a district total of 22,000 houses being built if the Council continue with a figure of 16,600 homes and windfall sites in rural areas produce a further 4,000 - 5,000 new homes. SSDC should include these homes in their housing requirement as allowed for in PPS3. If this plan was followed, this would negate the need for an Urban Extension of Yeovil along its rural edge.</p>	<p>Windfall housing by definition is unknown. It is not possible to develop policy to manage this. Government preclude positive considerations of windfall provision over the first 10 years of a plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*YEOVIL - Regional targets have gone, why retain such a high target for Yeovil?</p>	<p>The overall housing total has been revised in line with robust economic and household projection data and the identified need to ensure sustainable growth for the settlements within South Somerset.</p>	<p>No change to the principle level of growth to be based on relevant economic and population projection data.</p>

	*YEOVIL - Increase density of approved Key Sites to 60dph and then YUE is not needed.	The key sites already have planning permission. It is not within the control of SSDC to change this. It could only change on submission of a revised application from the developer with such an increase in density.	No change.
	*YEOVIL - 49% of additional housing growth to Yeovil is too great. The existing Key Sites that are being developed already make Yeovil too big relative to other towns in South Somerset, and will have negative impacts on the viability of those other towns.	Yeovil is the focus for new development as it is by far the largest settlement in the District, containing 50% of job provision, and many shops and services. However, the strategy does allow for sufficient development in the rest of the district, subject to being of an appropriate scale and nature. Overall it is recommended that the approximate 50:50 split set out continues to be pursued as this has the most economic benefits and enables a good level of accessibility to services and facilities, and helps to meet housing need where it is greatest at Yeovil.	No change
	*YEOVIL - Level of growth to Yeovil would result in car parking problems at Yeovil Hospital and on-street parking in nearby streets.	South Somerset District Council in partnership with Somerset County Council have commissioned a Car Parking Survey for the town to determine capacity and estimate likely future demand. Where a shortfall in capacity is identified the Council will look to provide for any identified deficit through new provision.	No change.

	<p>*YEOVIL - A new Town should be considered outside of Yeovil.</p>	<p>A new town option has been looked at and is not considered appropriate for the following reasons: would conflict with the proposed settlement strategy for the District directing growth to Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres; not part of the vision in the SCS; no sites promoted by developers of sufficient size to accommodate a free standing new town; it would not fulfill renewable energy or sustainable development objectives; as no site been promoted, physical and environmental constraints have not been assessed and could be prohibitive; a new town is unlikely to be viable given the cost of providing necessary infrastructure; current housing projections do not predict a level of growth capable of supporting the critical mass necessary to warrant a new town without a significant alteration to the settlement strategy or expansion of the plan period; a new town at Podimore or Cartgate would not perform well against sustainable transport options or fulfill the employment aspirations for Yeovil, a new town would not fulfill wide strategic goals.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*YEOVIL - The need for substantial housing growth close to Dorset County boundary is accepted but its proximity to centres of population in Dorset demonstrates a need for closer working between respective county and district authorities. This would accord with Gov policy to further effective strategic planning.</p>	<p>Noted. South Somerset District officers have been in contact with West Dorset officers, members and parish councils during the Core Strategy process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*YEOVIL - The deficiency in housing numbers in Yeovil necessitates a significantly larger Eco-town proposal for Yeovil. Given that DCLG household projections generate a housing requirement for 22,000 dwellings overall, assuming about a 50% split between Yeovil and the rest of the District there is a need to release additional land for housing around Yeovil to accommodate about 6,700 dwellings.</p>	<p>See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper presented to Project Management Board. Population projections are supported by Baker Associates paper on 'Housing requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil' January 2011, which uses three different approaches to estimate potential growth.</p>	<p>The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. The target for both Yeovil and the rest of the District will reflect the economic and population projections for this time period</p>

	<p>*YEOVIL - 16,600 is too low, proportion allocated to Yeovil should be higher - more Greenfield for Yeovil, due to topography more than one urban extension should be considered.</p>	<p>Yeovil is the focus for new development as it is by far the largest settlement in the District, containing 50% of job provision, and many shops and services. However, the strategy does allow for sufficient development in the rest of the district, subject to being of an appropriate scale and nature. Need for greenfield development will be determined by Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	<p>Overall it is recommended that the approximate 50:50 split set out in the 'draft Core Strategy incorporating preferred options' continues to be pursued as this has the most economic benefits, enables a good level of accessibility to services and facilities, and helps to meet housing need where it is greatest at Yeovil.</p>
	<p>*YEOVIL - Draft RSS sought 68% of development to be distributed to the SSCTs, South Somerset has failed to do this directing 58% to Yeovil, Yeovil's figure should be increased to 9,600 dwellings. Numbers should be redirected from Chard to Yeovil.</p>	<p>See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA. SA has been updated (June 2011) to explore alternative growth scenarios including concentrating growth at Yeovil as opposed to distributing growth across Rural Areas. Overall it is recommended that the approximate 50:50 split set out in the draft Core Strategy continues to be pursued as this has the most economic benefits, enables a good level of accessibility to services and facilities, and helps to meet housing need where it is greatest at Yeovil.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>* YEOVIL - The completion rate at Yeovil's urban extension is optimistic. Therefore further proposals for new housing should be identified at Market Towns to bridge this gap.</p>	<p>See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper presented to Project Management Board. Population projections are supported by Baker Associates paper on 'Housing requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil' January 2011, which uses three different approaches to estimate potential growth including market capacity.</p>	<p>The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. The target for both Yeovil and the rest of the District will reflect the economic and population projections for this time period</p>
	<p>* MARKET TOWNS - Wessex Water wish to ensure that flood risk is managed when development occurs in the Market Towns and strategic infrastructure requirements are identified and included at the master planning stages. Look forward to participating in the preparation of a suitable Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	<p>Wessex Water have the opportunity to identify infrastructure requirements through the IDP process. Specific details of flood risk management would be assessed through the development management process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	*CHARD - Support existing housing commitments and additional 1700.	Support noted.	No change though growth levels will reflect the projected economic and population forecasts
	*CHARD - More development to Chard will justify reopening the station and regenerate the Town Centre.	Paragraphs 6.63 and 6.64 explain that there is currently no business case for the re-opening of Chard Junction and there is not sufficient evidence to protect the land for future rail use in the Core Strategy.	No change though growth levels will reflect the projected economic and population forecasts
	*CHARD - Concerned that the housing growth for Chard and Crewkerne relies largely on saved allocations. Given the estimated cost of the Millfield Link and the ransom issue likely to require CPO it is unlikely that the Millfield Link will be delivered in 2-3 yrs as stated in LDA's implementation plan. Because of the need to have a 5yr housing land supply advocate that sustainable sites which are deliverable now with the potential to reduce car usage and do not exacerbate traffic capacity problems should be prioritised e.g Snowdon Farm, Chard. Phase 1 of the Regeneration Framework includes a triangular extension of land in open countryside whilst more readily available land closer to the town centre has been omitted. Policy only makes provision for 328 new allocations in Chard. This should be increased to achieve the Core Strategy's strategic objectives. Para 52 of PPS3 refers to the need to have a flexible land supply. The identification of additional sites would help to absorb any shortfall in delivery from Yeovil urban extension.	The 328 additional dwellings is required on top of existing commitments (including the 1350 dwellings within Chard Key Site) to deliver the majority of preferred Option 3. Chard is proposed to deliver the most growth in the district outside of Yeovil and in terms of the overall strategy this level of growth is considered to be appropriate. The approach to the delivery of housing set out in the Draft Core Strategy is considered to be flexible and in accordance with PPS3. South Somerset District Council currently has a 5 year supply of housing land. The Chard Regeneration Plan sets out to achieve the long term social, economic and environmental objectives for Chard. Further work undertaken by the Delivery Team (building on that carried out by LDA) presents a mechanism to ensure that the proposal is deliverable and viable. The use of CPO powers is part of those considerations. Any proposals to bring forward land that is not part of the strategic allocation will have to demonstrate how it can be brought forward without prejudicing the delivery of the strategic allocation, particu	No change though growth levels will reflect the projected economic and population forecasts
	*CHARD - The 328 additional houses at Chard should be increased to 500.	The 328 additional dwellings is required on top of existing commitments (including the 1350 dwellings within Chard Key Site) to deliver the majority of preferred Option 3 for the growth of Chard. Chard is proposed to deliver the most growth in the district outside of Yeovil.	No change though growth levels will reflect the projected economic and population forecasts

	<p>*CHARD - Written justification suggests that there is a market limit to the level of provision within Chard and that this limit is 1,700 dwellings. Given that the level of housing commitment in Chard is in excess of this figure and the Chard Regeneration Framework is at a very advanced stage with funding commitment for key infrastructure already secured in it is considered unnecessary to place restriction to growth at Chard.</p>	<p>Provisional figures for Chard for the Plan period now reflects anticipated start date and estimated market provision derived from the Baker Report and the Chard Eastern Development Area Feasibility Study</p>	<p>Amend Chard provision within plan period to reflect information on likely start and build out rates.</p>
	<p>*CHARD - Chard is receiving too much growth in relation to Yeovil - reduce Chard by 800 and give the housing to Yeovil (to 9,000) redress an imbalance and favour Yeovil as the primary growth point in the District.</p>	<p>Chard is the second largest settlement in the District and it is considered that the level of growth proposed is considered to be the most sustainable option to provide town centre regeneration, housing and employment growth and improved road infrastructure. It is proposed to deliver approximately half the districts growth in Yeovil.</p>	<p>No change though growth levels will reflect the projected economic and population forecasts</p>
	<p>*CREWKERNE - Crewkerne should deliver 200 extra houses.</p>	<p>The scale of growth recommended in the Core Strategy reflects the town's economic potential and the housing trajectory shows that this growth is possible. There is no evidence of a further need for housing in Crewkerne, therefore no case is made to change the Core Strategy position, which is a result of evidence from the Settlement Role and Function Study.</p>	<p>No change though growth levels will reflect the projected economic and population forecasts</p>
	<p>*CREWKERNE - The level of growth for Crewkerne is too low and should have more growth reflecting its role in the District.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*CREWKERNE - Concerned that the housing growth for Chard and Crewkerne relies largely on saved allocations. This is unnecessarily inflexible and would fail the justified, effective and consistent with national policy tests of soundness. Consider that it would be more appropriate to identify an additional larger housing requirement over and above commitments for these towns to allow for a more responsive and flexible housing supply.</p>	<p>The CLR site is a strategically significant allocation and is safeguarded as a residential key site under draft Policy HG1: Strategic Housing Sites. Area West committee have now made a resolution to grant planning permission subject to completion of the section 106 planning agreement. Given that the allocation has been reappraised and planning permission given subject to final agreement on the section 106 agreement, it would be inappropriate to identify alternative land for significant growth in Crewkerne whilst the current application is being negotiated upon to secure appropriate section 106 contributions.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	*CREWKERNE - Object to the level of growth attributed to Crewkerne, it will put too much strain on services and increase traffic.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies what infrastructure improvements will be required by the proposed level of growth. Despite concerns regarding highways, Somerset County Council, as the Highway Authority has not objected the proposal. Additionally, the planning permission granted for the CLR site includes the delivery of a distributor road which will effectively by-pass Crewkerne town centre and resolve highway concerns.	No change.
	*ILMINSTER - Insufficient evidence has been provided to support the considerable increase in housing for Ilminster. Increase in speculative housing would change the market town environment and character of Ilminster. Housing in the town is dense with little open space further building would result in an over built, hard environment in the Town Centre.	The Settlement Role and Function Study identifies Ilminster as a Market Town and this provides evidence of the need for the scale of growth identified in the draft Core Strategy. The scale of growth recommended in the Core Strategy reflects the town's economic potential and the housing trajectory shows that this growth is possible. A viability exercise shows that the proposed area for growth to be viable and a Transport Assessment shows no undue problems for delivery.	No change.
	*ILMINSTER - Do not believe that Ilminster requires an additional 340 homes, the 191 already committed is sufficient, especially combined with the Canal Way development, this should be ample for the town, or it will lose its character.	The Settlement Role and Function Study identifies Ilminster as a Market Town and this provides evidence of the need for the scale of growth identified in the draft Core Strategy. The scale of growth recommended in the Core Strategy reflects the town's economic potential and the housing trajectory shows that this growth is possible. Additionally, the town council confirms that they would support a further 340 dwellings over the Plan period	No change.
	*ILMINSTER - Object to the scale of residential development proposed for Ilminster, 150 would be more suitable for a small town	see above	No change

	<p>*ILMINSTER - Ilminster's housing figure should be flexible - balance between housing and employment is the key, cannot sign up to a 2009 figure.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy seeks to deliver balanced employment and housing growth, with employment taking the lead, to reflect the emphasis on economic-led development. When determining the level of housing provision for Ilminster, economic growth forecasts were taken into account, this is because economic changes are a key driver affecting housing demand. Additionally, in order to support economic expansion, a comparable level of homes is needed to support the growth of economically active residents. Whilst both jobs and housing are very much interlinked, from a sustainability perspective, the level and distribution of housing and jobs should be guided by the economic potential of the District (and subsequently Ilminster). In actual fact Ilminster has an existing strategic employment land allocation (carried forward from the Local Plan). The employment and residential land are both required.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>*ILMINSTER - Support and understand that Ilminster requires additional houses to grow, but concerned about how infrastructure will be delivered.</p>	<p>Support noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies what infrastructure improvements will be required to support the proposed level of growth and no insurmountable problems have been highlighted at present.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>*WINCANTON - There is a lack of evidence to justify a further 350 dwellings in Wincanton - should wait until the existing approved 703 dwellings are occupied.</p>	<p>See responses in the Wincanton section (paragraphs 6.110 - 6.115).</p>	<p>In view of growth in Wincanton in the early part of the plan period, further growth is unlikely to exceed existing commitments. Balanced growth will reflect economic and population projections</p>
	<p>*WINCANTON - Development attributed to Wincanton is substantially out of proportion compared to Castle Cary, Bruton, Langport etc.</p>	<p>See responses in the Wincanton section (paragraphs 6.110 - 6.115).</p>	<p>In view of growth in Wincanton in the early part of the plan period, further growth is unlikely to exceed existing commitments. Balanced growth will reflect economic and population projections</p>

	*WINCANTON - Not enough land allocated in Wincanton, suggest increase from 1053 to 1249, leaving a new requirement of 546 as opposed to 350.	See responses in the Wincanton section (paragraphs 6.110 - 6.115).	In view of growth in Wincanton in the early part of the plan period, further growth is unlikely to exceed existing commitments. Balanced growth will reflect economic and population projections
	*WINCANTON - Support detailed proposals for new housing.	Support noted. See responses in the Wincanton section (paragraphs 6.110 - 6.115).	In view of growth in Wincanton in the early part of the plan period, further growth is unlikely to exceed existing commitments. Balanced growth will reflect economic and population projections
	*SOMERTON - Totally support development of 500 homes in Somerton to sustain the town and bring prosperity to the local area. The last large developments took place in the 1960s/70s, and we have a good industrial site, good shopping area, very good road network, close to A303, has its own bypass at Behind Berry, so it's time to allow more housing.	Support noted. Somerton is of a smaller scale compared to some of the other Market Towns, and there have been some recent losses in public bus provision.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	*SOMERTON - Support 500 houses at Somerton as unless the town grows it will lose some of its present facilities, mainly due to it being in the vicinity of Street and Yeovil, both of which have a lot to offer.	Support noted. Somerton is of a smaller scale compared to some of the other Market Towns, and there have been some recent losses in public bus provision.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* SOMERTON - Need 500 affordable/social houses in Somerton, not retirement villages or grand detached houses.	There is a need for affordable housing, but 500 at Somerton would not lead to the creation of 'mixed communities' and is unlikely to be viable. Policy HG4 has a target of 35% of new homes to be affordable.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections and 35% will be proposed as affordable housing.

	* SOMERTON - The overarching factors in determining Somerton's future housing levels are the need to provide more affordable housing, and infrastructure capacity to support housing - favour smaller expansion now which can be increased if required in the future, as long as commensurate infrastructure can be provided later too.	Agree that affordable housing and infrastructure provision are key issues. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not currently identify any insurmountable infrastructure issues. Somerton is of a smaller scale compared to some of the other Market Towns.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* SOMERTON - Somerton allocation should be reduced by - 1)100, 2)150, 3)200, 4)300 houses. Growth should be related to available infrastructure and the size of the settlement.	Agree that infrastructure and the size of the settlement are important factors. Somerton is of a smaller scale compared to some of the other Market Towns.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* SOMERTON - The prospect of Somerton growing by about 25% over the plan period is disproportionate and unacceptable - concern that services, jobs and facilities will not keep pace with the proposed residential development, it is not possible to provide 25% more parking spaces or 25% more school spaces etc.	Additional development can help support shops, services and provide jobs. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan advises that necessary infrastructure requirements to support development are achievable	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* SOMERTON - Too many houses are proposed for Somerton (500) which is excessive growth for a small quiet town. Somerton has grown considerably in the last decade and, with the housing already committed, there is a danger that Somerton will lose its very special 'old world' character as a pleasant small town - it really is a village. It would destroy the cohesiveness of the community.	Agree that Somerton is of a smaller scale compared to some of the other Market Towns, but it is 6th most populous settlement in the District, and contains a range of shops, services and jobs.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* SOMERTON - 500 homes at Somerton would mean at least 750 more cars and over 1000 people - Somerton is located in a network of B class roads, the narrowness of which will not support such a large traffic increase - infrastructure is not there.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify any infrastructure constraints to development at present.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* SOMERTON - 500 houses would have a negative effect on tourism in Somerton as it could put off tourists attracted by the charm of the town.	Noted, but Somerton has been identified as a Market Town by virtue of its jobs, shops and services, and therefore should see an appropriate scale of additional development. New housing development properly located and designed will not affect tourism.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections

	* SOMERTON - Delivery of 500 new houses in Somerton is unrealistic in the present economic climate, and have not considered the scrapping of housing targets by the Coalition Government.	Although the present economic climate is fragile, given the long term nature of the plan there is likely to be growth in the economy 400 dwellings over the plan period to 2028 is very deliverable. Developer interest has already been received.	Propose lower levels of growth at Somerton (approx 400) in recognition of smaller scale of Market Town and to reflect economic and household projections
	* ANSFORD/CASTLE CARY -Support detailed proposals for new housing.	Support noted.	No change.
	* RURAL CENTRES - 2,700 dwellings should be distributed throughout the Rural Centres as a proportion to existing population, to ensure balanced growth, appropriate to the existing scale of each settlement, as follows: Martock- 634 dwellings; South Petherton- 430; Langport/Huish Episcopi- 404; Bruton- 404; Milborne Port- 357; Ilchester- 275; Stoke sub Hamdon- 196.	Factors other than population were taken into account when distributing the growth including level of services, employment opportunities and level of existing commitments. The original draft plan covered the period 2006-2026 and the figures published reflected the level of growth for that period. However, PPS12 states that the time horizon for a Core Strategy should be at least 15 years from the date of adoption therefore figures have been projected forward to an end date of 2028. The timetable for publication and subsequent adoption of the plan is mid to late 2012, which would give a period of operation of 16 years, which allows for any delays caused by the introduction of the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework.	Growth at the rural centres will be adjusted in line with Policy SS4 and reflect the 50:50 distribution of growth between Yeovil and the rest of the District. The levels of growth proposed are based on a robust analysis of economic and household projections.
	* BRUTON -Support detailed proposals for new housing.	Support noted.	No change.
	* ILCHESTER - Support 150 dwellings for Ilchester.	Support noted.	No change.
	* ILCHESTER - Ilchester should accommodate 300 dwellings, it is a rural centre with a strong employment role where out-commuting needs to be reduced. Milborne Port and Langport are given 300, so should Ilchester.	The Settlement Role and Function Study identifies Ilchester as a Rural Centre and this provides evidence of the need for the scale of growth identified in the draft Core Strategy. The scale of growth recommended in the Core Strategy reflects the settlement's economic potential and the potential constraints that exist. Ilchester is more constrained than Milborne Port and Langport (flooding and archaeology).	No change.
	* MARTOCK - Object to identification of 150 additional houses for Martock.	Martock has been identified as a Rural Centre and the proposed level of growth is considered to be commensurate with it's role and function within the District.	No change.

	*MARTOCK -Martock is by far the largest of the Rural Centres and SS4 allocates a disproportionately small amount of residential development for the settlement. It contains an extensive range of facilities, shops, services and infrastructure and a good public transport network, as well as employment opportunities to the north of the town centre and off Ringwell Hill, allowing the settlement to cater for a much greater scale of growth than 246 dwellings.	See response above.	No change
	* SOUTH PETHERTON - Object to no housing growth at South Petherton. Settlement is identified having a role and function equivalent to an RSS Category C settlement. As a minimum the policy SS2 criteria should apply otherwise you have a situation where villages are growing more than rural centres! South Petherton has the second largest population of the rural centres. South Petherton is located strategically off the A303 and therefore has good road links that can accommodate additional traffic generation. South Petherton has a good range of services, schools, GP surgery and employment.	There has been further consideration given to the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years. Some housing provision is appropriate and internal road issues are not sufficient to preclude a moderate level of further development.	Revise level of growth in line with other Rural Centres as set out in Amended Policy SS4
	*SOUTH PETHERTON - Need starter homes and not executive housing in South Petherton.	Policy HG5 seeks to achieve a mix of market housing based on the evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and successor documents - which will take into account the latest statistical information.	Revise level of growth in line with other Rural Centres as set out in Amended Policy SS4
	*SOUTH PETHERTON - South Petherton needs more housing, so that local families can buy a reasonably priced house and improve the community. SHLAA sites should be included and developed.	There has been further consideration given to the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years. Some housing provision is appropriate and internal road issues are not sufficient to preclude a moderate level of further development.	Revise level of growth in line with other Rural Centres as set out in Amended Policy SS4
	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS -Yeovil has the youngest population in the district. Focusing 49% of growth in Yeovil severely impacts on the sustainability of the other 100+ settlements. Not focusing growth in rural settlements and rural centres will be creating a greater age imbalance. These concerns are recognised by Rural Challenge, Local Government Association and TCPA.	Yeovil is the focus for new development as it is by far the largest settlement in the District, containing 50% of job provision, and many shops and services. However, the strategy does allow for sufficient development in the rest of the district, subject to being of an appropriate scale and nature.	Amend Policy SS4 to identify scale of housing in Rural Settlements.
	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS -Yeovil is unable to support growth, it should be spread evenly across the district. Villages shouldn't be frozen in time.	See response above.	Amend Policy SS4 to identify scale of housing in Rural Settlements.

	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS - Policy will restrict growth in villages creating ghost towns.	Policy SS2 does allow development in Rural Settlements, where justified, but consider that further explanation is required for this policy approach.	Amend Policy SS4 to identify scale of housing in Rural Settlements.
	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS -Very little development is directed to the Rural Centres and Rural Settlements when existing commitments are taken into account; more development should be allocated at these settlements to effectively support local services, allow room for local community aspirations to be realised, and address issues of population decline due to falling household sizes. Suggest 5,910 dwellings at Market Towns 2,364 at Rural Centres, and 1,773 at Rural Settlements.	It is considered that in general an appropriate scale of development was proposed at the Rural Centres, although nil additional housing at South Petherton has been re-assessed to be consistent with the other Rural Centres of a similar scale. It is also proposed to identify a figure for additional housing provision at Rural Settlements as a more realistic strategy for development in these settlements.	Revise level of growth in line with other Rural Centres as set out in Amended Policy SS4 and to include a figure which recognises growth in Rural settlements
	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS - The over reliance on economic and housing development for Yeovil in preference to other communities along the A303 Corridor economic zone does little to recognise the economic development along this zone. A re-balance would enhance sustainability and improve employment opportunity particularly in Rural Centres and Rural Settlements.	Yeovil is the focus in the A303 economic zone, so it is considered appropriate to consolidate this. Development of an appropriate scale is also recommended in the Rural Centres and Rural Settlements.	Amend Policy SS4 to include figure for growth in Rural Settlements
	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS - Long Sutton should be awarded a level of development, it has well developed local services and is accessible to other parts of the District - 2ha site which could accommodate 60 dwellings put forward.	Noted, proposals for development in Rural Settlements such as Long Sutton will be considered against Policy SS2.	No change
	* RURAL SETTLEMENTS - Object to the non-identification of additional housing for the Rural Settlements.	Agreed, it is considered that a more realistic approach for the strategy to identify a scale of development appropriate at Rural Settlements.	Amend Policy SS4 to include figure for growth in Rural Settlements
Rural Employment			
Employment (paras 4.55 – 4.62)	* Paragraph 4.57 - should be considering employment land near the strategic highways to attract employees from surrounding market towns and to alleviate rat runs in Yeovil.	As the Core Strategy is not allocating employment land, the market will generally decide where employment land will be developed in Yeovil and the Development Management process will address any potential adverse highways impacts. Additionally, Core Strategy Policy TA3: Transport Impact of New Development addresses the need for proposals, which specifically require a location with direct access to the strategic road network due to volumes and quality of traffic generated, to be well located on these networks. Moving commuters out of town to free stranding employment locations is not considered sustainable.	No change.

	* Paragraph 4.62 - This approach is not a sound principle for establishing a basis for a Core Strategy. Omitting highways & Development Management reasons at this stage can lead to wrong conclusions on preferred locations e.g. East Coker/ Keyford.	The respondent has taken paragraph 4.62 out of context, the paragraph relates to traditional employment land (Use Class B1, B2 and B8) and the fact that in the Issues and Options document the option of restricting employment land to certain B Use Classes was mooted, and then rejected in light of PPS4. It does not relate to options for/and directions of growth.	No change.
	Paragraph 4.62 - indicates a open-minded approach to commercial development but there are some forms of development that may not be acceptable as a result of noise. Core Strategy should not leave the protection of residential and employment land to pre-application discussion. CS should provide guidance on restraints for certain types of development at the boundary of industrial areas so as to provide reasonable expectation for the amenity of nearby residential development based on consideration of noise and vibration impact.	Noted	No change
Policy SS5 Delivering New Employment Land (and paras 4.63 – 4.65)	* Approach to economic growth is supported.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Accept the need to provide employment opportunities where housing growth is proposed and therefore support this policy - note that to a large extent the requirement for Chard has been achieved.	Support noted.	No change.
	*If housing numbers are modified, the employment figures also need to be modified.	The Core Strategy seeks to balance jobs and housing, but jobs and economic potential is the driver, not the housing. Housing will follow jobs. Baker's report into the economic potential of the District identifies the overall jobs potential of the District, with 50% being attributed to Yeovil. The remaining jobs have been distributed amongst the Market Towns, Rural Centres and Rural Settlements in line with their past potential (using Nomis trend data) and future potential (land availability and market strength).	Change to reflect economic growth projections.

	*More sensible to locate new employment opportunities in other towns to stop commuting into Yeovil.	The Core Strategy seeks to balance jobs and housing, but jobs and economic potential is the driver, not the housing. Housing will follow jobs. Baker's report into the economic potential of the District identifies the overall jobs potential of the District, with 50% being attributed to Yeovil. The remaining jobs have been distributed amongst the Market Towns, Rural Centres and Rural Settlements in line with their past potential (using Nomis trend data) and future potential (land availability and market strength).	Change to reflect economic growth projections.
	* Numbers are probably as good a guess as can be achieved at this time. It is however essential to recognise that changes will have to be made before the 20yr period comes to an end.	The employment land requirements (including jobs and floor space) will be revisited through the lifetime of the Core Strategy and revised if necessary.	No change.
	*The economic projections are unrealistic.	Baker Associates have reviewed the District's economic potential and there is clear evidence to support the jobs and land provision identified in revised Policy SS5.	No change.
	* South Somerset has access to a potential source of high quality employees due to its proximity to Bristol University, UWE, and local technical schools, however infrastructure does raise concerns and the roads suffer from congestion at critical times of the day, this results in: Capital tied up in goods in transit which can be high; Capital tied up in people commuting, this higher than some areas; bottlenecks can and do develop; problems are aggravated in the Summer months by tourists and increased on street parking aggravates traffic flows following a relaxation of the planning rules. Area needs employer who will produce added value goods. Problems are going to increase on the following routes: A37, A59, A60, A371, A359, A360 etc which deters businesses. Provision of jobs should be a key consideration. Planners should be asking why are we not attracting more firms to Somerset, particularly those in added value areas? and with the recession about to bite, how can we make expansion in the Somerset area economically viable?	The planning process can only support economic prosperity through ensuring that there is sufficient land of the right type and in the right location to meet the needs of businesses. The Council's Economic Development department and a County-wide organisation, Into Somerset, are responsible for attracting firms into the District, this is not the role of the Core Strategy. Chapter 10: Transport & Accessibility includes policies which seeks to encourage modal shift and reduce congestion, Policy TA2 requires Travel Plans in association with development to reduce the impact of congestion.	No change.

	* Policy does not take into account the PPS4 definition of economic development uses that go beyond B1, B2 and B8 uses. No provision is made for non residential development or activity.	Housing and Employment Topic Paper presented to Project Management Board explains that whilst the Core Strategy will not identify any land for non B-Use Class activities, their growth is recognised through the jobs targets for 2028, and their location guided through the Development Management process. The Topic Paper explains how revising Policy SS5 and the relevant supporting text will take into account all jobs growth, rather than just B Use Class activities.	Amend wording of Policy SS5 and its supporting text and the relevant sections in Chapter 6 & 7 to include a job target for individual settlements (Rural Settlements job and floor space figure will be combined as the small numbers involved make accurate projections difficult).
	*Policy is written from presumption that underlying baseline is good, but if land is being lost from employment uses and not coming forward, then is this enough?	The South Somerset Employment Land Review provides the evidence for the level of employment land to be provided by settlement, this looks at the loss of employment land and allocations that have not been delivered, assesses them and takes them into consideration in its recommended employment land levels.	No change.
	* Policy does not refer to economic development in rural settlements. Policy should cross refer to Policy SS2 to enable economic development in rural settlements commensurate with the scale and nature of a particular settlement.	Agree, in line with the revisions to Policy SS4, Policy SS5 needs to be revised to recognise that there will be jobs delivered in the Rural Settlements.	Amend Policy SS5 to include a jobs figure and B Use employment land figure for the Rural Settlements to 2028.
	*The employment land is spread too widely across the District, the land should be concentrated - providing more land in Market Towns to attract larger companies and less land in Rural Centres to encourage small business units. This would achieve more economies in terms of distances travelled to work - creating employment hubs in Rural Centres will not aid self containment.	The Housing and Employment Topic Paper - Policy SS5, presented to Project Management Board at Workshop 9, recognises that the Market Towns have the economic capability to deliver more employment land and jobs than currently identified in draft Policy SS5. The provision has therefore been revised accordingly, and the topic paper explains the methodology behind this revision. The employment figures were amended further in the paper presented to Project Management Board Workshop 12, to reflect the revised baseline for the Baker Report on housing requirement for South Somerset & Yeovil (January 2011), and the review of Nomis data trends.	Amend Policy SS5 to seek to deliver 50% of jobs in Yeovil, 29.1% in the Market Towns, 7.9% in Rural Centres and 13% in Rural Settlements.
	*Should have a policy of improving density in existing employment areas to prevent further Greenfield development.	PPS1 supports the concept of seeking to minimise the use of natural resources and cites the example of building housing at higher densities on previously developed land. A Policy is not required to deal with this issue, Development Management process can adequately support through existing policy.	No change.

	*Job opportunities should be for local people and not to encourage net migration.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No change.
	* Policy not sound, not based on a sound and even handed approach to national policy requirements in PPS5 and SEA Regulations.	Policy SS5 deals with the provision of employment land, PPS5 and SEA regulations are not relevant.	No change.
	* Misconception in para 4.65. District Council does not provide land for industrial development or any other type of development. It can only facilitate development by commercial concerns.	Point noted, but paragraph 4.65 does not suggest that the District Council provides land for industrial development.	No change.
	* YEOVIL - Support the increase in employment provision for Yeovil. Particularly the 23ha in the Eco - town.	Support noted.	No change.
	* YEOVIL - There is sufficient employment land in Yeovil, it does not need any more.	The Employment Land Review and the Housing and Employment Topic Paper - Policy SS5, presented to Project Management Board at Workshop 9, contain a clear methodology which supports the level of employment land for Yeovil. Whilst Yeovil has existing commitments in the region of 40 hectares, given the significance of Yeovil and the fact that there are only two strategic sites (one of which is for a specific use, a high quality business park) and the remaining sites are small scale commitments and vacant land (see ELR for details) there is a need for the additional 5 hectares of land be provided in Yeovil.	No change.
	* CHARD & CREWKERNE - Support employment allocations at Chard and Crewkerne due to rail links.	Support noted.	No change.
	* CHARD - Support the proposed extension to Chard Business Park at Mount Hindrance but this cannot take place in isolation and has to be seen as part of a comprehensive mixed use employment led development that also includes land for housing and relocation of the football club (respondents include a Master Plan illustrating how this could be done - eco-village).	The Preferred Option for growth in Chard includes the relocation of the football club, however it does not include land for housing at Mount Hindrance, but does include housing as part of the overall scheme. There is no need for additional housing above the scale of growth identified in the Core Strategy.	No change.

	<p>*ILMINSTER - 107.43ha seems excessive. Ilminster's figure is too high.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Employment Land Requirement for Ilminster is 23.05 hectares of land, this land is already committed and no new land is identified as being needed. Saved Local Plan Allocations ME/ILMI/3, ME/ILMI/4 & ME/ILMI/5 are carried forward into the draft Core Strategy as Strategic Employment Sites (Policy EP1) and between them, these sites (which comprise 18.75 hectares of employment land) offer an opportunity to secure major investment into the District, due to Ilminster's location. On the basis of this strategic need for employment land, the requirement in Ilminster should be for approximately 23 hectares of employment land (18.75 from Strategic Sites and the remainder from other commitments, i.e. no new land).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*ILMINSTER - Ilminster does not need any additional employment land, there is ample land (still undeveloped) which has been available for employment for many years.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Employment Land Requirement for Ilminster is 23.05 hectares of land, this land is already committed and no new land is identified as being needed. Saved Local Plan Allocations ME/ILMI/3, ME/ILMI/4 & ME/ILMI/5 are carried forward into the draft Core Strategy as Strategic Employment Sites (Policy EP1) and between them, these sites (which comprise 18.75 hectares of employment land) offer an opportunity to secure major investment into the District, due to Ilminster's location. On the basis of this strategic need for employment land, the requirement in Ilminster should be for approximately 23 hectares of employment land (18.75 from Strategic Sites and the remainder from other commitments, i.e. no new land).</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>*WINCANTON - Support 1.5ha of employment land for Wincanton.</p>	<p>Support noted, but a case has been made for additional employment land in Wincanton. There is local concern over a lack of a balance between jobs and homes in Wincanton and this is considered laudable, Wincanton has received a significant number of housing commitments, but unlike the other Market Towns, it has no strategic employment allocation, yet its proximity to the A303 and the south east makes it well placed in terms of transport connectivity. Whilst Wincanton has a supply of 2.5 hectares, it is suggested that an additional 5 hectares be provided as a minimum, taking the Wincanton figure up to 7.5 hectares. This will make Wincanton more attractive to potential developers, providing the opportunity to have a range and choice of sites and help to support an more balanced, self contained settlement.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS5 to reflect economic and household growth projections to ensure housing and employment growth in the District are balanced..</p>
	<p>* SOMERTON - Question the actual delivery of employment land in Somerton - how are we going to encourage businesses to come?</p>	<p>The Council's Economic Development department and a County-wide organisation, Into Somerset, are responsible for attracting firms into the District, this is not the role of the Core Strategy. The planning process can only support economic prosperity through ensuring that there is sufficient land of the right type and in the right location to meet the needs of businesses.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*ILCHESTER - Support 1ha minimum for Ilchester, welcome flexibility to increase if needs be.</p>	<p>In response to objections, to identify land requirements for B-uses in Rural Centres, a minimum viable site size has been identified in consultation with Economic Development Officers, this will give some scope for development to kick start employment growth. In the Rural Centres the site size is considered to be 2 hectares.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS5 to indicate a overall new employment land requirement of 2 hectares in Rural Centres.</p>
	<p>* SOUTH PETHERTON - Need more industrial land in South Petherton to create employment.</p>	<p>In response to objections, to identify land requirements for B-uses in Rural Centres, a minimum viable site size has been identified in consultation with Economic Development Officers, this will give some scope for development to kick start employment growth. In the Rural Centres the site size is considered to be 2 hectares.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS5 to indicate a overall new employment land requirement of 2 hectares in Rural Centres.</p>

	*MARTOCK - Object to the 1 hectare of employment land as a minimum identified for Martock.	In response to objections, to identify land requirements for B-uses in Rural Centres, a minimum viable site size has been identified in consultation with Economic Development Officers, this will give some scope for development to kick start employment growth. In the Rural Centres the site size is considered to be 2 hectares.	Amend Policy SS5 to indicate a overall new employment land requirement of 2 hectares in Rural Centres.
	*Observation - the issue for places like Wincanton and Castle Cary is that employment land uses tend not to generate workforce intensive activities. We would like to see a job number target set against the settlement and a running total of job creation towards a target of need.	Agree that identifying the total number of jobs to be delivered over the plan period, by settlement, will give a clear indication of the anticipated level of economic growth that the Core Strategy is seeking to support, and will give an indication of any additional land required, should the land identified as being required, be used for less intensive employment activities. The number of new jobs is also an easy concept to understand by the public.	Amend wording of Policy SS5 and its supporting text and the relevant sections in Chapter 6 & 7 to include a job target for individual settlements (Rural Settlements job target will be combined as the small numbers involved make accurate projections difficult).
Planning Obligations			
Planning Obligations (paras 4.66 – 4.69)	* More houses require more school places - is provision being made for this?	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) and education needs has formed part of this. Infrastructure will be required to support new housing growth.	No change.
	* Need amenities for young people to be provided alongside new housing.	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) and play facilities and youth provision needs form part of this. Infrastructure of this nature will be required to support new housing growth and will be provided.	No change.
	* Will local bus services and transport links be improved with new housing?	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) and transport provision forms part of this. Infrastructure of this nature will be required to support new housing growth and transport policies for modal shift address this issue	No change.
	* Land price should be put back into better quality build.	It is not for the planning system to determine how land price is determined but it is accepted that quality of build is important however it is achieved and design policies address this	No change.
	* Include places of worship in new development. .	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) and community facilities form part of this. Infrastructure of this nature will be required to support new housing growth and will be provided.	No change.

	* Paragraph 4.67 - this approach is a high risk strategy to take in current economic climate. Council needs to be sure that proposals are needed and viable.	Noted. The Council already has an adopted Protocol for ensuring that the level of contributions sought under S106 and development viability are properly considered. Any emerging CIL will need to consider development viability as part of the process and will be subject to public examination. The CIL Evidence base considers development viability and indicates which types of development can support a CIL.	No change.
	* Paragraph 4.68 - 2nd sentence should make reference to 'bridleways, and 'multi-use paths' as an example in the last sentence.	The list as identified is not intended to identify every requirement for new development. The use of the generic terms of footpaths and cycleways is considered to be more understandable.	No change.
	* Paragraphs 4.66-4.67 - fails to mention important 'soft' mitigation measures	Soft mitigation' is not considered to be a term widely recognised by the public. Reference is made within para 4.68 to landscaping which is more widely understood.	No change.
Phasing and Cumulative Impact			
Policy SS6 Phasing and Cumulative Impact (and para 4.70)	*Policy not sound as makes no reference to safeguarding the historic environment or monitoring the real capacity of places to absorb development.	This is a policy for phasing of infrastructure alongside growth. It would not be appropriate to include impact on the historic environment in this policy.	Delete Policy SS6 in light of proposed move to a CIL
	* Provisions of policy are understood but it does nothing to add to the requirements of the Planning Act and what is commonly accepted as a statutory process, therefore it is not necessary.	Use of planning obligations to secure timeliness of infrastructure delivery is important and therefore set out as a clear statement of policy intent.	Delete Policy SS6 in light of proposed move to a CIL
	* Need more emphasis to explain how the IDP and core strategy link and how viability agrees with the scale of growth. How will the infrastructure come forward? - role of infrastructure providers and LSP not clear.	Noted.	Amend to explain the connections between the IDP and Core strategy and CIL Contributions
	* Is there sufficient capacity in existing schools (particularly Ilminster primary, Chard Holyrood and Crewkerne Wadham)?	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) and education provision will form part of this. Infrastructure of this nature will be required to support new housing growth address this issue. At present the IDP identifies the need for additional primary school provision in both Crewkerne and Chard but none for the schools mentioned.	No change.

	* National Grid is a leading international energy infrastructure business, and includes electricity and gas transmission networks and gas distribution networks in the UK. National Grid has no high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines/underground cables within South Somerset district; but has five gas transmission assets. Southern Gas Networks owns and operates the local gas distribution network in South Somerset.	Noted. This should be picked up within the IDP if there are issues with capacity. No capacity issues have been identified.	No change
	*Object to reference in para 4.70 to necessary services, statutory services are largely outside the control of the developer . The obligation should be on the District Council to engage with these providers to ensure timely delivery of gas etc.	Noted. This is where the role of the IDP links to the growth strategy. There is already an obligation to work with other infrastructure providers through the IDP which will be considered alongside the CS. Necessary services goes beyond just statutory services when providing sustainable development and working alongside all agencies to deliver services is needed.	Clarify importance of delivering sustainable development.
	* Support policy SS6, provision of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and revised charging schedule to be used with Policy SS7.	Noted.	No Change.
Planning Obligations			
Policy SS7 Planning Obligations (and paras 4.71 – 4.77)	* Noted that many of the larger Local Plan allocations did not come forward before the economic collapse and now face problems of viability. Uncertainty in the housing market continues. In seeking to secure 'land value capture' from developments in the future, the District Council will need to be extremely wary of imposing costs on major new development that are designed not only to increase capacity for that development , but are also designed to obviate existing problems. Costs cannot be borne indefinitely especially when combined with other planning gain requirements. Viability assessment supporting Aylesbury Vale Core Strategy shows that a combination of high off-site highway costs combined with affordable housing, frequently generates very large negative values.	Noted. Viability is an issue which will be addressed on a site by site basis through open book negotiation for planning obligations. There is clear guidance under the CIL amendments that obligations can only be sought based on strict criteria. It is accepted that planning obligations must be proportionate and also that any move to a CIL charging schedule must have regard to viability but it is also accepted that not all sites will be viable in the current climate and it would be inappropriate to waive all contributions in order to deliver a site unless this was critical to the overall strategy.	Amend text in this section to ensure viability is acknowledged, to make reference to the IDP schedule of infrastructure and funding for infrastructure through planning obligations and potentially CIL in the longer term.
	* To protect against judicial review - need to ensure that Council is not encouraging contributions which do not accord with the tests set out in the CIL Regs which are now law.	Noted.	No change.

	* No reference is made in the Core Strategy supporting text to Circular 5/05 Planning Obligations. This should be rectified.	Reference is made to Circular 05/05 in para 4.71. However, the CIL regulations supersede these in respect of the appropriate tests for use of planning obligations which is also explained in this para.	No change.
	* Whilst the inclusion of a list of some of the elements that could be associated with a S.106 Agreement is not unreasonable and it is noted that the Core Strategy does not limit itself to the issues listed, experience with other Core Strategy examinations has shown that this approach leads to unnecessary uncertainty and such lists have been rendered superfluous.	It would be unreasonable to expect every type of obligation to be listed. Most authorities have included a non exhaustive list and their CS in this respect have generally been found sound.	No change.
	* Supporting text should refer to the New Homes Bonus scheme. Communities should be aware of such provisions and how they could benefit through growth beyond normal S.106 provisions.	Funding for infrastructure is a key issue and NHB can potentially form one of the funding streams. However, it would be unreasonable to refer solely to this one source of potential funding though reference needs to be made to the importance of finding funding for infrastructure.	Add text to refer to funding for infrastructure.
	* Paragraph 4.74 - May be useful to consider opportunities to 'future proof' sites through measures such as charging points for electric vehicles and appropriate cabling for high-speed broadband.	Noted. These issues are likely to be site specific and would be capable of being dealt with through planning conditions. Also covered within modal shift policies.	No change.
	* Policy makes no reference to the requirement for a comprehensive Section 106 agreement for the growth and in the absence of such a requirement it is very difficult to see how the Council will secure the co-ordinated delivery of infrastructure and associated facilities.	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) which will be linked to the Core Strategy and form part of the evidence base. This provides a coordinated list of the infrastructure required by different stakeholders to deliver the growth proposed and the likely timescale for delivery. Funding for infrastructure is critical and new funding streams are also being looking into which includes the possibility of SSDC adopting a CIL charging schedule in due course.	No change.
	* Reference to 3 tests of lawfulness welcomed. Policy wording appears to be focussed solely on residential development, it is therefore unclear how the council will seek to ensure contributions for non residential development. As currently worded there is a danger that housing development will be only source of contributions.	Text does not refer to housing but accept that greater clarity is needed that obligations will be sought from all appropriate development.	Clarify to ensure reference made to all appropriate development.

	* The difference in private housing proposals and affordable housing developments has not been recognised by excepting affordable housing proposals from development proposals in policies SS7 & SS8. Disappointing that a tariff based contribution system has not been introduced.	There is no intention to introduce tariffs and the Council will seek to move to a CIL in due course. Planning obligations will be sought on all appropriate schemes taking viability issues into account.	No change.
	* The list of community infrastructure types should include reference to health provision. (PCT)	It would be unreasonable to expect every type of obligation to be listed. The IDP identifies areas where health provisions is required and the IDP will be used as a basis for targeting resources. Most authorities have included a non exhausted list for S106 contributions and their CS in this respect have generally been found sound.	No change.
	* Concern that the planning obligations do not acknowledge or indeed contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Planning obligations should seek to support the objectives of the AONB Management Plans.	It would be unreasonable to expect every type of obligation to be listed. Most authorities have included a non exhaustive list and their CS in this respect have generally been found sound.	No change.
	* Add bullet point: secure proposals for Biodiversity Action Plan delivery, landscape restoration and enhancement, and green infrastructure. Proposals should link and complement the existing environmental resource, and overall plans should aim for a net gain for the natural environment.	It would be unreasonable to expect every type of obligation to be listed but green infrastructure should be mentioned.	Add green infrastructure under para 4.74.
	*Policy is unrealistic and unsound , fails to recognise that planning gain is derived from 'land value capture', land values have fallen, planning obligations should track land value and so should be reduced and the scope should not be extended in this current market.	There no intention to extend the scope of S106 obligations beyond that set out in Circular 05/05 and the amendments within the CIL regulations. All schemes where planning obligations are sought will be subject to viability and the council already has an adopted Protocol for schemes of this nature.	No change.
	*High Speed Broadband is an essential infrastructure requirement . For rural communities it will encourage employment, reducing the need to travel. Broadband requires greater emphasis.	Noted. The list of planning obligations being sought is not exhaustive. High speed broadband is currently being rolled out across Somerset as part of a national programme	No change.

	*Funding may be required for strategic flood risk/drainage solutions, as these may be more sustainable than onsite measures for strategic sites - see Level 2 SFRA. Include under Strategic Infrastructure section in Policy.	Noted. In some locations the IDP has indicated the need for on site works to be funded as part of the development in that location including at Crewkerne, Ilminster, Bruton and Martock and SUDs are recommended for most new development. The need for flood prevention and mitigation identified in the IDP do not however, preclude areas from possible growth. Funding would either be via EA or from developers as part of development proposals on individual sites.	No change.
	*Section 106 money should go directly to the settlement where the need for the money is generated i.e. if 100 houses built in Ilminster, all the S106 money generated from that development should go to Ilminster. There is a history of money going to strategic facilities and not benefitting settlements who take the development.	Currently S106 monies fall into site specific works and strategic works off site. With the proposed CIL charge, should SSDC adopt this approach a proportion would be set aside for local facilities with the IDP schedule of infrastructure required being used to identify other priorities. CIL expenditures arrangements and governance will need to be determined. A Planning Inspector will seek assurance that development identified for early years of the plan period can and will be delivered	No change.
	*Development of Ultra Light Rail services for Yeovil should be included in the IDP.	Noted. This should be picked up within the IDP if there are any firm proposals which there are not at this time. Ultra Light Rail is not considered practical for South Somerset at present.	No change.
	*Contributions should be made for industrial/employment land.	Text does not refer solely to housing but accept that greater clarity is needed that obligations will be sought from all appropriate development.	Clarify to ensure reference made to all appropriate development
	*Policy should be based on a 'roof tax' and the obligations should be spent on local needs.	There is no intention to adopt a "roof tax" but adoption of CIL is equivalent. Should SSDC adopt this approach a proportion would be set aside for local facilities with the IDP schedule of infrastructure required being used to identify other priorities.	No change.
	*Why are gypsy and traveller sites (in the form of an offsite provision of a strategic nature) not funded with planning obligations.	Planning obligations and conditions can only be sought for appropriate uses meeting the tests set out in Circular 05/05 and CIL Regulations	No change.
	*There is an undue emphasis on funding of strategic sports and cultural facilities - identified community need only. Contribute to strategic infrastructure where it has a very clear and demonstrable benefit for the community.	It is not considered that there is such an emphasis. The IDP identifies where infrastructure is required and will allow priorities to be set.	No change.

	*The Community/Parish Plan should be the tool for deciding where planning obligations money should be spent. For small rural villages funding creamed off for strategic developments elsewhere in the District should be subsidiary to meeting local needs.	The CIL regulations set out the percentage of money for spending on both strategic infrastructure and on more local projects.	No change.
	*Western Power Distribution - would expect developers to pay to divert less strategic electricity circuits operating at 11,000 volts or below (may include underground or low voltage overhead lines). Seek to retain 132,000 Volts, 66,000 Volts and in some cases 33,000 Volts lines, particularly if diverting would place a financial obligation on Western Power. Assuming that required minimum statutory clearances can be maintained, WPD does not generally have any restriction on the type of development possible in proximity to strategic overhead lines, but sensible for planning guidance and layout to WPDs position into account and consider compatible uses. WPD should be consulted if there are lines overhead or underground in proposed development locations.	Noted. Requirements of Western Power are be picked up through IDP.	No change.
	*All contributions from new development should be site specific and used to provide facilities within the town taking the development, any district-wide or area-wide facilities to gain should be clearly stated at planning stage.	Currently S106 monies fall into site specific works and strategic works off site. With the proposed CIL charge a proportion would be set aside for local facilities with the IDP schedule of infrastructure required being used to identify other priorities. CIL expenditures arrangements and governance will need to be determined. A Planning Inspector will seek assurance that development identified for early years of the plan period can and will be delivered	No change.
	*Object to reference that planning obligations will be sought to secure a range of housing types from new residential development, including market housing - imposes excessive and unrealistic obligations and is contrary to national policy in Circular 05/2005 (para.B5) and CIL Regulation 122(2).	There is no intention to seek different types of market housing through planning obligations but it is intended to ensure the policy requirements for affordable housing area achieved through S106.	Clarify text to ensure it is clear regarding market housing.
	To ensure delivery of key strategic sites, Core Strategy and IDP should be used as a tool to secure alternative sources of funding where possible as unlikely that development alone will be able to support infrastructure and other planning obligations required.	Noted and agreed.	No change.

	*Planning obligations should include the need to support health provision.	Noted. The IDP does indicate that additional provision will be required in certain locations but these will be funded by the Health Authorities.	No change.
	* Support the inclusion of cultural provision and enhancements - hope this refers to theatres as well as swimming pools.	Noted, confirm this would cover a range of cultural facilities.	No change.
	*Support Policy SS7 and proposed flexible approach towards contributions.	Support noted.	No change.
Viability			
Policy SS8 Viability (para 4.78)	* Support the principle but policy does not go far enough and should state that where viability is marginal Planning Obligations will not be sought.	Support noted. SSDC have an adopted protocol which considers viability. This is clearly mentioned in para 4.78.	No change.
	* Policy is welcomed as it demonstrates a clear understanding that issues of viability must be taken into consideration as part of the planning application process.	Support noted.	No change.
	Support, policy recognises viability.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Support this policy, in particular the use of planning obligations to secure green infrastructure.	Support noted.	No change.
	Issues made in response to SS7 apply equally. Ability to contribute will depend on market circumstances. Land prices have been reduced by up to 50 % during the recession and house prices by up to 25%. Open book does not deal with the essential question as to the baseline value from which viability determinations should be made. Viability studies that assume viability where development value exceeds the current agricultural value. This is unrealistic very few landowners/farmers would be willing to dispose of land even at a substantial multiple above agricultural value. On Brownfield sites the imposition of onerous S.106 obligations generates viability issues at an early stage.	Noted. Viability is already acknowledged through use of the Planning Obligations Protocol. A CIL charge will need to be tested against viability and set at an appropriate level in any forthcoming CIL charging schedule which will be then be considered at Inquiry.	No change.
	*Policy not sound as makes no reference to safeguarding the historic environment or monitoring the real capacity of places to absorb development.	Policy is referring to viability and it would not be appropriate to specifically refer to historic environment. Paragraph 4.74 makes it clear that planning obligations can cover a whole range of issues.	No change.
	* Wording of Policy lacks clarity. Reference should be made to Circular 05/2005 and the planning obligation tests now enshrined in law under the Community Infrastructure Levy.	The tests are mentioned in 4.71 as part of the discussions on use of planning obligations. It is not considered necessary to iterate part of policy.	No change.

	* Policies SS6, SS7 & SS8 could easily be incorporated into 1 policy.	This was considered but felt to be clearer under 3 separate policies. Merger of policies SS7 and SS8 would be appropriate	Propose amend and merge Policies SS7 and SS8 to single planning obligations policy
	* Support the principle of pro-rata contributions for proposals which form part of larger proposals and the recognition that viability will be a consideration in seeking financial contributions.	Support noted	No change.
	* The difference in private housing proposals and affordable housing developments has not been recognised by excepting affordable housing proposals from development proposals in policies SS7 & SS8. Disappointing that a tariff based contribution system has not been introduced.	There is no intention to introduce tariffs although the Council seek to move to a CIL. Planning obligations will be sought on all appropriate schemes taking viability issues into account. Occupiers of affordable housing have the same needs for infrastructure as other users but it is accepted that viability is of paramount importance.	No change.
	Highways Agency advice. Improvements to the Strategic Road Network will need to be funded by the developer or other non-agency source.	A separate infrastructure study has been carried out (IDP) and transport provision forms part of this. Infrastructure of this nature will be required to support new housing growth.	No change.
	*Object, council needs to take a more realistic and informed economic approach to viability, taking into account of fact that planning gain is derived from 'land value capture', land values have fallen, planning obligations should track land value and so should be reduced and the scope should not be extended in this current market.	The existing Planning Protocol adequately takes viability into account. The Council's move towards a CIL will need CIL to be set at an appropriate level but it is accepted in the legislation that it does not need to be set so that ALL development can subsequently come forward. It is a question of balance and this will be need to form part of the CIL Charging Schedule.	No change.
	*Viability of schemes has constrained development in the past, to ensure future schemes are deliverable it is essential that the Local Authority adopts a more flexible approach to planning obligations - need to be realistic about land values.	The existing Planning Protocol adequately takes viability into account. The Council's move towards a CIL will need CIL to be set at an appropriate level but it is accepted in the legislation that it does not need to be set so that ALL development can subsequently come forward. It is a question of balance and this will be need to form part of the CIL Charging Schedule.	No change.
	*This policy is too narrow and does not address economic infrastructure.	The existing Planning Protocol adequately takes viability into account. The Council's move towards a CIL will need CIL to be set at an appropriate level but it is accepted in the legislation that it does not need to be set so that ALL development can subsequently come forward. It is a question of balance and this will be need to form part of the CIL Charging Schedule.	No change.