

**Draft Core Strategy (incorporating Preferred Options) October 2010**  
**Summary of issues - Part 2 - Yeovil**

<b>Policy/Paragraph/Section</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Yeovil Vision and Proposals</b>			
<b>Spatial Portrait</b>			
Spatial Portrait (paras 5.1 – 5.5)	* By pass for Yeovil town centre needed before housing and employment land.	Somerset County Council as Highways Authority has advised that there is insufficient finance available to fund either a by-pass or ring road for Yeovil. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has confirmed this position.	No change.
	* Greater detail in the spatial portrait should be given to Yeovil's Wards to identify geographical character areas and neighbourhoods.	The Core Strategy is a strategic document that should not go into detail descriptions of Wards and Neighbourhoods.	No change.
	* Question the distance (20 miles) between Yeovil and Taunton.	The distance between Taunton and Yeovil is 21 miles as the crow flies or 24 miles by car.	Amend document to reflect distance of 21 miles.
	* There is a railway line between the two stations but no service. There is a lack of service between Yeovil and Taunton which could be competitive. The service would be further improved with stations at Somerton and Langport.	The Yeovil to Taunton Branch line has been abandoned for many years with no prospect of ever being viable again.	No change.
	* New text should be added to the end of para 5.4 describing out-of-centre non-food retail facilities. Suggested text supplied.	Contrary to PPS4 as it is a town centre use.	No change.
	* Paragraph 5.5, 5th bullet text should be replaced with that from para 4.37 of the Retail Study Update 2010. Replacement wording supplied.	Comment noted. Paragraph will be rewritten with the most up to date analysis of the retail market.	Amend document to reflect most up to date market situation.
	* Theatres Trust are surprised that given its role as the 'cultural anchor' The Octagon Theatre is not mentioned in the Spatial Portrait for Yeovil.	Agree	Amend text to make reference to the cultural role of the Octagon Theatre.

	<p>* Paragraph 5.5 - Local issues section refers Pen Mill Station as 'not providing an accessible rail access'. Disagree - it is easily accessible by most walkers and cyclists via an attractive off road path. Additionally the 2 stations are linked with the town by a half hourly 'clock face' bus service (no. 68) . The situation is not ideal but Yeovil's stations do offer a degree of accessibility. List makes no mention of the severance caused by A30 and the effect this has on pedestrian access.</p>	<p>Agree, Yeovil Pen Mill Station is accessible by walking, cycling and a regular bus service however maintain that Yeovil Junction Station is less accessible through its distance from the town centre.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
Local Issues	<p>* Concerned that population projections for Yeovil's growth have assumed a typical UK pattern of growth which would be inappropriate to apply to Yeovil when a significant proportion of the population work at RNAS Yeovilton inflating the 20-35 age group. Yeovil has a high proportion of the population employed in public sector work which is generally shrinking. South Somerset's high knowledge content economy is dependent to an extent on inward migration and older couples.</p>	<p>See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper. Population projections are supported by Baker Associates paper on 'Housing requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil' January 2011 as amended 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. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest population projections and additional years to 2028.</p>
	<p>* We need to diversify away from aerospace and engineering industry.</p>	<p>Noted. The District's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) 'Shaping South Somerset' seeks South Somerset to have a high performance local economy a competitive, high performance economy that is diverse, adaptable and resource efficient.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Disagree that there is a lack of dedicated routes for cycling. Cycling routes are limited by discontinuous routes, inappropriate designation and under promotion of well used unofficial routes and the lack of a dedicated route from North-West Yeovil into the town centre.</p>	<p>A lack of dedicated routes for cycling was identified by the UWE Study 'Active and Low Carbon Travel, a Transport Vision for Yeovil'.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* The importance of Yeovil's economy of the surrounding villages and hamlets which provide highly attractive accommodation which assists employers in the public sector secure key staff. Similar they attract people who are creative and in the arts sector. A number of nearby settlements have been used as film locations for television and cinema generating tourism.</p>	<p>Agree that surrounding villages contribute to Yeovil and its economy.</p>	<p>Amend text to make reference to the importance of Yeovil's surrounding villages to its economy.</p>

	* The location of rail links can not be changed it is the nature of the rail links (commuting destinations and single track) that restrict usage in Yeovil and not the proximity to housing. For example Castle Cary has a smaller population than Yeovil but draws a similar passenger number.	Agree that the location of existing rail links can't be changed however it is consider that rail links can be supported by local housing including enhanced bus networks.	No Change.
	* The TCPA does not endorse Urban Extension as a means of addressing affordable housing.	The TCPA believes that the full range of planning solutions – urban regeneration, sustainable urban extensions or, where appropriate, new settlements – should be available to communities to choose from as they search for the most sustainable pattern of development locally. Affordable housing for Yeovil will predominantly be in association with developments within the Urban Framework.	No Change.
	* People like commuting from villages.	The Council's proposed settlement strategy seeks to locate housing growth in towns and villages where economic growth is anticipated. Planning policy can only facilitate balanced housing and employment growth, it can't prohibit lifestyle choice.	No Change.
<b>Vision</b>			
Vision (paras 5.6 – 5.8)	*Best available technology without excessive cost for Yeovil is Ultra Light Rail	Noted. Throughout the period to 2028 there is likely to be expansion of existing technologies and viability to introduce these. Light rail can be an attractive option where there is sufficient critical mass and significant common journey patterns. Usually this occurs in settlements with more than 200,000 inhabitants. Therefore at present, the scale of growth envisaged for Yeovil, its existing population and diverse travel patterns mean that any feasibility study is likely to preclude it as a viable transport option for Yeovil.	No change.
	*The key issues facing the District and Yeovil are mentioned, but without reference to how these will be addressed, as such the vision fails to demonstrate the genuine opportunities that exist within the Town and the role of this strategic development.	How the Core Strategy seeks to deliver the vision for Yeovil is discussed in the next section.	No change.

	* Policies in this section set out the requirements for sustainable transport provision but do not appear to recognise that large scale developments may also require highways infrastructure. Would advise that there is a broader policy requiring provision of a full range of transport interventions, the details of which will be agreed following a technical assessment undertaken by the Local Authorities and a full Transport Assessment undertaken by the developers.	The broad transport infrastructure requirements for Yeovil Urban Extension are identified in the 'Yeovil Traffic Model' February 2011 and Addendums June 2011 and January 2012. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers the feasibility of delivery and funding. Developers will be required to submit detailed transport assessments with their planning applications and transport assessment will no doubt feature in future masterplanning.	No change.
	* Yeovil should have its place within its rural setting. It should do all it can to protect its rural edge for future generations. Bringing finance into Yeovil to make major improvements and regeneration of the urban areas including the deprived wards should be the prime focus. This vision is nothing if it doesn't meet the needs of the community.	Agree that the Vision is key to the successful delivery of sustainable development through the Core Strategy. The Yeovil Urban Extension seeks to address Yeovil's rural setting by establishing a strong development edge to the south of the town separating it from adjoining settlements.	No change.
	* The town centre strategy for Yeovil should be defined including retail floor space, car parking strategy, night time economy and services, hospitality sector, housing and leisure, retail mix and expected footfall. A subsidiary document should be identified.	The town centre and retail strategy for Yeovil is discussed at paragraphs 5.57-5.58 and within the Council's retail capacity study (2010). Agree that further reference to the night time economy, leisure and hospitality sector should be made in the Core Strategy. The Council is preparing a Car Parking Strategy for Yeovil.	Amend policy wording to make reference to town centre issues.
	* Concern that development will result in the loss of footpaths. Would like to see replacement footpaths to those lost.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No change.
	* Proposed development conflicts with the aspiration for better linkages with its immediate countryside environment.	Disagree, proposed development presents a real opportunity to enhance links between Yeovil and the surrounding Countryside.	No change.
<b>What will the Core Strategy Deliver?</b>			
<b>Appropriate Scale of Growth</b>			
Appropriate Scale of Growth (para 5.9)	* Disagree with scale of growth proposed. Yeovil currently has 27% of the population but it is proposed to take 49% of all growth and an Urban Extension that will take 22%. A more balanced approach is needed.	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. Scale of growth is proportionate to Yeovil. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.

	* Why has SSDC increased employment provision from 43ha to 51ha and decreased housing figures from 11,400 to 8,200 dwellings.	Originally the Core Strategy was based on the Employment Land Review (2010) which didn't take into account the projected growth in the economy, subsequent work by Baker Associates has sought to rationalise this issue. Updated figure work is covered in the Employment Land Topic Paper (Policy SS5) presented to Project Management Board and the whole focus of the Core Strategy is based on economic growth.	Amend Policy SS5 to reflect latest employment projections.
	* Immigration is changing to emigration.	Latest population projections released by the Office of National Statistics show that immigration has significantly slowed from 2007 rates. As has emigration. Statistics show population growth through natural growth.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
	* Have housing projections taken the current level of unoccupied housing into account within the region?	Population projections do not take into account unoccupied properties as there is no direct link. Empty properties should be expected in any healthy property market as they represent housing turnover. Level of empty properties addressed in Baker Report on Housing Requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil.	No change.
	* Consider housing demand will be from smaller household sizes falling through divorce, late marriage and immigration from other parts of the country coming from high unemployment area, economic immigrants from outside the UK and high inner city rents now not covered by Government benefits. Will these groups be able to afford South Somerset house prices? Population projection is beyond UK average. Increased population will require further jobs which I don't understand where they will come from.	Growth 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. The report is clear that in order to support economic growth a comparable level of homes will need to be provided to support the growth of economic residents. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
	* Housing Minister states 'We will back genuine new eco-town or eco-village developments, which have broad based local support and are genuinely environmentally sustainable', 'we will not impose eco-town developments through national planning rules on communities which do not want them'. 'I want to ensure that localism is a real feature of these schemes'. There is no local support for an Urban Extension.	There is no direct link between Eco-town standards and the Yeovil Urban extension they are mutually exclusive. Government funding is seeking to explore the delivery of Eco-town standards.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Extension with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6.

	* Encouraged to note that a review of the economic and household information is being undertaken.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
	* Disagree with the scale of growth and see no evidence to support that scale.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
	* The oversupply of housing would encourage economic stagnation and deprivation across the District.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
	* Objective justification needed for scale of growth.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
<b>Development within the Urban Framework</b>			
Development within the Urban Framework (para 5.10 – 5.12)	* Strategy fails to address the future of the Agusta Westland's airfield. Concern that high risk test flights are being carried out adjacent to residential development. Airfield must offer high land values for residential development. The loss of Westland's must be considered in the Plan.	The Council's position is to support Agusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. Agusta Westland's have submitted representation to the Council seeking to safeguard their airfield safety zones from future development.	Introduce Agusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.

	<p>* Ministry of Transport have stated that any development should not be allowed to increase traffic on the A303. Further growth would require upgrading and improvements to the A37 in and around Yeovil and links to the A303. Yeovil is therefore not the best place for any development. Propose Castle Cary and Wincanton as better served by road and rail.</p>	<p>Growth 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. Infrastructure issues are considered in the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.</p>	<p>The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.</p>
	<p>* Regeneration of central Yeovil should be the key priority for Yeovil not an urban extension.</p>	<p>The Yeovil Urban Village &amp; Cattle market site are key sites within central Yeovil identified in the Yeovil UDF as potential locations for residential redevelopment. These sites along with all other known redevelopment opportunities within the Urban Framework have been calculated within a review of Urban capacity. Regeneration is recognised a priority and is reflected in the Urban Village masterplanning work</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
<b>Greenfield Development</b>	<p>* This assessment is based upon 8,200 dwellings representing 50% of the total for the District. It is noted that 3,725 dwellings regarded as commitments with a further 533 dwellings coming form SHLAA. No detailed info is provided in the SHLAA as to the actual availability or deliverability of those 533 dwellings - this needs to be confirmed by further work on the evidence base. Assuming 4,481 dwellings come forward as existing urban extensions or as opportunities within the existing urban area, leaves a balance of 3,720 (if lower 16,600 dwellings is acceptable) or 6,720 if the latest evidence is used.</p>	<p>Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area. Set out in main report to District Executive and considered by Area Committees in February / March 2012.</p>	<p>Identify amount of Yeovil's growth to occur within urban framework to reflect latest position on urban capacity within Yeovil</p>
	<p>* Windfall allowance should count towards housing targets.</p>	<p>Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area. Set out in main report to District Executive and considered by Area Committees in February / March 2012.</p>	<p>Identify amount of Yeovil's growth to occur within urban framework to reflect latest position on urban capacity within Yeovil</p>

	*Reducing the scale of Greenfield development when brownfield development appears is a risky strategy - there are doubts over the ability to deliver some of the key Town Centre sites. The Greenfield figure should be provided in more than one location.	Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area. Set out in main report to District Executive and considered by Area Committees in February / March 2012.	Identify amount of Yeovil's growth to occur within urban framework to reflect latest position on urban capacity within Yeovil
	* HEA for Yeovil has failed to consider the capacity of the urban area to absorb more development. Policy is unsound.	The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment (HEA) has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. Consideration of capacity of Urban Area has occurred separately from the HEA which is not the appropriate vehicle for this.	No change.
	* HEA for Yeovil has failed to consider the capacity of the Greenfield area to absorb more development. Policy is unsound	The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment (HEA) has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. Consideration of capacity of Urban Area has occurred separately from the HEA which is not the appropriate vehicle for this.	No change.
	* Designation is unjustified and contrary to national policy (PPS5) as mitigation measures in SA may not be sufficient.	Disagree, SA does not identify any overriding issues with historic environment subject to proper detailed consideration. See also Yeovil Urban Extension discussion paper.	No change.
	* Building houses away from Town Centre e.g. Coker, will force households to drive and contravene Policy TA1.	Distance to town centre is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Hospital does not have the capacity to accommodate this level of growth.	Issue is considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan but no limiting requirements have been identified at this time.	No change.
	* The most important consideration in rural communities is to provide local housing in villages and towns	Policy SS2 seeks to allow development in rural settlements which is commensurate with the scale and nature of the settlement including that which meets identified housing need, particularly affordable housing.	Insert additional guidance on the interpretation of Policy SS2 within the supporting text. Delete the Rural Exception Sites part of Policy SS2.



	* Detriment to local biodiversity, loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and impact on local villages.	Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and impact on local villages is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper considered by Project Management Board.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
Policy YV1 Brownfield and Greenfield Housing Provision for Yeovil (and pares 5.13 – 5.16)	*Increase from 8,200 to 9,000.	Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area.	Amend policy YV1 to reflect latest figures
	*As ONS suggests a lower housing figure, these numbers should not be fixed. Also opportunities to increase densities on committed, but not yet built sites which may reduce the need for Greenfield land.	Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area.	Amend policy YV1 to reflect latest figures
	*Greenfield figure should be 4500.	Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area.	Amend policy YV1 to reflect latest figures
	*Greenfield figure should be 5000.	Provision has been updated to reflect a more formal post 2022 windfall provision; removal of the provision previously made on basis of professional judgement difficult to substantiate; an allowance for conversions and flats above shops and an ambitious assessment of capacity coming from the SHLAA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area.	Amend policy YV1 to reflect latest figures

	*Suggestion that new dwellings within the urban framework would all be on brownfield land is misleading as 3 key sites are largely Greenfield.	Agree Policy name is misleading as three key sites are greenfield developments.	Amend policy name to 'Urban Framework and Committed Greenfield Housing Provision for Yeovil'.
<b>Location for Urban Extension</b>			
Location for Urban Extension (pares 5.17 – 5.26)	There must be furthest employment benefit near Yeovilton and Augusta Westlands. People don't want to live next to where they work. Concern with SSDC employment land figures which should be reviewed down.	Employment land has been recalculated to reflect proposed housing commitments. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper considered by Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area.	No change.
	* Support a new school to the south but this would only work in sustainability terms / travel movements if catchments are applied.	Policy YV2 Yeovil Urban Extension seeks to make provision for a new secondary school. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will determine deliverability. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	No change.
	* Splitting the north option into two sites is unfair as issues in one are been attributed to the other.	Constraints mapping exercise identifies two distinct options to the Northwest and due North. Each option has been judged on its own merits. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board..	No change.
	* Consider the early drafts of Yeovil SA published in February 2010, March 2010 and April 2010 are unsound and contain inaccuracies. Consider the final Yeovil SA published in August 2010 still contains flaws and inaccuracies.	Noted. SA will be updated to reflect comments submitted, where appropriate.	Update Yeovil SA to reflect comments made, where appropriate.
	* Development in the north is not located further from facilities in the town centre than the south.	East Coker / Keyford option is located the shortest distance from the Town Centre as the crow flies than any other option, this is a positive. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board..	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Disagree with paragraph, five of the main employment centres of Yeovil (Lufton, Pen Mill Trading Estate, Town Centre and RNAS Yeovilton) have proximity to the North and only two have proximity to the south (Town Centre and Lysander Trading Estate / Augusta Westland's).	Disagree with analysis, Pen Mill Trading Estate is located to the South East of the town and only Lufton / Houndstone is to the North. RNAS Yeovilton is a major out of town employer and can therefore not be regarded as a positive for a northern direction for growth. The Urban Extension would have sufficient employment land to be potentially self contained.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	* The Yeovil Urban Village is a classic example of using passive solar gain at the base of a northern gradient so the argument isn't accurate.	The Renewable Energy Study by Brooks Devlin / Font energy identify Solar PV as a small but important part of the renewable energy mix for the Yeovil Urban Extension. Solar PV works at its most efficient in a due Southern direction and for this reason southern slopes are preferred. Solar panels will work in other directions but at a significantly reduced efficiency. North sloping sites are not well suited to solar PV as they increase the likelihood of over shadow. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No change.
	* No assessment has been carried out on the long term effect of large scale building development to the south of Yeovil on the viability of Westland's airfield, CAA prohibit test flying over built up areas except for the purpose of take off and landing. All circuits flown from airfield at present flown over the largely rural area of East /West Coker and Barwick, in part to avoid the urban area to the North of the Airfield.	The Council's position is to support Agusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. Agusta Westland's have submitted representation to the Council seeking to safeguard their airfield safety zones from future development.	Introduce Agusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.
	* Disagree that secondary education is a factor is deciding where an urban extension should be located. SA has made no reference to the College, University Centre, Skill Centre, and Innovation Centre which have proximity in the north. Or three primary schools in the North.	Access to Secondary School education is an impact issue in creating a sustainable community. Agree that access to Yeovil College, local primary schools, University Centre and Innovation Centre are also considerations. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Amend SA with reference to Yeovil College, University Centre, primary schools and innovation centre.
	* The Core Strategy has not taken into account the impact of the Strategic Defence and Spending Review which will result in significant job losses at Agusta Westlands, Yeovilton, MOD Civil Service. As well as joint operations with European Countries.	The results of the Strategic Defence and Spending Review have been considered.	No change.
	* Paragraph 5.24 should remove reference to 'immediately' as safeguarding maybe required for some distance along flight paths.	The Council's position is to support Agusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. Agusta Westland's have submitted representation to the Council seeking to safeguard their airfield safety zones from future development.	Introduce Agusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.
	* Should negotiate with neighbouring councils in Dorset.	West Dorset District Council has been consulted on all decisions regarding the proposed direction for growth for the Yeovil Urban Extension.	No change.

	* Growth should be to the north of Yeovil.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Paragraph 5.22 - Experience from past example e.g. Milton Keynes is that little use is made of walking and cycling to the town centre for entertainment or work for reasons of weather and the need to carry purchases. Improved public transport would be more effective and this does not influence the north vs. south argument in Yeovil .	The distance of new development from the town centre is not only an important factor in encouraging walking and cycling but in the effectiveness of public transport routes by reducing journey times. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Paragraph 5.23 - Core strategy is self contradictory re; secondary school provision (para 4.69). Unclear what the Council means by passive solar gain, this is likely more effective on a south facing slope but not necessarily south of Yeovil. This meet only a small part of the energy requirement. The change in incidence angle of the sun is insignificant in moving from the south of Yeovil to the north. Provided the solar energy sources are on the roof and the property is not surrounded by high terrain there is little difference.	The Renewable Energy Study by Brooks Devlin / Font energy identify Solar PV as a small but important part of the renewable energy mix for the Yeovil Urban Extension. Solar PV works at its most efficient in a due Southern direction and for this reason southern slopes are preferred. Solar panels will work in other directions but at a significantly reduced efficiency. North sloping sites are not well suited to solar PV as they increase the likelihood of over shadow. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper and as presented to Project Management Board Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Mudford Parish Plan states that parishioners wish to continue to be a separate settlement and maintain the 'Green Gap' between Mudford and Yeovil and wish to protect the countryside from encroachment from Yeovil. Development on the northern escarpment south of Mudford would add to the existing flooding issues for Mudford village which adjoins the River Yeo's floodplain.	No development is proposed at Mudford.	No change.

.....	*Urban extension located at Keyford would result in a 500% increase in the population over a 10 year period, urbanise 30% of the agricultural land - local needs policy SS2 should also apply to East Coker - local needs development only. Core Strategy reflects needs and aspirations of Parish and Community Plans, East Coker's Parish Plan should also be considered and reflected in the Core Strategy.	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. Scale of growth is proportionate to Yeovil. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect the latest growth projections and additional years to 2028.
	*Rep 1486945 or 4327361 put forward 6 sites in Brympton & Coker and East Coker, Keyford * Barwick options - see rep for details.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No change.
	* SSDC has placed significant weight on landscape issues and no weight on others. For example the Historic and Rural Environment, land quality and impact on communities.	See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA. Disagree, significant weight has been given to the Historic & Rural Environment as well as land quality.	No change.
	* The setting to the north escarpment is predominately visual from long view (Ilchester and beyond) and can be mitigated by wood land which is also a recreational feature.	Noted. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No change.
	* Development to the north will not impact on the setting of Montacute or Brympton D'Evercy houses and parklands.	Disagree, the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment identifies large areas of land to the north of Yeovil as potentially impacting upon the setting of Montacute House and Grounds as well as Brympton D'Evercy. For this reason the impact has been listed as a negative for this direction of growth.	No change.
	* States that north and west areas affect the historical settings - Mudford has no areas or properties of such magnitude. Therefore, extend Lyde Road Key Site along A359 and river Yeo instead of preferred site.	Area to the North of Lyde Road Key site has been identified an area of low constraint but has insufficient capacity to accommodate proposed level of growth. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board Project and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	<p>* No mention of having commissioned a Historic Environment Assessment for Yeovil's area of search and the incorporation of the findings in the selection process - this is commensurate with the lack of attention to the historic environment running through the whole core strategy.</p>	<p>Disagree the Yeovil Historic Environment Assessment forms a part of the Council's evidence base and is referenced extensively throughout the Yeovil SA and within the positives and negatives listed for each growth option on pages 47-49. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* In order to go north from East Coker area you need to go through the town and out on the Ilchester Road to the M5 Bridgwater Junction. To go east you go through town and out on the Mudford road to join the A303 at Sparkford. In both cases you must go through the town.</p>	<p>All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their costs have been identified. Traffic also uses the A3088 to Cartgate as a major route from the town to A303 irrespective of then travelling north or south on that route.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Disagree with advice that development to the north will cause greater transport congestion than development to the south. If a northern link road is required what is to say an equally expensive southern link road would be needed in that location.</p>	<p>The latest Yeovil transport modelling study (January 2012) indicates that there is little difference in terms of traffic impact on the road network between the northern and southern options. A further study on highways infrastructure requirements (Nov 2011) estimates a £7.4m difference in costs between the north west option and southern option - a link road was not identified as being required for the southern option.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Disagree with paragraph 5.21 as there are routes to access the town via Lyde Road, St Michaels Avenue, Mudford Road, Ilchester Road, Larkhill and Western Avenue. The Key site highways improvements are designed to provide a key cross route for Yeovil. SSDC have already expressed their intention to improve cycling, walking and public transport for the north to reduce reliance on the car.</p>	<p>Improvements to the towns Key sites are and the western corridor have been factored into the traffic modelling undertaken by Parsons Brinckerhoff on behalf of Somerset County Council as Highways Authority. However, these works are required as mitigation for the development of the keysites and are not sufficient to accommodate significant further growth.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* Disagree with the Yeovil SA that states any northern option will require a link to the A3088 and consequently will impact on Montacute park and garden as there are several direct links to the A303. SCC also have plans to upgrade the highway across the north of Yeovil from Lufton to Lyde to link into the three key sites. The YTSR promotes a northern link road.	Improvements to the towns Key sites and the western corridor have been factored into the traffic modelling undertaken by Parsons Brinckerhoff on behalf of Somerset County Council as Highways Authority. Additional modelling has been commissioned to determine the impact of development with and without a direct link onto the A3088 to include alternative scenarios. Without a direct link to the A3088 access to a North West development is restricted.	No change.
	* Main line rail has limited ability to be improved but SSDC focus on as a major factor. Who use the train at Yeovil Junction, where do they come from, how do they get there?	Development to the South and South East present real opportunities to increase footfall at the towns two mainline Stations through enhanced public transport provision and better walking / cycle access. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board Project and Yeovil SA	No change.
	* Opportunity exists to improve non-car modes to Yeovilton and to the east and west as well as the town centre.	RNAS Yeovilton as a major out of town employer and can therefore not be regarded as a positive for a northern direction for growth.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	*Ultra Light Rail could serve the extension.	Noted. Throughout the period to 2028 there is likely to be expansion of existing technologies and viability to introduce these. Light rail can be an attractive option where there is sufficient critical mass and significant common journey patterns. Usually this occurs in settlements with more than 200,000 inhabitants. Therefore at present, the scale of growth envisaged for Yeovil, its existing population and diverse travel patterns mean that any feasibility study is likely to preclude it as a viable transport option for Yeovil.	No Change
	*The Northern part of Yeovil is a better option, easy access from A303 and would provide a Northern Link Road. There is an existing cycle path (the area is also relatively flat) in this location and it is well lit. The north is closer to existing employment. Flooding is not an issue here, it is in the Keyford area.	The ease of access by walking, cycling & public transport for all new sites and in the ability to link sites through adjoining areas to the town centre and major employment areas is critical to the degree of take up of sustainable transport modes. Achieving high rates of permeability is very important to the principle of the urban extension. Flooding issues have been considered. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board Project and Yeovil SA.	No Change

	<p>* Core Strategy will be incomplete if it does not consider the implications of traffic flow in surrounding villages. Additional traffic arising from growth will seek alternative routes at peak periods using Tintinhull's back roads from the A303. Junction on A303 with Tintinhull is unique for the number of permitted manoeuvres, is unmarked pedestrian crossing used by children - has the worst accident/mile record of the Somerset A303 - was damned as not reaching standard level 5 for a dual carriageway which should be class 6. 10 yrs of no improvements by the Highways Agency on this junction emphasises the need for SSDC to ensure that their strategy does demonstrate their awareness of such issues. Only a matter of time before there is a serious injury or worse in the village as a result of the lack of traffic calming.</p>	<p>All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. The traffic impact on surrounding villages is an issue for the Masterplanning process and Somerset County Council Future Transport Plan cites road safety as one of its key objectives to consider. Potential linkage of a North West development with Tintinhull Road is an adverse factor against a North West development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Concern regarding the seemingly small importance being placed on road safety in Tintinhull by the Core Strategy. Would like to see greater priority placed on this issues especially with the impact of the Key Site Development at Brimsmore.</p>	<p>All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. The traffic impact on surrounding villages is an issue for the Masterplanning process and Somerset County Council Future Transport Plan cites road safety as one of its key objectives to consider. Potential linkage of a North West development with Tintinhull Road is an adverse factor against a North West development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Paragraph 5.21 - should note the need for further technical assessment before reaching conclusions and suggest some additional wording.</p>	<p>Improvements to the towns Key sites and the western corridor have been factored into the traffic modelling undertaken by Parsons Brinckerhoff on behalf of Somerset County Council as Highways Authority. Additional modelling has been commissioned to determine the impact of the final preferred option for Yeovil's growth.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Disagree with Highways Agency advice, employers require new premises to have good transport links to the strategic road network.</p>	<p>Highways Agency advice refers to large scale residential development and not employment allocations.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* The Highways Agency advice is a general point and does not specifically say that development in the Dorset Edge, Barwick/Keyford &amp; Brympton/Coker locations could generate harmful impacts on the SRN (A303), impact evidence SSDC failed to produce in the Core Strategy or SA.</p>	<p>The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and have not raised any specific objections subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction. They have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



	*Northern option only discounted because of County Highway concerns, yet in para 5.22 stated that the Highways Agency have concerns over impact of Southern option on A303.	Paragraph 5.22 explains that growth further away from the A303 is preferred and not that development to the south wouldn't have a impact. The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and have not raised any specific objections subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction. They have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.	No change.
	* Should be located nearer to the A303.	Paragraph 5.22 explains that growth further away from the A303 is preferred and not that development to the south wouldn't have a impact. The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and have not raised any specific objections subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction. They have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.	No change.
	* Land to north of Yeovil has better access to A303.	Paragraph 5.22 explains that growth further away from the A303 is preferred and not that development to the south wouldn't have a impact. The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and have not raised any specific objections subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction. They have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.	No change.
	* Para 5.20 - If new access highways are being considered why is the Yeovil Western Corridor Study not available to the public?	This study is available on Somerset County Council's website.	No change.
	*The other options should be reconsidered in the context of highway improvements paid for by means other than developers.	Any major highways improvements would need to be paid for by the developer if the development is viable. Major strategic infrastructure may need to be funded externally if a site is unviable through external funding sources. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has explored other sources of funding available to the Council to pay for enhancement to the highway network. Highways improvements can be considered through planning obligation policies and secured as part of new development proposals.	No Change

<b>Option: East Coker/Keyford/Barwick</b>			
Option: East Coker/Keyford/Barwick (paras 5.27 – 5.28)			
	* 'Negative impact on local biodiversity including resident bat populations' need not be the case if ecological requirements are built into masterplans at the initial stage and development planned around them. Should read 'this option has a high concentration of biodiversity assets including European Protected Species.'	Agree to wording change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Amend Yeovil SA to reflect suggested wording change. Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Any development will need to demonstrate how populations of European Protected Species are maintained including the habitat to support those populations.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Ecotown Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required	No Change.
	* Paragraph 5.28 - 4th bullet - this need not be the case if ecological requirements are built into Masterplans at the initial stages. SSDC are responsible for the 'Favourable Conservation Status' of European Protected Species (EPS) under Reg 9 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species regulations 2010 (the Habitats Regulations), which requires local authorities to have regards for the provisions of the Habitats Directive. Any development will need to demonstrate how populations of EPS are maintained including habitat to support them. Negative should read that this Option has a high concentration of biodiversity assets including EPS.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Ecotown Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process.	No Change.
	* Development will destroy natural habitats.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Ecotown Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process.	No Change.
	* Para 5.27 states option presents an opportunity to enhance Yeovil Country Park as an Urban Park - this will have a negative impact on the area.	An opportunity exists to safeguard the Country Park from future development, improve its quality and make it more accessible to everyone to enjoy. This is considered a potential positive benefit.	No Change.

	* Proximity to Nine Springs Country Park does not mean opportunities for healthy living will be taken up. Likely that a good number of residents would struggle to walk or cycle due to the topography.	An opportunity exists to safeguard the Country Park from future development, improve its quality and make it more accessible to everyone to enjoy. This is considered a potential positive benefit.	No Change.
	* Urban Park - implies a subtle change in the use of Nine Springs - increasing the size and number of teenage children using the park is short sighted as the park is already suffering as a result of anti social behaviour and encroachment of the cinema complex, car parks etc.	An opportunity exists to safeguard the Country Park from future development, improve its quality and make it more accessible to everyone to enjoy. This is considered a potential positive benefit.	No Change.
	*Fungus and newts should be added to the list.	Agree that the fungus 'Sandy Stilt Puffball' and 'Great Crested Newt' are both protected species and should be acknowledged where they are recognised. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Amend Yeovil SA to make reference to protected species o Fungus and Newts where they are shown to exist.
	* Not only should eco-principles be sought to be achieved but the urban extension should also be built to a high standard using local materials/local style materials so that the built environment is consistent with the adjoining countryside. There is not much evidence of this elsewhere - cinema and retail element on Babylon Hill. Over years of development at eco standards will be forgotten but the impact on the countryside will remain.	Agree, the highest standards of design should be sought in any new development. Policy EQ2 seeks to achieve a high quality, which promotes South Somerset's local distinctiveness and preserves the character and appearance of the district.	No Change.
	* Once built the development will have a negative impact on the landscape.	Landscape quality is considered in the Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study which forms part of the evidence base. See also Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* It is suggested that this option has the capacity in landscape terms to accommodate the growth, argue that once built the development would significantly and negatively impact on the landscape.	see response above	see response above
	*Disagree with the negative points - does not mention negative impact on East Coker; cannot see how joining of East Coker and Yeovil could be avoided.	The Council is committed to introducing a 'green buffer' between all surrounding communities to prevent settlement coalescence. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce 'green buffer' policy.
	* Option will embrace nearby villages. (East Coker)	see response above	see response above

	* Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land a definite negative.	Agree, the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land is regarded as a negative aspect of development in this location. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* What is an urban park?	An Urban Park is a Park within a Town or City that offers recreation and Greenspace to residents of and visitors of that town or city (as opposed to a country park on the periphery).	
	* Yeovil Country Park is equidistant from all three options. Park improvements are far closer to the Brympton or West Dorset options. Why are they not listed as positives.	Agree that the Yeovil Country Park is accessible to new development located in the West Dorset Option.	No Change.
	* Public Inquiry has confirmed the risk of substantial landscape harm effecting the setting of Yeovil.	Landscape quality is considered in the Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	*Add to negative list - impact on Nash Priory (Grade I), Coker Court, Hymerford House, St Michael and All Angels Church (Grade I) and Pavyotts Mill (Grade II*) and North Coker House (Grade II).	Listed buildings are considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	*Part of option is located within immediate proximity to an Outstanding Heritage Settlement (see Structure Plan) (see 1558977)	East Coker is listed under Policy 8: Outstanding Heritage Settlements of the Somerset & Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan. The Historical context of East Coker is however considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base.	No Change.
	* Negative impacts on historic environment under estimated - failure to consider public support for extension to Conservation Area in East Coker Parish Plan.	East Coker is listed under Policy 8: Outstanding Heritage Settlements of the Somerset & Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan. The Historical context of East Coker is however considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base.	No Change.
	* HEA indicates some likelihood of damage to historic landscapes in the Western area.	The historical environment is considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.
	* HEA applies to several locations not just the south.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Will effect view from villages.	Impact on views is not a material consideration for making planning decisions.	No Change.

	* Brympton option is closer to Agusta Westlands and Lynx estate than the East Coker option.	Agree, Brympton / West Coker Option is closer to Agusta Westlands and Lynx Trading Estate than East Coker / Barwick Option.	Amend SA to reflect proximity of employment opportunities to Brympton / West Coker option.
	* Is there any evidence that building the urban extension will result in more job opportunities at Lynx and Agusta Westland's or that the people living in the homes will work there?	The location of the Urban Extension is positioned to maximise the opportunities for work in existing employment areas although new employment provision will also be being made within the urban extension.	No Change.
	* It is disingenuous to state that there will be new job opportunities created as a result of developing this option.	Growth 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 economic growth. The South Somerset Employment Land Review has used estimated population growth to calculate the amount of employment land needed for Yeovil. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	No Change.
	* Links with Yeovil Pen Mill station are overplayed, access would only be through driving. Also states Yeovil Junction will be brought back into urban area, Tower Lane is narrow - dangerous especially for cyclists and walkers who currently use this route. Increasing size of Tower Lane would damage ancient oaks and hedgerow, and Barwick follies and Aldon Estate.	Development to the South and South East present real opportunities to increase footfall at the towns two mainline Stations through enhanced public transport provision and better walking / cycle access. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	*Will not strengthen the use of rail.		
	*Bus route will not be an advantage to the East Coker option only.	East Coker / Barwick Option presents an opportunity for a high frequency figure of eight bus route between Yeovil Junction Station, the new development and the Town Centre. Other options do not, so easily.	No Change.
	*Figure of eight bus is ambitious aspiration for stations which see relatively little use.	see response above	No Change.

	*Disagree with following positive points - not a short distance from town centre (1.5 miles+), walking & cycling unrealistic, joining railway station is unviable, don't need south facing slopes to maximise solar.	East Coker / Keyford option is located the shortest distance from the Town Centre as the crow flies than any other option, this is a positive. The purpose of sustainable development is to maximise opportunities for walking / cycling, it can not enforce this. The Renewable Energy Study by Brooks Devlin/Font Energy identified Solar PV as a small but important part of the renewable energy for YUE. Solar PV works at its most efficient in a due southern direction and for this reason southern slopes are preferred. They will work, but significantly less efficiently on other slopes. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	*Multiple unclassified road links are scant and mostly less than two cars width.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. The traffic impact on surrounding villages and lanes is an issue for the Masterplanning process to consider.	No Change.
	*Following additional negative points should be added: HA consider development will have a harmful impact on the SRN (A303).	The Highways Agency have been consulted on detailed Traffic Modelling of Yeovil's directions for growth and have not raised any objections subject to detailed junction testing of the Cartgate Roundabout. They have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.	No Change.
	*Option is not linked to Cycle route which runs north to south.	Option has potential to link to National Cycle Route 24.	No Change.
	* Additional transport evidence is being sought therefore undue weight may have been given to transport benefits. Advice to Planning Inspectors states: "Evidence should be proportionate and should inform what is in the plan rather than being collected retrospectively in an attempt to justify the plan."	Since the publication of the draft Core Strategy, Somerset County Council has commissioned additional traffic Modelling (Feb / June 2011/January 2012) for all the directions for growth to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. Further detailed traffic modelling of the final preferred option has also been commissioned received and used to determine the scale of impact on the Cartgate Roundabout.	No Change.
	*Given that there is outstanding transport information, undue weight (in relation to transport) may have been given to this option without knowing all the facts.	See response above	No Change.

	* Paragraph 5.27 - Without a Traffic Impact Assessment how can the Highways Agency consider this option as acceptable? A comprehensive study is required.	see response above	No Change.
	* Links to Pen Mill station - how will these be achieved - would mean driving into Yeovil or through Bradford Abbas - how can this be considered positive?	There are already links from the Keyford / Barwick option to Pen Mill Station via footpaths along the Dodham Brook and through the Yeovil Country Park.	No Change.
	* Yeovil Pen Mill is the other side of the town centre.	see response above	No change
	* Unless a bus link is sponsored by a developer or businesses it won't come forward - cannot be presented as an advantage to the Coker option.	East Coker / Barwick Option presents an opportunity for a high frequency figure of eight bus route between Yeovil Junction Station, the new development and the Town Centre. Planning can only facilitate the opportunity for a bus route as it can not deliver without private sector investment.	No Change.
	* Paragraph 5.28 - as well as being constrained by a single A road the option has multiple unclassified road links - this will create numerous rat runs.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. The traffic impact on surrounding villages is an issue for the Masterplanning process to consider.	No Change.
	* Plans encourages rat runs to form.	see response above	No Change
	* No road improvements are planned in the South where improvements are anticipated in the North.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Development will give rise to increased journey times of over an hour. Is this viable?	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil.	No Change.
	* Not many people can cycle up and down the southern escarpment.	The steep topography to access the southern option is noted. Topography has been considered in comparing options as part of the Sustainability Appraisal, but one of the benefits of the southern option is its relative proximity to the town centre. Steep topography is an issue around much of Yeovil. Journeys within the proposed Urban Extension to local shops, schools, employment will be on relatively flat terrain.	No Change.
	* Steep escarpment to the south is underestimated.	No Change.	No Change.
	* Bus service will cause congestion and therefore more CO2 emissions.	Bus services reduce congestion by removing cars from the road network.	No Change.

	* West Dorset option makes no reference to access to Pen Mill Station as a positive.	Agree, reference to good access to Pen Mill Station from West Dorset Option should be acknowledged.	Amend Yeovil SA to acknowledge good access to Pen Mill Train Station.
	* Unless gradients are very steep, passive solar gain has little to do with aspect.	The Renewable Energy Study by Brooks Devlin / Font Energy identified Solar PV as a small but important part of the renewable energy mix for the Yeovil Urban Extension. Solar PV works at its most efficient in a due Southern direction and for this reason southern slopes are preferred. Solar panels will work in other directions but at a significantly reduced efficiency. North sloping sites are not well suited to solar PV as they increase the likelihood of over shadow. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Solar capture does not rely on direct sunlight.	No Change.	No Change.
	*Option would severely impact on dark skies.	Agree that the impact on dark skies should be considered a negative for this option and all other options but disagree that growth in this direction will severely impact on this designation as light pollution would be absorbed into the existing Yeovil glow. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Cause light pollution.	see response above	No Change.
	* Option does not meet local aspirations in the Parish Plans.	Parish Plans should be prepared in conformity with the Core Strategy.	No Change.
	* Area of the option with potential land capacity is poorly related to the Yeovil Town Centre	Disagree, the area of land within the proposed direction for growth and identified in the SHLAA as suitable, available and viable is well related to the town centre. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	*Option would have an adverse impact on health and well-being by urbanising extensive rural rights of way system.	Disagree, the proposed Urban Extension will contain large areas of open space provision (40% if Eco-town principles are achievable). It would be expected that most rights of way will either be retained or diverted through new open space being created.	No Change.



	* Development within the option would adversely change the character and distinctiveness of the rural communities in its vicinity.	Where possible the design of the Urban Extension will seek to retain the character and distinctiveness of rural communities. In addition the Council is seeking to introduce a green buffer policy to provide a barrier between existing settlements and screen development and they are to preserve the character of North and East Coker.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.
	* Para 5.27 - Additional Positives in respect of Keyford are: The location was put forward by the Planning Inspector in 2003 (Local Plan), there is enough land available at Keyford unlike other options, the physical distance from these villages is geographically such that they will be impacted only marginally by any development to the south of Yeovil.	Agree, reference to Planning Inspectors Report to the Local Plan and land supply should be acknowledged in the Yeovil SA.	Make reference to the Local Planning Inspectors recommendation and the supply of land in this area in the SA.
	* What is the methodology for balancing the negatives and positives. Does the benefit of facilitating links to the National Cycle Network Route No.26 outweigh the loss of countryside?	Sustainability Appraisal identifies likely significant effects of the policies and recommends mitigation measures accordingly. Therefore it is not simply a matter balancing negative or positives, but an overall judgement as to how to ensure sustainable development.	No Change.
	* Based on the SHLAA how will settlement coalescence be avoided when Naish will be 200m from the urban extension.	The Council is committed to introducing a green buffer between all surrounding communities to prevent settlement coalescence. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA and propose the introduction of a buffer zone.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.
	* Development should be at least 1 kilometre from any existing village.	see response above	No Change.
	* Failure to identify available plots makes the Draft Core Strategy look less transparent.	The Core Strategy is a strategic document that should only identify broad directions for growth. Detailed site allocations will be made in the Yeovil Urban Extension Masterplan.	No Change.
	* Object to any development in this option (especially north of Camp Hill, Pavyotts Lane & Barwick Park).	The Core Strategy is a strategic document that should only identify broad directions for growth. Detailed site allocations will be made in the Yeovil Urban Extension Masterplan.	No Change.
	* Negatives should include: impact on East Coker, constraint of flooding on the southern border of the sites, impact on wildlife. List provides the reasons for rejecting the option.	Paragraph 5.28 already makes reference to the impact on East Coker, local biodiversity and flooding.	No Change.

	* Destroy agricultural land.	Paragraph 5.28 already makes reference to the loss of Grade 1 Agricultural Land. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* The Option identified is too small to accommodate the proposed level of growth.	The Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board estimates the likely amount of land required for an Urban Extension for 2,500 dwellings as includes an indicative Masterplan depicting how this might work.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Brympton and West Dorset are just as far from the town centre as the East Coker option and can be accessed easily by walking and cycling.	East Coker / Keyford option is located closer to the town centre than Brympton Option but would agree that West Dorset option is equally close to the town centre.	Amend supporting text to reference proximity to the town centre.
	* Goldenstones may be closed to fund sports zone.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Population increase in parish of East Coker would be out of proportion.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target has increased from the level set in the Draft Core Strategy to 8,600 dwellings.
	* Rights of way in the countryside is not a positive.	Disagree, access to rights of way are positive for health and well being as well as accessibility.	No Change.
	* Option is poorly located to Yeovil College, adult education facilities and Hospital	Disagree- this option is approximately 1 mile from these facilities, which offers potential to use alternatives to the car.	No Change.
	* Option would be detrimental to the existing residential areas of south Yeovil and rural communities on the southern edge.	Disagree, development presents an opportunity to introduce new facilities and enhance existing communities.	No Change.
Option: Brympton/Coker (5.29 – 5.30)	* Object to any development in West Coker.	Objection noted.	No Change.
	* The area should be protected from development.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Much of the land is Grade 1 agricultural land, not part.	Paragraph 5.28 already makes reference to the loss of Grade 1 Agricultural Land. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* The roads flood regularly.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Cycle routes go down the fairly steep Bunford Hollow.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Para 5.30 add the following - Naish Priory, mature hedges and trees, mesotrophic grassland.	Agreed.	Amend text.

	* Object to any development in this location given the impact it would have on Brympton D'Evercy.	Brympton D'Evercy is considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Paragraph 5.30 - An additional negative for the Brympton /Coker option - the Planning Inspector who considered the Bunford allocation in 2005 expressed the view that because of the sensitivity of Brympton House, land should not be developed to the north of the existing employment allocation.	Brympton D'Evercy is considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Para 5.29 Lack of traffic modelling should be addressed.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling report.	No Change.
	* 'Negative impact on local biodiversity including resident bat populations' need not be the case if ecological requirements are built into masterplans at the initial stage and development planned around them. Should read 'this option has a high concentration of biodiversity assets including European Protected Species.'	Agree to wording change.	Amend Yeovil SA to reflect suggested wording change. Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* SSDC should look at the cost benefit of each option rather than grand expensive schemes that make little difference to the majority of the population. For example to locate an Urban extension (12% of Yeovil's population) in proximity to Yeovil Junction Station is not cost effective considering the high cost of sustainable transport infrastructure against the small increase in rail travel and the detrimental impact to rural environment.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Access to Goldenstones should be listed as a positive for the Brympton Option.	In relative terms the southern direction for growth is best related to Goldenstones Leisure centre although would acknowledge that both the Eastern West Dorset option and Western West Coker option both have good access to Goldenstones Leisure centre along the dismantled railway line.	No Change.

<b>Option: West Dorset/Over Compton</b>			
Option: West Dorset/Over Compton (5.31 – 5.33)	* Potentially least impact on biodiversity resources and provides greater enhancement opportunity than the other options.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Eco-town Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process.	No change.
	* Positives should add that the Option has the least impact on biodiversity resources and provides greater enhancement opportunity than other options. Statement Re: bats should be deleted as impacts can easily be avoided or mitigated.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Eco-town Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process.	No change.
	* Point that Option is constrained by a single A road is not strong enough. The road that bisects the site is only accessible for a very short distance because of topographical constraints. The road is some distance from large parts of the site requiring a large internal distributor road network. The resulting traffic is point load is difficult to improve and will impact on Yeovil's eastern corridor beyond capacity. Unlike other sites there are no alternatives.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports. Points are well made.	No change.
	* Access to Goldenstones should be listed as a positive for West Dorset option.	In relative terms the southern direction for growth is best related to Goldenstones Leisure centre although would acknowledge that both the Eastern West Dorset option and Western West Coker option both have good access to Goldenstones Leisure centre along the dismantled railway line.	No Change.
	*Development should be addressed in conjunction with West Dorset. Suggested in past that Yeovil Junction station could be moved a couple of 100m to east and serve London & Bristol lines. Improved links would make Stoford/Bradford Abbas worthy of consideration.	West Dorset District Council have been consulted at all stages in the Planning process. It would be impractical and financially unviable to move either of the towns two train stations.	No change.
<b>What is the Council's Preferred Option For Growth</b>			
What is the Council's Preferred Option For Growth (Paras 5.34-5.37)	* Long standing presumption against development in the south is incorrect, Ivel Barbarians is an example of development. The northern escarpment has had a long standing presumption against development.	Ivel Barbarians development is sports and recreation based which is an acceptable use in areas outside settlements limits.	No Change.

	* Naish Priory has not been mentioned it should be listed as a negative in the Brympton / East Coker options.	Listed buildings are considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Support of the preferred direction of growth. Glad to see that it is not proposed to develop north of Primrose Lane or down towards Mudford.	Support noted.	No Change.
	*Lack of due process - failure to give proper consideration to all alternative sites and proper consultation has not taken place.	Disagree - see Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Preferred Option has been chosen based on expediency not proper consideration.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Land to north of Yeovil has better access to A303.	Paragraph 5.22 explains that the further away growth is from the A303 the less likely it is to have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and Cartgate Roundabout in particular. The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and has not raised any specific objections, subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction but does prefer development to be further away from the A303.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Build on Grade 3 agricultural land not Grade 1.	Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	* Growth should be to the north of Yeovil.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Has not been a study to demonstrate which option is most favourable, no consideration has been given to a less concentrated distribution across South Somerset or more generally around less historically sensitive areas.	The SA has been updated (June 2011) to explore alternative growth scenarios including concentrating growth at Yeovil as opposed to distributing growth across Rural Areas. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA which considers all issues concerning the proposed directions for Yeovil's growth.	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>* Agusta Westland are concerned about developments around Yeovil, particularly to the South, South West, South East and East as these will affect the safe operation and continued use of the airfield. The company could risk losing its aerodrome Licence if development takes place in the protected zones (referred to under other issues). Agusta Westland is trying to expand its business and safeguard employment - this includes undertaking work to modify or repaired existing aircraft. This may involve extensive flight trials and as such the aerodrome Licence must be safeguarded as it would hinder any future new development aircraft programmes. Agusta Westland previously objected to the Bunford Park employment allocation as the land should be kept open for flights in and out in the event of an unexpected event. The land to the south is the only open land left.</p>	<p>The Council's position is to support Agusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. Agusta Westland's have submitted representation to the Council seeking to safeguard their airfield safety zones from future development. Points are well made and to be addressed by safeguarding land for flight safety reasons. See main report to District Executive.</p>	<p>Introduce Agusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.</p>
	<p>* Agusta Westland has previously notified SSDC that the section of Bunford Lane from the Cartgate roundabout to the Agusta Westland entrance is privately owned by the company but is used by many as a short cut to the Lynx Trading Estate or Lysander Road. Bunford Lane bridge is in need of major repairs and will need to be closed whilst they are carried out. Agusta Westland may have to consider closing Bunford Lane to general use therefore any traffic surveys will need to take this into account.</p>	<p>Noted, repair work has subsequently been carried out.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* The least hilly option should be chosen to allow easy access by cycle.</p>	<p>Noted; steep topography is an issue around much of Yeovil.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
<p>Policy YV2 Yeovil Urban Extension</p>	<p>* No detailed traffic survey has been undertaken to assess the impacts of the proposal. Would generate 3,000 vehicle trips per hour a peak times in and out of proposal onto A30</p>	<p>All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	* Concerns regarding the impact of additional traffic on the surrounding villages and in the town including congestion on Hendford Hill, Newton Road approach to Yeovil, West Coker Road, Lysander Road, Coombe Street Lane A37, A30, A303, A3088. Village roads are not suitable, especially if no additional link roads being built. Access to the M5. Will new roads be built to take traffic into Yeovil, to the A303 and the A37?	see response above	No Change.
	* Object to Urban Extension as the resultant traffic will increase congestion (Town Centre, Sandhurst Road, Forest Hill, Turners Barn Lane, East Coker Road, Lower Wraxhill Road, Quicksilver roundabout, Dorchester Road, Cartgate) and businesses will relocate. A ring-road is required.	see response above	No Change.
	* Will improved road safety measures be put in place?	see response above	No Change.
	* Access for horse riders, farm vehicles and parents walking children to school will be difficult.	see response above	No Change.
	* A30 is not a major route - is single carriageway apart from the stretch between Sherborne and Yeovil. Town is poorly related to the motorway. The South West Rail service is on a single line and has limited capacity for a vibrant business community.	see response above	No Change.
	* Emergency services are located centrally - how will they function?	Not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* Access to Yeovil Junction is not easy - single track road, difficulty crossing the A37. Yeovil Junction and Pen Mill station over 2 miles apart.	Development to the South and South East present real opportunities to increase footfall at the towns two mainline Stations through enhanced public transport provision and better walking / cycle access. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA	No Change.
	* Proposal will lead to rat running through Yeovil's residential streets and surrounding villages. Examples cited; the village of East Coker, East Coker road cemetery, Beaconsfield/Wraxhill/Turners Barn Lane, Closworth, Halstock, Sutton Bingham, Pendomer and Hardington.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their estimated costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports. Points are well made.	No Change.



	* Journeys by foot and cycle along Dorchester Road, Hendford Hill and West Coker Road to main employment areas in Yeovil will be hazardous and steep.	The Core Strategy is a strategic document that must identify broad directions for growth any specific safety concerns will be considered at the Masterplanning stage.	No Change.
	* Cycling will be hazardous. Investment in cycle paths may be wasted as they could be underused due to the topography of Yeovil.	see response above	No Change.
	* People will not walk into town, it is too far and hilly.	Noted; steep topography is an issue around much of Yeovil.	No Change.
	* North of Yeovil has better connectivity to the A303 and is closer to the main rail links at Taunton and Castle Cary.	Paragraph 5.22 explains that the further away growth is from the A303 the less likely it is to have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and Cartgate Roundabout in particular. The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and has not raised any specific objections, subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports.	No Change.
	* Where will the feeder roads go?	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. The traffic impact on surrounding villages is an issue for the Masterplanning process to consider.	No Change.
	* If development is in the north problems at the Cartgate junction could be solved as the area is relatively undeveloped.	Paragraph 5.22 explains that the further away growth is from the A303 the less likely it is to have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and Cartgate Roundabout in particular. The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and has not raised any specific objections, subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction but have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.	No Change.
	* Keyford does not provide any close transport link, by foot, bus, cycle, car or otherwise.	Development to the South and South East present real opportunities to increase footfall at the towns two mainline Stations through enhanced public transport provision and better walking / cycle access.	No Change.

	* Proposal will exacerbate commuting.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their estimated costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports. Points are well made.	No Change.
	* Car usage will increase.	see response above	see response above
	* Increased congestion is likely to have an adverse impact on Yeovil's economy.	see response above	see response above
	*The development will increase commuting, the time when people lived and worked in close proximity has gone.	see response above	see response above
	* Electric cars will still mean congestion.	Noted. Electric cars do however contribute to the UK Carbon reduction targets and should be encouraged through planning policy where practical.	No Change.
	* Are there plans to link the two railway stations together?	There is no prospect of linking the stations together via a train link however East Coker / Barwick Option presents an opportunity for a high frequency figure of eight bus route between Yeovil Junction Station, the new development and the Town Centre. Planning can only facilitate the opportunity for a bus route as it can not deliver without private sector investment.	No Change.
	* There is not enough town centre parking to accommodate this growth. Where will the new car parks be.	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.
	* Comments from the Highways Agency regarding the ability to develop to the north of Yeovil are not well founded.	The Highways Agency has been consulted on the Council's preferred direction for growth and have not raised any specific objections, subject to detailed modelling of the final preferred option on the Cartgate Junction but have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303. They have indicated a preference for development further away from the A303.	No Change.
	* Proposal will cut across many existing footpaths and bridleways.	Noted. New development will seek to incorporate existing footpaths and bridleways where possible.	No Change.

	* Keyford should only be considered if a by-pass is built between Yeovil, the A303 and M5.	Somerset County Council as Highways Authority has advised that there is insufficient finance available to fund either a by-pass or ring road for Yeovil. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has confirmed this position.	No Change.
	* A by-pass is needed to take traffic away from West Coker Road and Hendford Hill.	see response above	No Change.
	* Why was this site chosen before the transport review and HEA were available.	The Yeovil Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates an evolving process of site identification and at all times was caveated with reference to the emerging evidence base which included the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment, Yeovil Traffic Modelling and South Somerset Infrastructure Delivery Plan. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Already several residential properties for sale outside Yeovil Junction Railway Station.	Noted.	No Change.
	* People will not travel to work in Yeovil by train?	Passenger footfall varies considerably between the two stations with Yeovil Junction having an average footfall of some 354 passengers per day (0700-19:00) over the period 2001-2008 whereas the equivalent figure for Yeovil Pen Mill is 227 passengers per day. Rail use is generally low but a key aim of the council is to integrate rail travel with other transport modes.	No Change.
	* Yeovil Junction has poor access from the proposed site. The station cannot be moved. It is a red herring to suggest so many people will use the train.	see response above	No Change.
	* With Gov cut backs who will be employed to upkeep the roads and green space.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	Essential that developer contributions for highways infrastructure improvements are actually spent in Yeovil and do not disappear in a 'communal pot' and get lost.	The Council has indicated they mean to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). All development will be expected to contribute towards this funding pot which will be spent on key council priorities.	No Change.
	*Would result in existing sustainable modes of transport becoming unviable/unsafe. More cars would make existing cyclists less likely to continue cycling and the bus service would take longer due to increased congestion on the roads.	Disagree, new development presents a real opportunity to improve walking and cycling connections to the town centre through new footpaths and cycle ways. Increased passenger numbers would also improve public transport provision in the town which can be given priority routes.	No Change.

	*Mentions 'multiple unclassified road links', but these can only refer to Two Tower Lane and a number of small roads to the west of the hospice, these are not logical routes into town.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network in Yeovil. The traffic impact on surrounding villages and routes is an issue for the Masterplanning process to consider. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports.	No Change.
	*Access to the proposed site is no good.	see response above	No Change.
	*Government's recent announcement in relation to rural bus subsidies should be taken into consideration - Somerset will take a 57% reduction, what impact will that have on the ability to fund a bus?	Noted. Bus services in Yeovil are almost exclusively 'Commercial', which means they operate without subsidy.	No Change.
	*Dorchester road difficult to cross when events being held in showground, development will exacerbate the problem.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their estimated costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports.	No Change.
	* The A37 Dorchester to Yeovil is extremely busy with a large number of commercial vehicles from Weymouth Ferries onto Yeovil, A303, M5 and M3. Additional traffic from new development will create a bottle neck. Traffic lights may help.	see response above	No Change.
	*The land is elevated upon a scarp slope, sustainable transport is not viable. Cycling is a dangerous option as Hendford Hill and Forest Hill are not suitable.	Disagree, new development presents a real opportunity to improve walking and cycling connections to the town centre through new footpaths and cycle ways.	No Change.
	* Do not believe that SSDC have correctly assessed the impact of an extra 3000 cars on the key routes through Yeovil. Majority of residents will need to travel north towards the key employment areas.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their estimated costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports.	No Change.

	*What provision will be made for cycling and using public transport?	New development presents a real opportunity to improve walking and cycling connections to the town centre through new footpaths and cycle ways. Increased passenger numbers would also improve public transport provision in the town which can be given priority routes.	No Change.
	*Traffic congestion would lead to pollution, especially in Yeovil with prevailing winds.	Issue is considered in the Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Noise pollution caused by traffic.	Agreed.	Amend Yeovil SA to acknowledge noise pollution caused by traffic.
	* When proposal for a Business Park in Keyford was put forward in 2003, a relief road was considered from Red House roundabout to A30. Will the Urban Extension require a relief road, and if so, who will pay for it?	Somerset County Council as Highways Authority has advised that there is insufficient finance available to fund either a by-pass or ring road for Yeovil. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has confirmed this position.	No Change.
	* There have been insufficient traffic surveys undertaken to establish traffic flows north and south of the Town Centre.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their estimated costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports.	No Change.
	*An adequate road scheme for the entire Southern area of Yeovil is required if this site is developed.	see response above	No change
	*The development will have a negative impact on the day-to-day lives of existing Yeovil residents in terms of access to major roads into and out of Yeovil.	see response above	No change
	*Congestion will get worse when the proposed development's at Seafire Business Park and Bunford Business Park are complete and operating.	see response above	No change
	* It seems inconsistent that the option is viewed as viable in highway terms, yet the single 'A' Road access is cited as negative in documentation.	see response above	No change

	*Alternative sites - <b>(1)</b> away from existing inhabitants and close to major road networks should be considered. <b>(2)</b> develop South East - build new road from Sherborne Road triangle to Junction Station at bottom of Newton Surmaville Valley and extend town along that valley to encompass the station, so town is not divorced from main public transport assets. <b>(3)</b> smaller site extending no further than White Post.	see response above	No change
	* Development should have provision for a park and ride scheme.	The UWE report identifies Yeovil as a suitable location for a Park and Bus scheme a matter for subsequent masterplanning.	No Change.
	* Unconvinced that sufficient, quality bus services can operate - can you offer reassurance.	The UWE report identifies Yeovil as a suitable location for a Quality Bus Partnership to be introduced, a matter for subsequent masterplanning.	No Change.
	* Disagree that people will ever walk to work or school.	The Core Strategy can't make people walk to work or school but can facilitate opportunities to do so through the location of development.	No Change.
	* Increase in learner drivers.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* New development should have access to the A303.	All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their estimated costs have been identified. See Project Management Board consideration of Parsons Brinckerhoff Traffic Modelling Reports. IDP presents evidence that the Yeovil Urban Extension has a reasonable prospect of being funded.	No Change.
	* Any road required for the Urban Extension will be costly and unviable to build. Question the overall viability of the scheme.	see response above	No Change.
	* Support the proposed urban extension. Although it will have to be examined carefully to ensure it can accommodate 3,700 dwellings. It is considered that the land to the east of the A37 has a higher level of constraints and therefore most if not all the allocation will need to extend west to the A37 in the vicinity of Keyford. Early work should be undertaken to determine the scale and constraints within the area.	see response above	No Change.

	* North of Yeovil is preferred as it has good links to the A303. Object to the proposal to the South of Yeovil because of traffic congestion resulting in more pollution, more delays and more accidents.	see response above	No Change.
	* I question that Somerset County Council have adequately assessed viability of the Keyford site in respect of transport.	see response above	No Change.
	*Alternative Site (to YV2) - Extension to Bunford Park - The Core Strategy SA recognised its merits, but it featured badly on Transport because of proximity to the train station, although proximity to main employment uses was ignored. The Council's landscape Study looked at the land's potential to accommodate development and it was viewed favourably - report appended to submission 4315809 to justify alternative site.	Land in this area is constrained by the proximity to Brympton D'Evercy Historic Park and Garden and the Airfield Safeguarding Zone, and the residual land that is not constrained would not be of sufficient scale to deliver the proposed urban extension.	No Change.
	* Brownfield sites in and around Yeovil should be used first e.g. Augusta Westland site.	PPS3 seeks to maximise the use of Previously Developed land however it is not possible to introduce a Policy that enforces this objective as delivery of brownfield sites is notoriously difficult.	No change.
	* Concerned that developing the public playing field situated between Sandhurst Road and Lower Wraxhill and Wraxhill Roads may be considered for housing development.	The playing field at Sandhurst Road / Lower Wraxhill Road is identified as a no development area under the Yeovil proposals map and will be protected from development by saved SSLP Policy EH10.	No Change.
	* Concerns regarding the capacity of Yeovil Hospital to cope with demands of increased population	Issue is considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which has not identified any need for expansion at present time.	No Change.
	* Wrong location for growth.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.

	* Scale of growth - too many new houses - are the population projections correct - extension too large?	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target has increased from the level set in the Draft Core Strategy to 8,600 dwellings. The requirement of 2,500 dwellings to be built out at a density of 45 dph in a land take of 133ha.
	* Methodology used to ascertain the number of homes needed is flawed. ONS statistics suggest that South Somerset will only need 7600 houses.	see response above	see response above
	* 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%.	see response above	see response above
	* There is no longer a Government requirement to build a specific number of extra dwellings.	see response above	see response above
	* There will be a substantial increase in the number of people (8000 - 10000) and vehicles (3000).	see response above	see response above
	*Present Government is not interested in eco building that is not supported by the local community.	see response above	see response above
	* Yeovil can sustain itself without inward migration - Brownfield sites in other parts of the UK should be used.	see response above	see response above
	* Would be prudent to wait for the Census 2011 data.	see response above	see response above
	*Almost 25% of the total housing growth for the District will go to Keyford.	see response above	see response above
	*YUE should be 5,000 dwellings.	see response above	see response above
	* Whilst having no 'in principle' objection to the introduction of Eco-town standards it is clear that the development does not meet the minimum requirements set out in the Supplement to PPS1. This refers to 5,000 dwellings which would suggest that the scale of the extension should be increased - would result in a requirement for at least 220 hectares of land.	see response above	see response above



	*Support the principle of the urban extension, but feel that figure should be 4,500 not 3,700 homes. Development at this scale would be achievable, deliverable and sustainable. Do not see a clear justification for reducing the figure.	see response above	see response above
	* Any housing should be restricted to the north of Camp Hill, Pavyotts Lane and Barwick Park.	The Council is committed to introducing a green buffer between all surrounding communities to prevent settlement coalescence. Specific development lines will be considered in the subsequent Masterplanning process programmed to follow the Adoption of the Core Strategy. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.
	* Would prefer more balanced growth across South Somerset with possibly a new stand alone eco-town.	A free-standing new town 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 also conflict with the vision within the South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy the soon to be revoked Regional Spatial Strategy and would not achieve any wider strategic goals. On a practical level there have been no sites promoted by developers of a suitable size to accommodate a free-standing new town and therefore the physical and environmental constraints have not been assessed, but could prove prohibitive. A new town would also be unlikely to be viable given the cost of providing all the necessary infrastructure associated with a free-standing new community. 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. See South Somerset New Town Paper.	No Change.
	* Growth should be concentrated in 1 area rather than diversified.	The advantages and disadvantages of placing the urban extension in one site or several have been considered. The assessment undertaken of the relative merits demonstrates the case for one Urban Extension. The key benefits are; access for residents to jobs and facilities, better CO2 reduction performance and cheaper energy, more sustainable transport and potentially a cheaper overall cost for development.	One site is preferred over a multi-site option.

	* Support in principle, but feel that one single extension is inappropriate, it is a high risk strategy	The advantages and disadvantages of placing the urban extension in one site or several have been considered. The assessment undertaken of the relative merits demonstrates the case for one Urban Extension. The key benefits are; access for residents to jobs and facilities, better CO2 reduction performance and cheaper energy, more sustainable transport and potentially a cheaper overall cost for development.	One site is preferred over a multi-site option.
	* Alternative land is available.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Population of East Coker will increase and damage the feeling of community.	Noted - a green buffer is proposed between East Coker and the proposed urban extension.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.
	* There are more suitable sites on the north side of Yeovil.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Density currently calculated at 30 dph this could be raised to 60 dph as in Bath which is a desirable place to live, instead of losing Greenfield land.	It is proposed to delete the Density policy and deal with this issue on a site by site basis taking into account the most efficient use of land and the character of the area. There is no reason why a well design proposal at 50-60dph would not be acceptable in certain parts of the district. The requirement of 2,500 dwellings to be built out at a presumed density of 45 dph in a land take of 133ha. This is considered a reasonable density that will be further defined as part of the subsequent masterplanning.	No change.

	* Density is too high, should be 50 dph overall but range between 30-50. This figure would be more in keeping with the location and allow for a range of family housing.	It is proposed to delete the Density policy and deal with this issue on a site by site basis taking into account the most efficient use of land and the character of the area. There is no reason why a well design proposal at 50-60dph would not be acceptable in certain parts of the district. The requirement of 2,500 dwellings to be built out at a presumed density of 45 dph in a land take of 133ha. This is considered a reasonable density that will be further defined as part of the subsequent masterplanning.	No change.
	* To what extent was the choice of site determined by the willingness of landowners to make land available?	The councils preferred direction for growth should have sufficient land for the first 5 years of development that is suitable, available and viable. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension
	* Development should be to the north of Yeovil.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension
	* Should build on Ham Hill.	Disagree Ham Hill is a protected geological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Scheduled Ancient Monument, Iron & Bronze Age hill fort, Roman site, Local Nature Reserve and country park. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension

	<p>*Would be better to expand existing Lyde Road Key Site, access off Babylon Hill roundabout - close proximity to existing railway station and the country park, public footpaths and bridleway networks are all accessed from this part of town. This location would satisfy the following policies - SS3, SS4, SS5, SS6, SS7, YV4 &amp; YV5. Additional housing in this location would compliment what is there already. The saved policies and proposals of the South Somerset Local Plan state that provision should be made for housing in support of need by adjacent Parishes, as Mudford abuts Yeovil it seems appropriate that 6-12 hectares of land encompassing Hales Meadow to Mudford Bridge should be developed - accords with HG4 and HG5.</p>	<p>A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. This proposal alone could not meet the identified housing requirement and there are clear advantages of a single Urban Extension site rather than several. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.</p>	<p>Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension</p>
	<p>* Ignores potential for cost effective, sustainable development associated with existing and committed developments elsewhere in town, results in one large scale development which could exacerbate any adverse impacts - suggest revised approach - development focused on eastern and western sides of the growth arc (see submission 4315809 for detail). Urge council to review the single site approach and develop a number of sites in a holistic approach whilst protecting sensitive locations.</p>	<p>The advantages and disadvantages of placing the urban extension in one site or several have been considered. The assessment undertaken of the relative merits demonstrates the case for one Urban Extension. The key benefits are; access for residents to jobs and facilities, better CO2 reduction performance and cheaper energy, more sustainable transport and potentially a cheaper overall cost for development. A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.</p>	<p>Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension</p>

	* Changes in the national age of retirement may rise levels of employment required above demographic trends. Employment figures should be expressed in terms of numbers and distribution of people who live in the urban extension and the number of jobs anticipated. The number and distribution of dwellings is a secondary element and ought to be revised annually as the SHLAA informs the state of play. Principally used to inform a 5 year housing land supply. The amount of employment land vary as business job densities vary. Other plans use floorspace sq m of office, retail & warehousing.	Growth 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. Agree that the Urban Extension should also be expressed as people and jobs as well as dwellings and ha of employment land for the reasons raised.	Amend wording of Policy SS5 and its supporting text and the relevant sections in Chapter 6 & 7 to include a job and floorspace target for individual settlements (Rural Settlements job and floorspace figure will be combined as the small numbers involved make accurate projections difficult).
	* Restricts build rates, so limits implementation.	Growth 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 housing market capacity. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	No Change.
	* Unforeseen constraints from landowner or infrastructure could put whole strategy at risk.	see response above	No Change.
	* Restricts the range and choice of housing.	see response above	No Change.
	* Restricts potential for new development to deliver improvements to physical and social infrastructure.	see response above	No Change.
	*Urban extension should be smaller and constrained to areas adjacent to the existing built up area of Yeovil.	see response above	No Change.
	*Respected bodies (TCPA Rural Challenge) have doubts about Urban Extensions - negative impact on edge of towns, urban sprawl, inner centre areas disenfranchised, does not aid rural sustainability.	The TCPA believes that the full range of planning solutions – urban regeneration, sustainable urban extensions or, where appropriate, new settlements – should be available to communities to choose from as they search for the most sustainable pattern of development locally. The issue of one or several sites is considered by Project Management Board in the Yeovil Urban Extension discussion paper.	No Change.

	*Do not believe that there is not sufficient capacity on existing brownfield sites to accommodate required growth (suggest Lysander Road, land between Tintinhull Road, Thorne Lane & Larkhill Road).	An assessment of the likely development within the Urban Framework has been made on the basis of completions, commitments as at April 2010, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sites and a subjective planning assessment of potential additional sites with development potential. As a result a range of 4,452 – 5,204 dwellings were identified. The report recommends that the higher end be accepted, as an ambitious target is considered appropriate.	Endorse the potential dwelling provision within the Yeovil Urban Framework be 6,100 dwellings.
	* Has previously developed land been considered.	see response above	see response above
	*There are large areas of Yeovil (within existing urban frame) that are under-developed and there is employment land that has no end user, these would be better developed than Greenfield sites.	see response above	see response above
	*Agusta Westland's object to development to the South, South East, South West and East of Yeovil as it will affect the safe operation and continued use of the airfield - detailed explanation of why included (see 4296865).	The Council's position is to support Agusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. See Agusta Westland's flight path paper, Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Introduce Agusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.
	* Requirement of 3719 dwellings and 23 hectares should be expressed as population and jobs.	Agree, housing and employment should be expressed as both dwelling and approximate population numbers and ha / jobs.	Amend Core Strategy to make reference to dwellings and approximate population and ha / jobs.
	* Housing has been brought forward at high population densities. Leading to under provision of physical and social infrastructure. It is not possible to deliver adequate infrastructure retrospectively.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Bradford Abbas Parish Council object to all development options to the south in favour to the north. Positives for the south are overstated and negatives are understated. Development to the east has significant flooding issues or congestion of Babylon Hill.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	* There is no demand for new development in Yeovil.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	The Plan period is extended to 2028 to reflect a 15 year time horizon. Yeovil's housing growth target will reflect growth projections, evidence of deliverability and environmental constraints.
	*The proposed development is unnecessary, proposed to meet national targets that do not exist locally.	see response above	see response above
	* Disagree with the scale of growth directed to East Coker Parish, it will potentially make East Coker the 4th largest settlement in South Somerset. It would no longer be an outstanding heritage settlement - against Policy 8 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park, Joint Structure Plan.	A buffer zone is proposed between the proposed urban extension and East Coker - there is no plan to extend East Coker itself. East Coker is listed under Policy 8: Outstanding Heritage Settlements of the Somerset & Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan. This policy is currently saved, however it will no longer be saved when the Localism Bill come into effect. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	Continue to include a buffer zone between the proposed Yeovil urban extension and East Coker.
	*Object to the precise location of the Urban Extension, land to the east of the A37 (Aldon and Barwick park) are unsuitable for development, A37 Dorchester Road would form a logical boundary to development, this should form the eastern boundary of the YUE, YUE should lie to the west of A37, land immediately to the west of Plackett Lane could be developed without causing coalescence with East and North Coker.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	*Rep 1486945 or 4327361 put forward 6 Alternative Sites in Brympton & Coker and East Coker, Keyford * Barwick options - see rep for details.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	<p>*Range of sites around Yeovil required, not just one as there are deliverability issues - land at Stone Farm should be developed, 10ha available for 300-350 homes</p>	<p>The advantages and disadvantages of placing the urban extension in one site or several have been considered. The assessment undertaken of the relative merits demonstrates the case for one Urban Extension. The key benefits are; access for residents to jobs and facilities, better CO2 reduction performance and cheaper energy, more sustainable transport and potentially a cheaper overall cost for development. A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.</p>	<p>Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.</p>
	<p>* Concern for the historic environment - increased traffic will have a detrimental impact on the historic buildings in East Coker, West Coker and other locations. Many Listed Buildings in East Coker including: Coker Court (Grade 1), Naish Priory (Grade 1), Pavyotts Mill (Grade 2), North Coker House (Grade 2) and St Michael's and All Angels Church (Grade 1) Hymerford House.</p>	<p>All the directions for growth around Yeovil have undergone extensive traffic modelling to determine the likely impact of new development on the existing highways network. Where traffic congestion is identified key infrastructure improvements to roundabout / junctions and their costs have been identified. The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. Not clear that extra traffic will be experienced by the dated buildings and masterplanning should be able to clarify and mitigate upon.</p>	<p>Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension</p>
	<p>* Concern regarding the impact of the new development on the historic landscape.</p>	<p>The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. Naish Priory Listing has been checked and confirmed as Grade I. It has also been considered in the Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment. A buffer zone policy will be provided to protect North and East Coker.</p>	<p>Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension and introduce a North and East Coker Buffer Zone.</p>
	<p>* Recognise the need to growth Yeovil but growth sound be in locations where there is minimal impact on the character of existing rural communities.</p>	<p>see response above</p>	<p>see response above</p>



	* Buffer zone too close to surrounding villages - should be at least 1km separation.	see response above	see response above
	* Concern that the villages around Yeovil including East Coker, West Coker, Barwick, Stoford or Bradford Abbas will be "swallowed up" .	see response above	see response above
	* Naish Priory is Grade 1 not Grade 2 (this was ignored in the SA).	see response above	see response above
	* Beautiful Hamstone villages will be ruined.	see response above	see response above
	* Proposals will spoil East Coker for future generations.	see response above	see response above
	* Proposal will have a detrimental impact on East Coker as a tourist attraction (church houses T.S. Eliot's ashes, William Dampier connection brings many tourists from Australia, Naval connections) . Views from St Michael's Church will be spoilt.	see response above	see response above
	* Less attractive villages north of Yeovil, the south is more attractive.	see response above	see response above
	* The importance of Coker Cloth (regarded as the best sailing cloth).	Noted.	No Change.
	* East Coker embodies the heritage of the Royal Navy, major centre of the flax industry and source of sailcloth used for the Navy for hundreds of years.	Noted.	No Change.
	* Country parks and historic parks should not contribute to the developers obligation to provide open space.	Agree that existing features should not contribute towards Planning gains however existing features do offer an opportunity for enhancement that is more affordable than introducing new parks.	No Change.
	* Policy is unsound due to lack of consideration of alternatives and impact on historic environment.	The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Would request that English Heritage make a full assessment of the proposals.	The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. English Heritage have been consulted at all stages in the Core Strategy process.	No Change.
	* Yeovil Vision recognises the importance of the exceptional countryside which surrounds it. The fact that Yeovil is surrounded by countryside is what makes it special. It is important to retain this asset. Yeovil will lose it's sense of place.	Noted. Greenfield land take is necessary to accommodate whole of growth advocated.	No Change.

	* Fully endorse YV2 particularly the inclusion of land at Keyford which was put forward by the Planning Inspector in 2003. Land at Keyford would seem able to accommodate the growth whereas other Options would not. Worth noting that the Inspector who considered the employment allocation at Bunford in 2005 expressed the view that, in recognition of the sensitivity of the nearby Grade 1 Listed Building/gardens at Brympton House development should not be allocated on land to the north of the recommended employment site.	The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment. A buffer zone policy will be provided to protect North and East Coker.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension and introduce a North and East Coker Buffer Zone.
	Urban Extension will lead to East Coker, Barwick, Sutton Bingham and Stoford being swallowed up. Naish is only 200 metres from the proposed Urban Extension.	see response above	see response above
	*Question the need to protect Barwick's historic parkland, especially when the public have little access to it.	see response above	see response above
	*SSDC seems concerned that development would have a detrimental effect on the setting of Montacute House and Brympton D'Evercy - what about the detrimental effect of urban sprawl on the setting of East Coker.	see response above	see response above
	* Policy SS2 should apply to East Coker and hence no development should be in close proximity.	The Yeovil Historic Environmental Assessment has assessed Yeovil's capacity to absorb more development purely on grounds of the Historic Environment.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension and introduce a North and East Coker Buffer Zone.
	* Threat to Brympton D'Evercy House and its setting - via westward spread of housing along the southerly ridge of Camp Hill (above Gooseacre Lane)	see response above	see response above
	* East Coker is a strong and thriving community with a strong sense of identity, the impact the development will have on this community has not been considered.	see response above	see response above
	* Potential for East Coker to be a World Heritage Site.	see response above	see response above
	*An Eco Town will not sit comfortably in the environment of a Conservation Village.	see response above	see response above
	* Threat to sites of archaeological interest.	see response above	see response above

	*Agriculture is an integral part of the areas heritage, strong connections to Yeovilton and Westland's.	Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and impact on local villages is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board. Government policy relates to Grade 1, 2 and 3a and significant levels of high quality agricultural land around Yeovil's periphery.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Will cause environmental damage and impact on sustainable food production by developing Grade 1 agricultural land. Quality of the land has made Coker a highly valued agricultural prize. Cheshire Council excluded Grade 1 land even before Conservations Areas and areas of high ecological value. Reserve the right to comment once advice from DEFRA/DoE received. Farming press and TV note that the world needs to produce more food. Urban extension would cover 400 acres of grade 1 land. Sustainable food initiatives contribute to the District's economy and enhances food security.	see response above	see response above
	* Grade 1 Agricultural Land is valuable and should be protected. Yields from Grade 1 Agricultural Land are greater than from other land. Looking into the future, the UK will need to be more self-sufficient in terms of food production - has DEFRA advise been sought? Food from this area would be low-carbon. Chief Scientific Adviser to the Government, Sir John Beddington recommends that UK should be 50% self-sufficient in terms of food production by 2030. Cheshire Council have discounted development on Grade 1 Agricultural Land.	see response above	see response above
	*A Plebiscite (referendum) was taken (7 yrs ago) not to develop on Grade 1 Agricultural Land.	see response above	see response above
	* Concern regarding the impact of the new development on wildlife - has a wildlife survey been carried out? Destruction of habitat for protected species. Aware that there are dormice along Tarratt Road.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Eco-town Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension
	* A more rigorous assessment of biodiversity impacts is required.	see response above	see response above
	* This is a Greenfield development - should be avoided.	Noted. The Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper includes a comprehensive review of brownfield sites and concludes that Yeovil's growth can not be met by this supply alone.	No Change.

	* Proposal will result in unacceptable urban sprawl.	Noted and can be protected by a buffer zone.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension and introduce a North and East Coker Buffer Zone.
	* Yeovil Country Park would be seriously compromised.	Noted. Disagree, development presents a real opportunity to enhance the Yeovil County Park making it more accessible to the public.	No Change.
	* Environmental scorings on the SA (in terms of Keyford) do not accurately score the transport or economic effects of an extension in this location. Flood risk is not assessed or scored properly. Country Parks and Historic Parks should not count as developer obligations.	Consider the scoring in the SA are appropriate. Agree that existing features such as the Yeovil Country park should not contribute towards Planning gains however existing features do offer an opportunity for enhancement that is more affordable than introducing new parks. The Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA considers flood risk.	No Change.
	* Evidence from SSDC against Keyford Proposals in 2002 & 2008 - note that land at Keyword & Aldon should be classified high sensitivity but the 2008 report concludes that Nash/Keyford has the greatest capacity to be developed. Respondent raises a number of questions regarding the Landscape appraisals.	Landscape quality is considered in the Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study which forms part of the Councils evidence base. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Short term financial gain is being put before the wider to conserve a pleasant environment in which to live.	Disagree, main driver is Yeovil's economic growth.	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 HRA at 'Publication' stage of the Core Strategy.	No Change.
	* Policy does not include the policy wording from the findings of the HRA on Bracket's Coppice SAC and therefore the Core Strategy cannot be considered to be Habitats Regulations compliant (suggested wording supplied).	Accept.	Amend supporting text.
	* Some of the areas that could be affected are regarded by Natural England as areas of outstanding merit.	The nearest Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is located in West Dorset, well beyond any visual envelope.	No Change.
	*Development would affect the Dorset AONB.	see response above	No Change.
	*East Coker between Keyford and North Coker was once classified as an Area of Biological Conservation Status.	Noted.	No Change.
	*The eco standards and eco credentials of the site should not be pursued at the expense of damage to the countryside. Local materials should be used and any resultant development should be in keeping with the countryside not 'trendy new planning and architectural styles'.	The Council have committed to maintaining Eco-town Standards within the Yeovil Urban Extension. Agree, the highest standards of design should be sought in any new development. Policy EQ2 seeks to achieve a high quality, which promotes South Somerset's local distinctiveness and preserves the character and appearance of the district. Local materials and development in local vernacular will be a matter for masterplanning. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Extension with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6.

	*Greggs Riding School (rep no:1561153)(long established local business -1946) would be threatened in terms of safety if housing was developed adjacent to it -footballs, garden machinery, fireworks. The school also cultivates an unimproved Mesotrophic Grassland under Natural England Entry Level Stewardship Scheme since 2007, abundance of grasses, flowers, Green Winged Orchids etc a meadow like this cannot exist and thrive in isolation, it needs adjacent fields to flourish. Now investigating Higher Level Stewardship for our hay meadow and hedgerows and whole land becoming organise. Hay Meadow also in Somerset Environmental Records.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Eco-town Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process. Riding School identified within the Green Buffer Zone. A link can be made to the Countryside.	No Change.
	*Development will destroy the mature hedgerows that have been cultivated over the years by inhabitants of Gregg's Riding School.	see response above	see response above
	*Concerned that development will encroach on the riding school and which is an important resource for health and wellbeing and reducing obesity.	see response above	see response above
	*Development will be out of scale with the surrounding landscape.	Proposed Urban Extension is in scale with the growth requirement of Yeovil and can be assimilated into the countryside.	No Change.
	*There are a number of 'Local Wildlife Sites' that will be impacted upon.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Keyford is a Gateway site, the countryside needs to be protected.	Noted.	No Change.
	* The Urban Extension will have a negative impact on the biodiversity and archaeology of the area. Protected species such as Bats, Kingfishers, Skylarks, Buzzards, Otters and Badgers inhabit the area - a proper wildlife survey must be undertaken which addresses the loss of their habitats.	The protection and maintenance of European Protected species are considered in the document 'Yeovil Eco-town Biodiversity Baseline and Scoping Report'. It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process. The report is considered fit for purpose and flora and fauna species have not been evidenced.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	* The fungus <i>Battarrea Phalloides</i> (the sandy stiltball) is found not only in Red House Lane, but also in the grounds of Bubspoon House, East Coker - it is likely that these are not two isolated communities - this is extremely rare and heavily protected - extensive surveys are required - Biodiversity Plan/Core Strategy makes no mention. Object to Urban Extension as the biodiversity study is flawed (Badgers, slow worms, Kingfishers, Water voles, Bats and Dormice all present).	see response above	see response above
	*There are Dormice present.	see response above	see response above
	* Any development will need to demonstrate how populations of European Protected Species are maintained including the habitat to support those populations.	see response above	see response above
	* Essential that eco-town standards are followed, and a 'net gain in local biodiversity is achieved' - alternative locations or options should be considered if this cannot be achieved - see TCPA worksheet.	see response above	see response above
	* Threat to existing wildlife. (Badgers, Foxes, deer and many varieties of birds) Harm to wetland environment.	see response above	see response above
	* The masterplan must be designed in such a way that features supporting bat movement are not severed and that access between feeding areas and roosts is maintained. The lighting requirement will also need to take into account of the requirements of bats.	see response above	see response above
	*The land comprises sandy soil which is excellent for farming livestock, as it copes well with wet conditions and animals therefore do not have to wade through mud and develop leg injuries and bacterial infections.	see response above	see response above
	*Hope this policy will protect the trees around Yeovil, especially on the horizon lines (especially southern horizon, when urban extension is built).	The Yeovil landscape character assessment considers views. The Council is committed to introducing a green buffer to prevent settlement coalescence in the south west. In addition the Yeovil Urban Extension is seeking 40% of the development area to be open space in line with Eco-town standards and emerging best practice.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.

	* Green infrastructure is an essential component of any development that aspires to be sustainable and to provide its population with a high quality environment in which to live, work and play - see TCPA worksheet.	Agree. The Yeovil Urban Extension is seeking 40% of the development area to be open space in line with Eco-town standards and emerging best practice.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Extension with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.
	*The natural boundary to development (separating town and country) should be maintained - A30/West Coker Road runs along the escarpment north to East Coker, it's a natural, topographical boundary to town of Yeovil.	It is expected that more detailed study work will be required to inform the Masterplan process. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Need to ensure that Natural England's key spatial planning objectives are taken into account in all plans and proposals. It is vital that sufficient account is taken of the natural environment at an early stage in decision making.	see response above	see response above
	* The landscape context of new development should guide decisions on the location and nature of new development to create high quality locally distinctive places that retain and enhance existing landscape character.	see response above	see response above
	* Climate change has not been considered.	The Yeovil SA considers Climate change under objective 11 - Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	No Change.
	* Employment and housing should be kept separate.	The Council have committed to maintaining Eco-town Standards within the Yeovil Urban Extension. The aim is to provide for sufficient jobs within the Urban Extension for all the potential economically active residents in B Use activities.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Extension with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6.



	* There is no need for more employment land in Yeovil.	The Councils employment land review identifies the need for additional employment land in Yeovil including land to be located in the Urban Extension to support the planned housing growth. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and reappraisal of the potential land availability within the existing development area. The Baker report 'housing requirement for South Somerset and Yeovil' identifies significant growth potential for the rural economy. 50% of the growth is anticipated to be within Yeovil reflecting past trends. Land take follows identification of jobs.	Endorse an Urban Extension for housing and employment provision
	* Who will take up the new employment land?	see response above	see response above
	* Why is employment land included when a large part of the Bunford allocation is being offered to Sports Zone.	see response above	see response above
	* Where is the employment going to come from?	see response above	see response above
	* There are enough vacant areas on existing employment sites at Lynx and Bunford.	see response above	see response above
	* Yeovil has low unemployment - why do we want to encourage more people to come here to work? There are plenty of empty residential and employment properties in Yeovil.	see response above	see response above
	* New development should have access to employment areas.	see response above	see response above
	* Support the inclusion of employment land in the Urban Extension.	see response above	see response above
	*There is insufficient employment land for all these additional people, therefore they will drive to work, adding to congestion. Additionally 4 out of 5 major employers in Yeovil are North of the Town. There will be lots of unemployed people.	see response above	see response above
	*Nearest significant employment to the south is in Dorchester which is 19 miles away.	see response above	see response above
	* In relation to population growth, how many businesses will cease to operate over the life of the plan, and how is this taken into account in terms of population?	see response above	see response above
	*The employment land identified as part of the proposed site would result in HGVs travelling through residential areas, and adding to congestion.	see response above	see response above

	* A focus on jobs rather than land take would be more accurate, current system fails to cope with low density warehouse development or automated warehouses. Similarly multi-storey development or mixed-use sites will not conform to current measurement system. If Eco-town standard are reached, space allocated for car parking will be significantly reduced.	see response above	see response above
	* Proposal would be better located on the industrial side of Yeovil where there is better access to the A303 and motorway.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA. The Urban Extension will be self sufficient in employment land.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Sites to the north of Yeovil are more closely related to employers an hospital.	see response above	see response above
	* Broadband speeds within the Yeovil area are unacceptable for most business requirements which would put off many computer based businesses.	This issues is being assessed through the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will inform the Core Strategy.	No Change.
	* Growth will cause increased noise and pollution.	The Yeovil SA considers noise and pollution within objective 12 - Minimise pollution and waste production.	No Change.
	* Housing should be preserved for 'locals' using legal agreements.	Persevering affordable housing for 'locals' is not appropriate in larger settlements such as Yeovil due to the scale of settlement, nor is it legally possible on market housing. Legal agreements such as these are generally associated with rural exception sites only. Affordable housing will be available to people on the Somerset choice based lettings.	No Change.
	* Existing services in East Coker will be threatened by the growth.	The Yeovil Urban Extension will contain sufficient services to serve itself.	No Change.

	* What about the high levels of RADON in the preferred option? Has this been reviewed?	Depending on how houses are built and ventilated, radon may accumulate in basements and dwellings. Radon can also seep into an indoor environment through cracks in solid floors, construction joints, cracks in walls, gaps in suspended floors, gaps around service pipes, cavities inside walls, and the water supply. Because the half-life of radon is only 3.8 days, removing or isolating the source will greatly reduce the hazard within a few weeks, it is therefore not considered a significant issue for the Urban Extension as mitigation measures are possible. For example another method of reducing radon levels is to modify the building's ventilation. The proposed area is not identified as a high radon area although that should not exclude the South and West.	No Change.
	* Who are the Councils development partners on this site, do they have personal interests in the site? If so are those interests declared and where?	The Council has no development partners. Land with developer interest is identified in the SHLAA, land ownership details are not available from the Council but can be obtained from the Land Registry website.	No Change.
	* What social class will the inhabitants of the homes be - manual labour/professional, retired?	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* This development will become an urban jungle as has happened in Bexley, Welling, Belvedere, Swanley and Edenbridge. Should draw on the mistakes of past decades.	High standards of design will be sought in the proposed urban extension.	No Change.
	* Strategy does not identify available plots of land.	The Core Strategy is a strategic document that should identify a broad direction for Yeovil's growth, specific land allocations are an issue for the subsequent Masterplanning process. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Critical friend at Inspectorate may have decided that it is better to identify general areas of search, however this is misleading in the case of East Coker where it is clear from the SHLAA what sites are being offered, which means no general area is under consideration. Would be forgiven for suggesting that this is an attempt to pass a preferred option under a cloud of generality as in the case of Screwfix which was resisted.	The Core Strategy is a strategic document that should identify a broad direction for Yeovil's growth, specific land allocations are an issue for the subsequent Masterplanning process. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper and Yeovil SA.	No Change.

	* Inappropriate weight has been attached to consideration of the Keyford site by the previous Local Plan Inquiry Inspector.	The site search process used to identify suitable directions for Yeovil's growth was undertaken independent from the previous Planning Inspectors Report but as could be expected was again identified as an area suitable for development. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Yeovil is too constrained by topography, transport and service infrastructure.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Concern regarding the impact on well-being and house prices.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* Urban extension is not viable.	The viability of the Yeovil Urban Extension is considered in the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No Change.
	* Light pollution will increase - impact on dark skies in the south.	Agree that the impact on dark skies should be considered a negative for this option but disagree that growth in this direction will severely impact on this designation as light pollution would be absorbed into the existing Yeovil glow. Light will apply wherever the extension is proposed. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	*Light pollution from resultant development would have a negative impact on the countryside. There are protected species that will be affected by light pollution.	The impact of light pollution on protected species is considered by the report 'Yeovil Eco-town Biodiversity Baseline and scoping report' which suggests appropriate mitigation measures for light sensitive species found in Yeovil's periphery including the; Lesser Horseshoe bat, Daubenton's Bat and Brown Long-eared bat. Light will apply wherever the extension is proposed.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* SSDC are using undemocratic haste to railroad their preferred option.	The preparation of the Core Strategy has followed due legal process.	No Change.

	* Why has the eco town vision been dropped, yet you are using government funds for sustainable development?	The Council have committed to maintaining Eco-town Standards within the Yeovil Urban Extension. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Extension with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6.
	* Appalling that people are expected to comment when some of the most important study work has not yet been done.	The two pieces of evidence that were missing from the Draft Core Strategy were the Yeovil Transport Modelling and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. As a result the Draft Core Strategy consultation was extended to allow comments to be made specifically on transport modelling and allow representations to be received. Evidence has been received with the final Traffic Assessment and the IDP. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is now finalised and will be consulted upon alongside the Core Strategy Submission Plan.	No Change.
	* The homes will not be affordable to local young people.	The Core Strategy is seeking to achieve 35% affordable housing on all development over a threshold of 6 units.	No Change.
	* Lack of consultation before the plans were drawn up.	The Core Strategy went through extensive consultation at Issues and Options stage in March 2008.	No Change.
	* Australians will visit Weymouth for the Olympics and visit East Coker if the link is advertised.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* Objections from residents of East Coker are not nimbyism but seeking to protect the character of the Coker's and Yeovil from ill thought out wholesale development.	Noted, the incorporation of a green buffer will seek to protect the character of East Coker.	Introduce a North and East Coker Buffer Zone.
	* Once the land is developed it is gone forever.	Noted, but there are social and economic needs for new development.	No Change.
	* Chard should be developed further rather than Yeovil.	Growth 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. See Yeovil Scale of Growth Paper as presented to Project Management Board. There are clear infrastructure and market constraints for the location of development across the district.	No Change.

	* Available alternatives have not been properly assessed.	A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Joint Structure Plan and East Coker Parish Plan have not been taken into account.	Although it is acknowledged that the policies in the Somerset & Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan are currently 'saved' the Draft Core Strategy gave these policies little weight given that they are in general out of date having been prepared pre-2000 and will no longer be saved when the Localism Bill is enacted and once the Government has considered the outcomes of the environmental assessment of the RSS revocation. The East Coker Plan has been taken into account but should be prepared in accordance with the Core Strategy.	No Change.
	* Proposal is not in accordance with saved SSLP Policy ST5.	Disagree.	No Change.
	* Yeovil has a history of bad decisions e.g. the demolition of the George Hotel, Middle Street.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* Proposal does not meet the Oxford English Dictionary definition of sustainable or sustain.	This is not a Core Strategy issue. The proposal will achieve the definition of sustainable development within PPS1.	No Change.
	* Object to the attempt to recoup expenses incurred by a local benefactor for the building of the Red House roundabout when his farrago was defeated by local opposition.	This is a personal financial matter not relevant to determining growth location for Yeovil.	No Change.
	* The preferred location has been chosen as developers already own the site.	Disagree, evidence of deliverability is a key issue, but not the sole reason for choosing the preferred location.	No Change.
	* St Margaret's Hospice will no longer be in a quiet secluded corner for its patients.	The Core Strategy seeks to identify a broad direction for Yeovil's growth, site specific issues will be considered in the following Masterplanning process. More pupils in the general area would appear to support existing local Schools.	No Change.

	* Proposal will have an adverse effect on East Coker and Barwick village schools.	The Core Strategy seeks to identify a broad direction for Yeovil's growth, site specific issues will be considered in the following Masterplanning process. More pupils in the general are would appear to support existing local Schools.	No Change.
	* If this goes ahead someone will look back and say 'we made a terrible mistake'.	Disagree a reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Why the use of the word "Preferred"?	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* Infrastructure in and around Yeovil will not be able to cope with the growth - roads, schools, hospital, Dr's surgeries, sewage, water, energy, churches and other community facilities.	The viability of the Yeovil Urban Extension is considered in the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan which indicates infrastructure costs are reasonable.	No Change.
	* SSDC is not listening to the residents of East Coker.	Disagree - all issues raised in consultation have been considered.	No Change.
	* Lessons should be learnt from bad planning elsewhere in the world e.g. Magnetic Island, Australia	The Core Strategy has been developed using best practice guidance available at that time.	No Change.
	* An independent analysis of the issues should be published and the facts established.	The Core Strategy is founded upon a robust and evolving evidence base. The Examination will ensure independent analysis.	No Change.
	* Reference to buffer zone is meaningless without committed consultation. Does it mean a few yards and a beech hedge? A bubble of farmland preserved in a mile radius? A ban on development anywhere near it?	The Council is committed to introducing a green buffer between surrounding communities to prevent settlement coalescence in the south west. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA. The Buffer Zone will be available for consideration at the proposed Submission stage of consultation.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension. Introduce green buffer policy.

	<p>* Affordable housing does not need to be addressed by grandiose schemes. Fordham Survey shows a backlog of 275 affordable homes and delivery could be addressed through quality Brownfield regeneration. HMA also states there is a plentiful supply of cheap units in Yeovil, so smaller development and brownfield sites should be developed as opposed to the Urban Extension.</p>	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) states that there is a net annual need for 659 new affordable homes in South Somerset. At the time of the household survey (2008) 486 households were in affordable housing need in Yeovil - these are households who lack their own housing or who live in unsuitable housing and who cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Within the Yeovil Urban Area (including brownfield opportunities) Officers have identified capacity for 6,100 dwellings leaving a remainder of 2,500 dwellings to be accommodated in an Urban Extension. Cheap market housing does not meet the definition of affordable housing in planning terms. Need for affordable housing is a dynamic factor requiring continued monitoring over the Plan period.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Was informed that 3 new schools are planned - why so many when budgets are being cut?</p>	<p>The number of schools proposed in the Urban Extension has been calculated from advice from the Local Education Authority. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Land at Hales Meadow to Mudford Bridge, Mudford should be expanded for affordable housing (6-12ha site). This approach is supported by Policy HG4 &amp; HG5.</p>	<p>Policies HG4 &amp; HG5 are not applicable to this comment as they deal with targets and thresholds for affordable housing and mix of market housing. National guidance in PPSs 1 &amp; 3 seek to achieve balanced and mixed communities - a 6-12ha site of affordable housing only would be contrary to these objectives. This proposal alone could not meet the identified housing requirement and there are clear advantages of a single Urban Extension site rather than several. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* The process has failed to consider alternative sites .</p>	<p>A reassessment of emerging options (from a comprehensive constraints mapping exercise) against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the South of Yeovil towards East Coker / Barwick. Key determining factors relate to accessibility to services, effects of traffic and reducing the contribution to climate change. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper and Yeovil SA.</p>	<p>Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.</p>



	* The argument relating to passive solar gain and proximity to Lynx Trading Estate and Augusta Westland's could also apply to other areas.	The Renewable Energy Study by Brooks Devlin / Font energy identify Solar PV as a small but important part of the renewable energy mix for the Yeovil Urban Extension. Solar PV works at its most efficient in a due Southern direction and for this reason southern slopes are preferred. Solar panels will work in other directions but at a significantly reduced efficiency. North sloping sites are not well suited to solar PV as they increase the likelihood of over shadow. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Could provision be made for community space for worship?	This is an issue that will be considered in the following Masterplanning process. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Support.	Support noted.	No Change.
	* West Dorset DC support.	Support noted.	No Change.
	* Screwfix planning application was refused some years ago on the basis that it would generate too much congestion - this development would be worse.	Objection noted.	No Change.
	* How can you ensure that the homes will be Eco homes.	The Council have committed to maintaining Eco-town Standards within the Yeovil Urban Extension. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Extension with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6.
	* Preferred option is not 'eco-friendly'.	see response above	see response above
	* Term 'eco' just means more houses being crammed in thus increasing the builders profit margin.	see response above	see response above
	*Not convinced that Urban Extension will be built to Eco Standards as it states "subject to viability" - will just be an extension.	see response above	see response above
	*It is not clear that the urban extension will be built to Eco standards, ultimately it will be just another housing estate, the term Eco is being used to defend the scale of the proposed allocation.	see response above	see response above
	* Proposal will lead to increased levels of CO2.	see response above	see response above

	* Grant Shapps the Housing Minister says the eco-town developments will not be imposed through national planning rules on communities that do not want them.	see response above	see response above
	* Medical facilities in Yeovil will not stand this scale of development - moved to Yeovil 6 months ago and had choice of 1 NHS Dentist, not aware of others or their availability. GPs are limited. Hospital is stretched, have had to travel to Taunton and Chard for routine appointments because of capacity issues. These medical supports need to be available .	Issue is considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No Change.
	* The rationalisation of the defence industry gives the opportunity to relocate Augusta Westland's and develop the land owned by Westland's for residential development.	The Council's position is to support Augusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. Augusta Westland's have submitted representation to the Council seeking to safeguard their airfield safety zones from future development.	Introduce Augusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.
	* There is insufficient infrastructure to accommodate the Urban Extension (hospitals, primary schools, sewage, parking). There are no new schools provided.	The viability of the Yeovil Urban Extension is considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is proposed that the Urban Extension includes a new Secondary School & Primary School. No insurmountable infrastructure problems are presented.	No Change.
	* Development will devalue existing house prices and affect their views.	This is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	* Concerned about the impact the additional development would have upon existing residents and their ability to access services and facilities.	The viability of the Yeovil Urban Extension is considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Access to services and facilities for existing residents should only occur as the Urban Extension is built out.	No Change.
	* MOD note that Yeovil options including preferred option falls into MOD statutory safeguarding zones.	Noted. The MOD will be consulted on all future Planning Applications regarding the Yeovil Urban Extension.	No Change.
	* Southern outskirts of Yeovil is under the primary inner flying circuit used by Augusta Westland for flight testing purposes, therefore not advised to build on this area as it will substantially reduce the emergency/landing division.	The Council's position is to support Augusta Westland's in their continued operations within Yeovil as the towns major employer and economic hub for the District. Augusta Westland's have submitted representation to the Council seeking to safeguard their airfield safety zones from future development.	Introduce Augusta Westland's Flight Safety Zone policy and amend proposals maps to depict safeguarding zone.

	* Development will have a negative impact on the quality of life of people in the surrounding area.	Development has the potential to improve the quality of life of existing residents through a wider housing market, more accessible open space, greater employment opportunities, further sport and leisure provision, new shops and services and improve public transport provision.	No Change.
	* Existing schools (East Coker & Barwick & Stoford) would be impacted on and development would affect their quality.	See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper presented to Project Management Board. Policy YV2 Yeovil Urban Extension seeks to make provision for a new secondary & primary school. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will determine deliverability. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board.	No Change.
	* Densities proposed in Urban Extension (50+) could lead to slum conditions.	Disagree, high density development can be designed in a sympathetic manner and does not necessarily mean that there will be little space. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board, Yeovil SA and Housing Density Paper.	No Change.
	* Increase the density of development on the existing Key Sites.	see response above	No Change.
	* If land has to be developed it should be at a density which relates to Eco Town standards and should be self-sufficient with regard to power and water.	see response above	No Change.
	* Object to the methodology used to select the Preferred Option, based on the availability of land through the SHLAA.	PPS12 requires development proposals to be deliverable. As the SHLAA identifies what land is suitable, available and viable and therefore deliverable this must be one factor in deciding where the preferred direction for growth should be located. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* Support growth but wish to see good infrastructure, green spaces and community facilities.	Issue is considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No Change.
	* The additional infrastructure required should be paid for by the developer and not out of the public purse.	The Core Strategy will require developers to contribute to both Planning Obligations for site related issues and a Community Infrastructure Levy for off site issues.	No Change.
	* The parish consultation process identified the North West as the preferred location for growth, why was this ignored?	All areas around Yeovil were initially considered. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	* Site is elevated and buildings would overshadow the area.	The Renewable Energy Study by Brooks Devlin / Font energy identified Solar PV as a small but important part of the renewable energy mix for the Yeovil Urban Extension. Solar PV works at its most efficient in a due Southern direction and for this reason southern slopes are preferred. Solar panels will work in other directions but at a significantly reduced efficiency. North sloping sites are not well suited to solar PV as they increase the likelihood of over shadow. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	No Change.
	* The escarpment and its geology limits development of roads from Keyford to the town, making it unsuitable.	Topographical issues are considered with the Yeovil SA. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* NHS medical facility should be listed explicitly in policy. (Primary Care Trust)	Agree, NHS medical facilities within the Urban Extension will be listed in the policy. Infrastructure Delivery Plan establishes requirement.	Amend Policy YV2 to make specific reference to NHS medical facilities that are planned in the Yeovil Urban Extension.
	* Insufficient amenity.	Disagree - Eco Town standards are for 40% of the area to be green space.	No Change.
	* Lack of knowledge of infrastructure requirements.	The viability of the Yeovil Urban Extension is considered in the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No Change.
	* This is not the time to be planning major projects because of the current economic crisis.	The Core Strategy is a long term plan (up to the year 2028) so it is considered that the economy will improve in this time horizon.	No Change.
	* Town centre shopping will not be increase because parking will be reduced and public transport will not be efficient.	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. Delivery will be considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No Change.
	* Empty properties in Yeovil Town centre will not be opened by new residents for reasons of viability and growth of internet shopping. Larger shops are moving out of town.	Comment noted. Policy EP12 of the Draft Core Strategy seeks to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres. The growth of internet shopping is a national trend.	No Change.

	* Roads leading to Yeovil Junction flood.	Flooding is considered within the South Somerset Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which forms part of the Councils evidence base. More detailed flood risk assessments will be carried out in the following Masterplanning & Planning application process including continued consultation with Wessex Water & the Environment Agency. Where appropriate, mitigation measures will be incorporated in new development to manage flood risk. See Yeovil Urban Extension Discussion Paper as presented to Project Management Board and Yeovil SA.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Flooding occurs at Coker Marsh, Halves Lane, Coker Moor and North Coker - proposed growth will make the situation worse.	see response above	see response above
	* Concerns regarding surface water flooding.	see response above	see response above
	* Sewage system will need to be upgraded.	see response above	see response above
	*Environment Agency - Area of Search needs to be informed by SFRA. The preferred area of growth is subject to flooding from the West Coker and Barwick Stream, consequently although it should be possible to develop in the area without infringing on the floodplain, as the Flood Zone outlined is not very accurate around East Coker, further hydraulic modelling is required to determine actual flood risk.	see response above	see response above
	*A strategic approach to surface water is required for this area.	see response above	see response above
	* Developing this area will mean a number of small streams and rivers will end up covered in development.	see response above	see response above
	* This area is in the floodplain and floods. The A37 has flooded several times in the last 12 months. Surface run-off will further exacerbate the issue. "Last winter A37 from junction with Netherton Lane leading into Yeovil had standing surface water after heavy rain. Pavyotts Hill is wet". The centre of West Coker floods, Manor Street, given the geographical levels and water courses new flood alleviation cannot be incorporated, additional development will result in more flooding to this part of the village ( Manor Street, West Coker). Flooding also at Netherton and Coker Marsh.	see response above	see response above

	* Wessex Water supports water efficiency and sustainability measures. Engineering appraisal will be required for major sites to confirm the scope and extent of improvements to the existing infrastructure. Ongoing consultation with Wessex Water should be maintained to ensure infrastructure capacity improvements are planned to match development rates.	see response above	see response above
	* Development at Keyford will increase flooding at Pavyotts Mill.	see response above	see response above
	* The River Yeo is struggling to meet EU Water Framework Directive Standards, given the extra waste water discharged, will the river cope with this.	see response above	see response above
	* There will be extra demand for water for approx 8,000 people, how will we manage this sustainably.	see response above	see response above
	*There are delineated groundwater source protection zones in the vicinity of Yeovil, depending on the location and nature of development, these zones may constrain development proposals.	The Yeovil SA considers all constraints including delineated groundwater source protection zones.	No Change.
<b>Yeovil Urban Village</b>	* Support the idea of an inner Yeovil regeneration project. Reducing car parking and building many more homes in an urban extension is counter productive. An alternative site for car parking must be found.	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. Delivery will be considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No Change.
Policy YV3 Yeovil Urban Village (and para 5.38)	* Proposals map does not include a sustainable transport corridor along the Dodham Brook. A start has been made to cap the culvert for the Foundry House site and it would be odd not to continue this line of development. This route needs to be declared.	The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) proposes the retain a sustainable transport corridor alongside the Dodham Brook.	Amend supporting text to make reference to the key outcomes of the Summerhouse Village Masterplan.
	*Environment Agency would like to see provision for the continued enhancement of the Dodham Brook Corridor, involving the replacement of the concrete channel with a restored naturalised stream adjacent and downstream of Old Station Way.	The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) proposes that Dodham Brook is to be widened through the introduction of a new weir close to and upstream from the new bridge with the northern edge of the concrete canal wall broken out to establish a small lake. The water level will be allowed to rise, controlled by the weir at times of flooding, to create a direct relationship with the water. This is subject however to a flood risk assessment.	Amend supporting text to make reference to key outcomes of the Summerhouse Village Masterplan.

	<p>*Object on grounds of words "develop to eco-town standards if viable". Also more emphasis needed on production use of green space as opposed to the recreational value of green space.</p>	<p>The Council have committed to maintaining aspirations for Eco-town Standards within the Yeovil Urban Village. The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) suggests that the 'eco' theme offers a number of opportunities that will make Summerhouse Village more attractive as a place to live as well as exemplar in terms of offering a healthy environment. Most important of all is growing food, which the BioRegional CABE report considers is key to reducing carbon footprint. Allotments are not only increasingly popular, but also provide a means of cultivating and looking after green space that might otherwise go to waste.</p>	<p>Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Village with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.</p>
	<p>* Need to ensure that Natural England's key spatial planning objectives are taken into account in all plans and proposals. It is vital that sufficient account is taken of the natural environment at an early stage in decision making.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the Natural England &amp; TCPA worksheet on biodiversity &amp; green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Village with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.</p>
	<p>* Essential that eco-town standards are followed, and a 'net gain in local biodiversity is achieved' - alternative locations or options should be considered if this cannot be achieved - see TCPA worksheet.</p>	<p>see response above</p>	<p>see response above</p>
	<p>* Green infrastructure is an essential component of any development that aspires to be sustainable and to provide its population with a high quality environment in which to live, work and play - see TCPA worksheet.</p>	<p>see response above</p>	<p>see response above</p>
	<p>* Any development will need to demonstrate how populations of European Protected Species are maintained including the habitat to support those populations.</p>	<p>see response above</p>	<p>see response above</p>

	* The landscape context of new development should guide decisions on the location and nature of new development to create high quality locally distinctive places that retain and enhance existing landscape character.	Noted. The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan states that whereas currently open space within the site is primarily left over land adjacent to roads, a key feature of the new masterplan is to make landscape a key element of the scheme through the provision of new focal spaces that help to link the town with the countryside. The provision of attractive and useable open space close to where people will live, and to increase tree cover in this otherwise poorly vegetated part of the town will create an attractive place to live.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Village with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.
	Support.	Support Noted.	No Change.
<b>Urban Village and Extension Eco-town</b>	* Masterplan and Viability Assessment need to be aired fully with landowners within the area. Pegasus Planning represent at least 1 landowner and would be willing to work with the Council in a joint exercise.	The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan has identified several major barriers to be overcome before the desired physical and social transformation can be achieved, the Masterplan can be finalised and consultation can occur. At this stage all landowners, developers and interested parties will be able to comment on site viability.	No change.
Urban Village and Extension Eco-town (paras 5.39 – 5.44)	* Paragraph 5.42 - Bullet 6 should refer to "a minimum of one job per dwelling" not per house.	Agreed.	Amend wording to refer to 'one job per dwelling'.
	* Adoption of Eco-town standards will promote Yeovil for key investors.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Eco-town standards is an unrealistic dream. Delete policy or mend to reflect solely the urban village project.	The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) demonstrates that many of the eco-town aspirations can be met on-site including biodiversity, modal shift and renewable energy generation but that other features are subject to site viability.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Village with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.
	*Zero carbon aspirations must be developed for public transport and there should be a zero carbon public transport options study.	The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) is supported by an in depth study of sustainable transport options within the Urban Village site by Addison Associates. This work demonstrates how the Eco-town standards target of 50% modal shift could be met on site as well as suggesting a range of measure for Yeovil more generally.	Amend supporting text to make reference to key outcomes of the Summerhouse Village Masterplan.



	*Lots made of energy efficiency, but little about water conservation - this is vital for the future, please include.	The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) makes reference to Sustainable Urban Drainage systems that would clean and hold and run off before it was released.	Amend supporting text to make reference to key outcomes of the Summerhouse Village Masterplan.
<b>The Benefits of Eco-town Development</b>	* Support eco-town standards but would expect them in any new development. Aim is to achieve zero carbon emissions but must take into account pollution caused by the lack of road infrastructure. We need to have electric cars. Emissions from long distance traffic traversing the town. Village traffic will generate emissions. No amount of solar heating will compensate for this.	Support noted. The Draft Summerhouse Village Masterplan (August 2011) demonstrates that many of the eco-town aspirations can be met on-site including biodiversity, modal shift and renewable energy generation but that other features are subject to site viability. All new development will have external electric plugs to enable electric car use. The Urban Village Masterplan is supported by an in depth study of sustainable transport options within the Urban Village site by Addison Associates. This work demonstrates how the Eco-town standards target of 50% modal shift could be met on site as well as suggesting a range of measure for Yeovil more generally.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Village with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.
The Benefits of Eco-town Development (paras 5.45 – 5.48)	* If the Urban Extension is going to be self sufficient there should be no requirement that it needs to be close to the town centre.	Agreed, the preferred direction for growth is located close to the town centre.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* Yeovil's growth should be distributed evenly around the town to distribute the impact of traffic and employment opportunities. Should families need to live near train stations they will choose to, only a small percentage of the community use rail regularly.	Traffic sensitivity testing by Parsons Brinckerhoff demonstrates that distributing growth around Yeovil rather than concentrating growth actually increases traffic congestion as a critical mass can't be reached for sustainable transport methods. It is considered that rail links can be supported by local housing including enhanced bus networks.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.
	* All new homes are built to rigorous standards in line with best practice in fuel efficiency and there are numerous government schemes to encourage eco ideals, eco standards is not a prerogative.	Eco-town standards go way beyond minimum building regulations and represent a real step change in best practice.	Maintain the aspirations to achieve Eco-town standards in the Urban Village with the exception of construction standards beyond the Governments newly proposed Code 6 and subject to viability.
	* SSDC would not need to re-create the Country Park as something else if families were encouraged to live closer to the countryside and discover it for themselves.	Comment noted.	No change.

	* Yeovil Country Park is already in existence and must not be considered as biodiversity enhancement as part of the Eco-town development. The Eco-town should deliver its own biodiversity enhancements for residents to enjoy on their doorstep.	Agree that existing features such as the Yeovil Country Park should not contribute towards Planning gains however existing features do offer an opportunity for enhancement that is more affordable than introducing from scratch.	No change.
<b>Yeovil Employment Land Requirement</b>	* Employment shortfall can be made up by existing empty units.	Disagree, the Employment Land Review demonstrates that there is a need for employment land (B1, B2 & B8 Use Classes) in Yeovil in addition to any land or premises which currently are empty and land is required within both the existing urban framework and to support additional growth in the Urban Extension.	No change.
Yeovil Employment Land Requirement (paras 5.49 – 5.55)	* Existing employment land and units should be built first.	The possibility of having a policy within the Draft Core Strategy that phases residential development to deliver employment land has been investigated, this concluded that whilst employment land would be developed there could be no guarantee that units would be occupied and jobs created. Such a policy could also have a negative impact on the delivery of housing and affordable housing, potentially leading to a stagnant market and resulting in the overall cost of housing going up. The policy would have to prevent ANY house building in those settlements that have reached the threshold, including a single house as otherwise it would be ineffective and the Council could be accused of treating larger house builders unfairly.	No change.
	* Northwest of Yeovil would offer the best direct links for business to access the A303.	Although it is agreed that development in the North West of Yeovil offers the best access to the A303 it is considered that development costs are prohibitive in this location and the Highways Agency have said they prefer development to be further away from the A303.	No change.
	* Where is the demand for this employment land?	The South Somerset Employment Land Review is the evidence base which sets out the employment needs for the District.	No change.
	* Manufacturers are unlikely to want to locate to the south / south west on traffic reasons.	The South Somerset Employment land review identifies the level of employment land needed within Yeovil however market factors will decided where this is located.	Endorse South West Option 1 as the location of the Urban Extension.

	* Out of town retail will spell the demise of the town centre.	Noted. National Policy sets out a sequential town centre first approach to retail development. The Urban Extension should provide retail facilities commensurate with the communities need.	No change.
	* Paragraph 5.50 - if Greenfield sites continue to be built upon it is more important to ensure that existing employment land is "ring fenced" and not allowed to slip into other uses.	Noted. Policy EP3 seeks to safeguard employment land however need to await the outcome of the NPPF which does not adopt this approach.	No change.
	* Paragraph 5.50 - planning system can provide more than just land - can provide an enabling environment for sustainable living that makes such settlements attractive to the mainstream rather than those already predisposed to such developments. Questionable that cycling is already limited due to lack of dedicated routes - more likely to be limited by the traffic conditions on the roads - an important difference when considering the strategic approach to increasing cycling levels.	Noted.	No change.
Yeovil Community Infrastructure (para 5.56)	* NHS Somerset should be consulted on the IDP to ensure health provision is adequately catered for.	Agreed.	No change.
<b>Yeovil Retail Capacity</b>	* Para 5.58 should make a specific reference to Stars Lane / Box Factory and the Keymarket / Somerfield.	Yeovil UDF identifies potential sites for retail growth.	No change.
Yeovil Retail Capacity (para 5.57 – 5.58)	* Improving the town centre is more important than increasing capacity.	Both issues are important and should be pursued.	No change.
	* Supermarkets are east, west and central. Will one be improved within the new larger development.	The Yeovil Urban Extension will include its own retail provision to meet identified demand.	No change.
	* Paragraph 5.58: Comparison floor space capacity figures are inconsistent with the Retail study Update 2010 therefore are not justified and are unsound. Amended wording should reflect paras 5.30 & 6.20, table on p.97 and Tables 16a/16f. Sentence beginning "The extension of the Quedam....." should be deleted. Suggested replacement sentence supplied.	Paragraph 5.58 does not reflect the Retail Study update November 2010 which revised the figures (retail capacity model) based on the draft Core Strategy district wide population growth and housing distribution data. The paragraph needs revising accordingly. Note that GVA Grimley (retail consultants who undertook retail study in 2010) state that the figures will need to be updated once we have agreed the scale and distribution of growth, to extend the timeframe to 2028 and to reflect changes to data such as retail expenditure levels and forecasts. A reference to this should be included in supporting text.	Amend paragraph to incorporate revised retail figures (November 2010).

<b>Modal Shift</b>	* Are improvements to existing public transport services viable?	As a general rule a bus needs to carry around 20 passengers per journey to be commercially viable. Yeovil has the critical mass to achieve this and currently 4 of the 5 existing main routes in Yeovil do not receive a subsidy.	No change
Modal Shift for Yeovil (paras 5.59 – 5.66)	* Quality bus partnership should be a countywide strategy.	Noted but beyond the scope of the Core Strategy. A countywide strategy in respect of Quality Bus Partnerships would be a matter for the County Council to take forward through their Future Transport Plan and its subsequent Implementation Plans.	No change
	* Have developers agreed to funding public transport?	Funding for public transport both for existing and new routes and for other modal shift initiatives such as bus passes and cycle ways can be considered through planning obligations policies and secured as part of new development proposals.	No change
	* Villages will not be intrinsically linked.	The prime interchange sites at Yeovil Borough and Yeovil Bus Station support the interchange between various bus, rail and express coach routes. This includes the connections with rural routes, both conventional bus and demand responsive services.	No change
	* If groceries are delivered, why will people leave their homes?	For most journeys to the shops i.e. for daily convenience needs or for other facilities it will be quicker and cheaper to walk. The delivery scheme is important as it would reduce the need for car use for bulk shopping.	No change
	* Supermarkets in the Eco-towns should not have car parks as people should walk to shops. This does not address inhabitants who continue to use their cars for shopping.	As above. In addition, the supporting text seeks to reduce the environmental impact of such parking by incorporating car park management measures such as priority for electric and reducing demand through parking charges.	No change
	* Who will pay for an electric car pool scheme?	Individual members of the scheme would pay usually based on a subscription & 'hire' charge. Electric cars have considerably lower running costs than conventional cars (about 10p per mile on fuel costs alone) but capital cost of purchase can be high. This can be overcome both through the 'shared ownership' and higher vehicle use that pool car schemes can deliver. Initial set up costs can be met by the development and as with footpaths, cycle ways and public transport as part of modal shift.	Amend supporting text to include the need to be in place from first occupancy.

	* Low emission bus routes from the urban extension will not address the needs of the whole community.	Noted. The Guidance in respect of Eco Towns requires us to seek a minimum of 50% of travel by sustainable mean and thus seek to reduce reliance on cars. Other policies both in respect of Yeovil and the wider district are designed to improve public transport for the whole community.	No change
	* Real time public transport information for bus and train travel will not work as it will be radial into and out of the town centre.	A prime reason for real time is to instil confidence in the user that the bus will arrive and the actual time it will arrive at the stop. The system tracks the bus and is effective whether the route is linear or radial.	No change
	* Who will pay for a quality bus partnership to deliver modern desirable bus routes with frequent services and clean vehicle technology?	The development should contribute to the initial funding for both the infrastructure necessary to set up a quality route and for the initial 'kick starting' for use until sufficient critical mass is attained. Once established it is feasible to provide financially viable routes. However best practice elsewhere has proved that such routes must be in place from first occupancy. The benefits to the developer are that these costs are considerably less than the otherwise necessary highway improvements.	No change
	* Paragraph 5.61 - Modal shift is a utopian dream.	Policy accepts that not everyone will change mode (hence reference to electric cars, car share etc.). Best practice in towns and cities both in the UK, Europe and indeed worldwide proves that significant modal shift will take place if appropriate measures are in place to enable this to happen. It cannot happen unless provision is made	No change
	* Paragraph 5.59 - Carbon emissions would seem to be a sensible inclusion in this list of concerns.	Agreed. Text should be amended to include need to reduce carbon emissions.	Edit text to include need to reduce carbon emissions
	* Paragraph 5.62 - concern from SCC that a number of projects noted are not considered by their work on transport in Yeovil and have therefore not been included in any testing or modelling work. Further concern over the role of this list given there are unlikely to be any regional or national resources available to implement the measures.	Noted. The supporting text recognises that prior to any feasibility studies being carried out it is difficult to factor the UWE projects into the core strategy. The 'drivers' for its inclusion are the significant input from local stakeholders and the potential to deliver some of the measures in relation to the Eco Town and Urban Extension. Whilst it is accepted that in the current financial climate regional or national resources are unlikely to be available, this may not be the case for the duration of the Core Strategy.	No change

	* Paragraph 5.62 - Does UWE report need this much coverage? Could it not be summarised more briefly with references to the main report if more detailed required.	Noted.	Will review level of detail required
	* Paragraph 5.62 (1) - might be helpful to readers if label was applied to these measures.	The Projects 'labels' or titles for each 'seed project' evolved through the UWE work.	No change
	* Paragraph 5.62 (2) - Footnote 60 makes reference to 'Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2', which has yet to be written. A baseline report has been produced. Need to clarify what is being referred to.	Agreed. Technical editing issue. The footnote should be applied to paragraph 5.66 and should refer to the 'baseline report of the Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2'	Amend supporting text to correct footnote.
	* Paragraph 5.62 (2, 4 and 5) SCC's draft Bus Strategy should be included in the strategy (chiefly applies to Yeovil).	Noted. Reference to bus strategy is relevant	Will review level of detail required
	* Unrealistic aspirations for walking and cycling given topography. Likewise aspirations for public transport given reduction in services is unlikely. Disagree with Park and Ride reducing car usage.	Best practice in towns and cities both in the UK , Europe and indeed worldwide proves that significant modal shift will take place if appropriate measures are in place to enable this to happen. The feasibility of Park & Ride will be considered in the Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2.	No change
	* SSDC should look for best value for money and focus on improvement from within the urban fabric, to make alternative modes of transport preferable for the majority living in existing residential areas in Yeovil.	Agreed. The concept of making sustainable transport preferable for the majority of all residents is encouraged in the supporting text.	No change
	* Objects strongly to para 5.64 and 5.65 - any new development needs to fit in with the future of Yeovil as a whole, not just an urban extension - should start by developing the concept across the new northern sites and linking them into Yeovil	Agreed but this section is dealing with the principle of sustainable transport for the urban extension. The ease of access by walking, cycling & public transport for all new sites and in the ability to link sites through adjoining areas to the town centre and major employment areas is critical to the degree of take up of sustainable transport modes. Achieving high rates of permeability is very important to the principle of the urban extension.	No change
<b>Active and Low Carbon Travel a Transport Vision for Yeovil</b>	* More detail and actions are required in this section or it will just become a wish list. Park and Ride is an ideal partner for Ultra Light Rail.	Noted. The UWE report recommends that a feasibility study should be undertaken in respect of the 8 seed projects and will need consideration by the County Council in respect of the emerging Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2. The YTSR2 will consider Park & Ride. (See response to next comment in respect of light rail).	No Change

Active and Low Carbon Travel a Transport Vision for Yeovil (5.61 – 5.66)	* UWE vision will only achieve 30% of the carbon emissions reductions which will eventually be required of the transport sector. UWE vision was aligned to the funding regimes of the old Government, the Coalition Government have different funding priorities and Ultra Light rail fits in with their Light Rail Policy issued in January 2011.	Noted. Throughout the period to 2028 there is likely to be expansion of existing technologies and viability to introduce these. Light rail can be an attractive option where there is sufficient critical mass and significant common journey patterns. Usually this occurs in settlements with more than 200,000 inhabitants. Therefore at present, the scale of growth envisaged for Yeovil, its existing population and diverse travel patterns mean that any feasibility study is likely to preclude it as a viable transport option for Yeovil.	No Change
	* This is an ambitious vision which may be too costly to implement in the current economic climate.	Noted. However the Core Strategy is looking at the long term. Please see comments above in respect of feasibility studies and the YTSR2.	No Change
	* The UWE report active and low carbon travel a transport vision for Yeovil is cited but not referenced in the evidence base.	Accepted. There should be a cross reference on the evidence base.	Add footnote
	* What is park and go? Definition required.	Noted. UWE report outlines project which is wider than conventional park & ride, in as much that the user transfers from his/her car to other modes - walk, cycle & public transport.	Update supporting text to clarify
	* UWE report suggestions would incur significant costs specifically figure of 8 bus route. Parking and then undertaking a figure of 8 bus route is not going to offer a good choice for an in commuter. Support idea of active access to the north / north east of Yeovil. Retain the direct route to Yeovil Junction to the town centre and improve connectivity from northern suburbs.	The Core Strategy recognises that the 8 UWE projects will incur costs, hence the need for feasibility studies. However the figure of 8 bus route is actually shown in the UWE report as the least expensive project other than the journey to work (Travel Plan) measures. This is because the principle uses contra or bi-directional journeys (i.e. journeys that on existing routes are primarily re-positioning journeys) to service other areas of demand meaning that the vehicle is more efficiently utilised. It doesn't necessarily mean longer journey times and utilising contra journeys on Park & ride can be very cost effective. N.B. The '8' should also be interpreted as a loose term and does not necessarily imply 2 parallel, concentric and perfect circles; the actual route would be determined by travel generators.	No Change
	Support improvements to cycling and walking opportunities within the existing urban fabric and from key development site in the north, north west and north east. Do the things that are feasible and cost effective.	Support noted	No Change

	The multi-pathway out to Yeovilton is a brilliant idea and should be pursued	Support noted	No Change
<b>Measures to Encourage Modal Shift</b>	* 1a should refer to providing or completing continuous routes and that such routes should be preferably be off highway or sufficiently segregated from traffic to make the option available for potential users. For example segregated access along Huish would contribute towards Lufton Key Site access to the town centre and employment. Alternative limit is 20 mins commute cycling (7km) or walking (1.5km) for relevant infrastructure. Neither would limit the Yeovil Urban Area, why set a limit?	Agree in respect of distance limit. It is legitimate to ask for contributions to improving such a route at any point if it enables pedestrian and cycling access to key facilities. The actual design of such routes is best considered on a case-by-case basis.	Amend text to delete 'within 400 metres of the site'.
Measures to Encourage Modal Shift (para 5.67)	* Comment "reduce the desire to use the car" should also refer to reducing the need to use the car.	Accept. Reducing the need to use the car is complicit in reducing the desire, however the desire is often there although there is no need!	Amend text to read "reduce both the desire and need to use the car".
	* Thresholds are sensible and broadly commensurate with those in the draft countywide Travel Plans SPD. However, unclear how the thresholds of 2,400 and 3,600m2 have been arrived at - should be explained in footnote. Should also be explained why this applies to all land uses despite difference in travel demand due to staff densities i.e. B1 vs. B8.	Agree greater clarity required.	Amend supporting text to include explanatory footnote.
	* Paragraph 5.67 (1 & 2) - Rigid limit of 400m is questionable. Connectivity to the external network should look at key routes, e.g. routes between the town centre and the site. It is legitimate to ask for contributions to improving such a route at any point if it enable pedestrian and cycling access to key facilities. For a site to be accessible by bike it must be accessible all the way to and from trip attractors not just 400m beyond the site. Also important to consider how far developer will be able to develop routes beyond the boundary of their sites and where there may be obstacles to this (within and beyond the 400m limit). Also important to highlight the cycle parking standards in the countywide Travel Plans SPD. Should be made clear if 400m refers to the edge of the development.	Agree in respect of distance limit. It is legitimate to ask for contributions to improving such a route at any point if it enables pedestrian and cycling access to key facilities. Cycle parking will be in line with the SCC cycle parking strategy.	Amend text to delete 'within 400 metres of the site' (in terms of cycling and walking - but not PT).



	* Paragraph 5.67 (2) - Policy on bus shelters may not always use planning obligations to their best effect. Is £5-£10K per shelter is value for money? Example provided that shows that you might be able to achieve more by directly subsidising bus passes for tickets for residents than by providing infrastructure. Policy needs to be more flexible and allow a comparable enhancement to be made where there is evidence. May also be helpful to clarify whether SSDC is clear that their Council or Parish Councils will take on the license to support the maintenance of bus shelters.	The envisaged threshold for providing a bus shelter is > 20 dwellings or 2,400 sq m in respect of employment sites - within 400 metres, although "care should be taken to ensure bus routes are not distorted to satisfy this criterion...". Obviously some developments will already benefit from an existing bus shelter within 400 metres and therefore any additional shelter would not be necessary and this is recognised in the text. The other enhancements are already included in the policy to ensure flexibility. Agreed that the question of maintenance should be clarified.	Amend supporting text to include provision and on-going maintenance. Add foot note re threshold.
	* Paragraph 5.67 (2) - Would appreciate clarification over why a flat rate contribution has not been carried through into policy.	This would not be practical in terms of bus shelters given existing provision, variety of designs and aspects of location.	No Change
	Paragraph 5.67 (1b) - Cycling - CS would benefit from including further standards from the countywide Travels Plans SPD and /or the emerging Cycling Strategy. Might be useful to refer to current standards to fill any gap cause by delay in adopting the Countywide Parking Strategy which will cover cycling in more detail.	Noted update in light of SCC Draft Car Parking Standards on cycle parking (subject to full adoption of SCC standards).	Amend supporting text to reflect SCC Draft Car Parking Standards (subject to full adoption of SCC standards)
	* Paragraph 5.67 (5) - Reference "dependent on the outcomes from County Council FTP" is incorrect. Should be 'dependent on the County Council's transport implementation plan'.	Noted.	Amend supporting text for correct reference.
	* Paragraph 5.67 (5) - The distinction between major and smaller developments made here (scale not specified) is not carried through into policy.	The supporting text refers to "contributions being commensurate with the scale of the development to either enhance ..... or in the case of larger developments consider new routes etc" The policy is designed to be flexible in that whether it is more appropriate to contribute to the improvement to existing or new services and the establishment or enhancement of a route to Quality Bus Partnership standards could often depend on location rather than the merely the size of that development.	No Change.

	* Paragraph 5.67 (6) Does not appear obvious why developments in Chard should contribute to travel planning in Yeovil. If this measure is designed to target employees it is questionable if floor space is the right basis on which to apply it. Could lead to low travel generators subsidising high travel generators. Could the use of a pooled resource (rather than requirement to undertake PTP activities) be specified as a requirement, given that PTP could be bought in by the developer from a number of commercial organisations?	The aim of the policy is to pool that provision between Chard & Yeovil. As the contribution would be on a per dwelling or employment floor space then any such contribution would be commensurate with the scale of development for each town. The risk with using a 'bought in' resource would be that it would be difficult to deliver a uniform standard and also very difficult to achieve on smaller sites. As SSDC has no jurisdiction over the numbers of employees on any respective employment site, floor space is realistically the only option for assessing the scale of these sites.	Edit text to ensure clarity over Chard and Yeovil contributions.
	* Support policy and supporting text.	Noted.	No Change
Policy YV4 Modal Shift for Yeovil	* Point V should be modified to remove reference to distance limit of 400m. This should be 7km in 20mins for cycling or 1.5km in 20 mins for walking.	Agree in respect of distance limit. It is legitimate to ask for contributions to improving such a route at any point if it enables pedestrian and cycling access to key facilities. There are also the practicalities of actually being able to develop such routes whether that be within the 400m threshold or not.	Amend Policy YV4 v. to delete 'within 400 metres of the site'
	* Needs to be a direct link between contributions and development.	Agree. On site will be addressed through Planning Obligation Policies. Offsite will be addressed through CIL and recommendations should reflect this.	Amend text to note that on site contributions will be addressed through Planning Obligation Policies and offsite will be addressed through CIL.

	<p>* Transport modelling shows Yeovil is a trip attractor to many journeys from within Dorset including home-work trips. DCC therefore concerned that any employment proposals will increase the volume of these trips. It is accepted that the strategy for Yeovil is for modal shift towards sustainable transport options but suggest that there is a need to boost the sustainable emphasis not only to trips between residence and workplace within Yeovil and it's Somerset hinterland but also be more active in the strategy of "capturing" or encouraging modal shift of inbound journeys using Park &amp; Ride and even further enhanced rail of bus connectivity; this should be in addition to seeking less traditional forms of transport. Home to work travel is likely but not exclusively to increase trips on the A30 corridor Chard through Crewkerne, and Yeovil to Sherborne and Shaftesbury, as well as the A37, A352, and A357 corridors.</p>	<p>The policies seek to encourage modal shift between Yeovil and all its hinterland, whether that lies in Dorset or Somerset - policies such as Park &amp; Ride need to be assessed and come forward as appropriate through the YTSR 2 &amp; FTP implementation plans.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
	<p>* SCC's draft Bus Strategy should be included in the strategy (chiefly applies to Yeovil).</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Edit to include reference to SCC's Policy SUS2 (Transport Policy) Bus &amp; Community Transport.</p>
	<p>* Thresholds are sensible and broadly commensurate with those in the draft countywide Travel Plans SPD. However, unclear how the thresholds of 2,400 and 3,600m2 have been arrived at - should be explained in a footnote. Should also be explained why this applies to all land uses despite difference in travel demand due to staff densities i.e. B1 vs. B8.</p>	<p>Arrived at by taking the numbers quoted in SCC's draft travel plan SPD and then basing on typical employment densities in the SSDC employment Land study. It would not be reasonable to express thresholds in terms of the number of employees, which could easily change over the lifetime over a property. Given that most sustainable travel measures are reliant on either initial capital or 'kick-starting' then an area based threshold is felt more appropriate. Policy TA2 Travel Plans indicates more detailed reference to thresholds according to land use types.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
	<p>* Policy seems at odds with Policy TA1 re: bus shelters - 20 units v 10 units.</p>	<p>YV4 is 'in addition to the generic policies that support modal shift throughout the district'. TA 1 has the caveat 'commensurate with the scale of the development' whereas YV4 is more specific and reinforces that such developments in Yeovil of 20 dwellings or more should provide bus stops, bus shelters etc.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	* Current title may not make it clear to readers what modal shift means.	Modal shift is an accepted term and the supporting text explains in detail.	No Change.
	* YV4 (vi) - This criterion is confusing, it says it relates to developments of over 20 dwellings or 2400 sq m but continues to discuss developments below these thresholds.	Noted.	Minor text editing to policy to clarify.
	* New and improved infrastructure in support of these measures will also need to ensure that no severance is caused to habitat features used by bats in commuting between feeding areas and roost sites.	Accept. New paragraph to be inserted to ensure habitat protection	Amend supporting text.
	* Policy is excessive and unreasonable - specific sustainable transport measures should only be sought to make development proposals acceptable and should be fair and reasonably related in scale to the proposed development.	The alternative would be huge expenditure on highway infrastructure, which would have to be met by future development. The sustainable transport measures within these policies are in line with best practice elsewhere and have been proven to be more cost effective both in delivery and in the end result in terms of usage and benefits to users.	No Change.
<b>Modal Shift for Yeovil Eco Town and Urban Extension</b>	* Electric cars are not low emission until large scale tidal or sun power is produced. In the short term electricity is powered by coal, gas, oil with a hint of wind. Don't confuse emissions and carbon footprint with traffic congestion they only align when numbers of journeys reduce.	The level of emissions from an Electric Vehicle (EV) will depend how that electric power is generated e.g. solar or coal. Generally acknowledged that in the long term a greater proportion of electricity will come from either renewable sources or nuclear. Accept the statement that reducing congestion and reductions in CO2 only align when the numbers of journeys actually reduce. However the policy also recognises that in an area such as South Somerset realistically some journeys can only be made by car and again realistically some of those journeys will be between the Yeovil Eco Town and rural South Somerset and when those situations arise the car used should produce the lowest possible emissions at source.	No Change

<p>Modal Shift for Yeovil Eco Town and Urban Extension (paras 5.68 – 5.70)</p>	<p>* How is this possible with Yeovil's current road system? It is not possible to add a bus lane on Hendford Hill, Newton Road, Ilchester Road, Mudford Road, Preston Road, Sherborne Road or West Coker Road.</p>	<p>This policy relates to the Eco Town Urban extension purely because such measures need to be designed in from the start and with sufficient critical mass to enable delivery and take up. It recognises that the degree of modal shift is much more difficult to attain in existing settlements because of the limitations imposed by the existing infrastructure and the difficulty in overcoming these limitations. Different policies therefore apply in respect of transport for the rest of Yeovil and similarly to Chard and subsequently to the district as a whole to realistically reflect the different levels of potential to implement sustainable transport measures.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
	<p>* References to eco developments are inconsistent and confusing, particularly Eco Town when what is meant is Eco Urban Village.</p>	<p>The Eco Town and Eco Urban Village are distinct and there is a separate policy in respect of the Urban Village YV3. This policy states that in respect of the Urban Village the adoption of Eco-Town Standards is subject to a viability assessment. The degree of modal shift is much greater for the 'Eco Town and Urban Extension' than within the confines of the Urban Village and policy YV5 is primarily aimed at the 'the Yeovil Eco Town and Urban Extension'. Minor editing to clarify.</p>	<p>Edit to clarify</p>
	<p>* Paragraph 5.68 - The 50% target is a loose interpretation of the PPS. ET11.2 and ET11.3 indicate that 50% is a bare minimum, with 60% being the long-term ambition (cf.10.6). SCC interpretation is that for the purposes of this target being a car passenger does not count as a sustainable mode of transport.</p>	<p>Agree that the long-term aim should be to work towards 60% of travel by sustainable means. However whilst this will be possible within the urban extension itself, and higher rates are probable given that in exemplar towns the number of journeys by private car has been reduced to just 25%, we should still recognise that many of the travel attractors will lie outside of an urban extension and a degree of realism must therefore ensue. Also agree with the interpretation in respect of car passengers, however, this does not preclude either encouraging car share or the setting up of car pool schemes which is specifically recommended in the DCLG's Eco-towns transport worksheet (page 15).</p>	<p>No Change</p>

	* Paragraph 5.68 (3) - Important to consider how the setting of charges at low rates fits with the parking strategy and how far it might act as an incentive for other to use these facilities. Whilst recognise that parking provision is a sensitive issue it is one which undeniably impacts on the propensity to drive and cannot be ignored.	Agree that any charges would also have to reflect the car parking strategy to discourage visits by car from other areas. Visitors should be encourage to travel by sustainable means and if appropriate and deemed necessary Smartcard technology could also enable a dual tariff system to further discourage this sort of use.	Edit text to refer to SCC Transport Policies - Draft parking Strategy (Oct 2011) - Policy TM5.
	* Paragraph 5.68 - Does not include the text wording from the findings of the HRA on Bracket's Coppice SAC and therefore the Core Strategy cannot be considered to be Habitats Regulations compliant (suggested additional text supplied).	Accept. New paragraph to be inserted	Amend supporting text (already noted above).
	* Paragraph 5.68 (4) - Should also be considered whether providing long-stay residential car parking further away than the nearest alternative transport opportunity would further encourage people to swap the car for other modes of transport.	Noted. Matter for Masterplanning.	No Change.
	* Paragraph 5.68 (5) - May benefit from a wider focus: 1. Should not focus simply on electric vehicles, as other alternative fuels exist. Referring to electric only is unnecessarily risky. Appropriate terminology such as 'emerging vehicular technology such as electric vehicles or other fuel cell/hybrid alternatives' should be used. 2. Consideration should not be restricted to cars. Electric (and other emerging technology ) powered bikes and motorcycles should also be considered as part of these schemes.	Encouraging the use of electric cars reflects current government thinking. It does not preclude or discourage the use of other low emission vehicles such as those powered by Hydrogen Fuel cells or Biofuels. The difference is that one of the main constraints to electric car use currently relates to the lack of charging infrastructure and the policy as a whole seeks to mitigate this. The provision of this infrastructure will also positively encourage the use of electric bikes and electric motor cycles.	No Change
	* Paragraph 5.70 - There may be many sources of potential transport interventions in addition to the UWE study, not least the County Council's views as transport authority. The purpose of the IDP is to encapsulate the infrastructure requirements do would suggest the policies refer to the IDP rather than the UWE study. IDP should capture agreed proposals and requirements from the range of sources of transport interventions.	The UWE report evolved from key stakeholder participation and it is part of the evidence base. There are clear links for building some of these projects into the Eco Town. This again does not preclude measures envisaged by SCC that emerge from the YTSR 2 and the FTP's implementation plans. Agree that there should be reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the fact that it should capture agreed proposals and requirements from a range of sources in the supporting text.	Amend supporting text to refer to infrastructure in the IDP.
	* Public transport is at best patchy due to cuts can result in a college day of 7.00am to 7.30pm.	Not a direct issue in respect of modal shift for the Eco Town.	No Change
	* Support policy and modal shift target of 50%.	Support noted.	No Change

Policy YV5 Modal Shift for Yeovil Eco Town	* Object to YV5 as unrealistic. Free deliveries are unrealistic. Traffic will increase, be it be by families, elderly or lazy folk as they will not use cycle paths or park and go schemes. Hendford hill is steep. Yeovil junction is where it is and no amount of figure of 8 bus routes will bring it nearer the town. It is not possible to raise the status of the Exeter to Waterloo line as it would need upgrading for that to happen. Dr Beeching did the damage which is impossible to reverse.	YV5 follows the principles for delivering sustainable travel that have been applied elsewhere and are proven. Don't accept that free deliveries within an Eco Town urban extension are unrealistic. The concept of supermarkets delivering is now widely accepted usually at very low (way below cost) price and occasionally free. In this instance the delivery distance would involve very short distances from the shop and there is an added incentive of market share and retention from the supermarkets perspective. Similarly measures to improve walking, cycling and public transport use have worked elsewhere and can work in an Eco Urban Extension for Yeovil.	No Change.
	* I don't object to the principle of modal shift. To put one policy on one housing development is not sensible. SSDC should start to build in good achievable concepts into the new key sites and regeneration areas of Yeovil. This would tie in with the most cost effective parts of the policy. Make it a Yeovil wide policy and not just the Urban Extension. Recommend that you delete this policy as it consumes time and resources which should be used to improve Yeovil and South Somerset.	The degree of modal shift attainable relates to the ability to design in measures that will actually deliver it. Best practice has illustrated that measures need to be designed in from the very start and have sufficient critical mass to ensure take up and viability. This is why there is greater potential to deliver modal shift in the Eco Town Urban Extension. Where there is existing infrastructure or even for those sites approved under old policy this is very difficult to achieve. The range of transport policies in the Core Strategy therefore follow a hierarchical approach.	No Change.
	* Policy generally supported but the cost of subsidising bus services and other measures needs to be looked at carefully in the context of viability even in relation to the Yeovil urban extension. Otherwise the scheme may become unviable.	Noted and agree that any measures must be viable.	No Change.
	* Needs to be a direct link between contributions and development.	Yes agree - this is explained in the Planning Obligations Policies.	No Change
	* Importance of legible network for walking and cycling through the provision of measures such as maps, web resources and signage) and non-public transport soft measures should also be considered. Would seem appropriate to consider whether any of these measures are appropriate for other developments elsewhere.	These are all considered in Chapter 10 Transport & Accessibility and the generic policy TA1.	No Change.

	<p>*Question the viability of walking and cycling proposals. How will the Council enable travel by means other than the car?</p>	<p>The background text illustrates how this can be achieved and the degree to which this can be achieved. However the hierarchal approach recognises that this will be easier to achieve in the Eco Urban extension than in existing developments, which in turn will also vary in terms of practical application. The key will be the greater degree of permeability and ease of access and directness of these sustainable routes.</p>	<p>Recognise that relaxed car parking standards are set to be introduced by SCC. Delete the word 'limited' from YV5, paragraph 4.</p>
	<p>*Building housing without adequate parking will lead people to park on the street which will affect emergency service access, it will not mean that people will not have cars - suggestion will not work.</p>	<p>There will remain a requirement for parking. Policy is about making sure that other modes are readily available and are as easy or easier to access than the private car. It recognises that there will still be a need for some journeys by car and it's about discouraging the need or desire for journeys by car rather than car ownership itself. Accepted that the design will mean that car parking won't be adjacent to the front door, however the design can also eradicate any potential for on-street displacement. Best practice elsewhere has proved this is feasible. Somerset County Council are set to publish more relaxed car parking standards which will resolve this concern.</p>	<p>Recognise that relaxed car parking standards are set to be introduced by SCC. Delete the word 'limited' from YV5, paragraph 4.</p>
	<p>*Policy is excessive and unreasonable - specific sustainable transport measures should only be sought to make development proposals acceptable and should be fair and reasonably related in scale to the proposed development.</p>	<p>This policy relates to an Eco Town Urban extension and as such should aim to deliver at the very least 50% of travel by sustainable means. It follows examples from best practice elsewhere. The alternatives to these measures to ensure delivery of this scale of development would be very expensive highway infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>*Delete this policy, the Eco Town should not have its own policy, modal shift should apply across Yeovil.</p>	<p>The degree of modal shift attainable relates to the ability to design in measures that will actually deliver it. Best practice has illustrated that measures need to be designed in from the very start and have sufficient critical mass to ensure take up and viability. This is why there is greater potential to deliver modal shift in the Eco Town Urban Extension. Where there is existing infrastructure or even for those sites approved under old policy this is very difficult to achieve. The range of transport policies in the Core Strategy therefore follow a hierarchical approach.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>



	*Object to the way SSDC is seeking to urbanise historic rural rights of way and bring them into an urban framework.	No intention to do this but where existing rights of way can be linked to a proposed development then we would be looking to improve sustainable access to them to enhance their use and provide sustainable links to that development.	No Change.
	*Park and Ride provision needs to be included.	The YTSR 2 will consider the feasibility of Park & Ride - measures and outcome will be fed into the Core Strategy 'Submission' plan.	No Change.