

Appendix B

'DRAFT CORE STRATEGY INCORPORATING PREFERRED OPTIONS': AREA WEST COUNCILLOR WORKSHOP

5th July 2010, Stringfellow Room, Chard

Attendees

Members:

Kim Turner
Jenny Kenton
Dave Bulmer
Nigel Mermagen
Ros Roderigo
Angie Singleton
Andrew Turpin
Ric Pallister
Geoff Clarke

Area Development West Team:

Andrew Gillespie
Zoë Harris
Rob Murray

Spatial Policy Team

Session 1 – Scale Of Development

Points emerging:

16,600 dwellings 2006 - 2026 (District wide):

- 8,400 dwellings in 'B' and 'C' settlements.
- 8,200 dwellings in Yeovil.
- Provisional figures subject to review of Baker Associates' work on population, housing and economic projections.

Are members happy with 16,600?

- Potential problems of localism, general support for low levels of growth.
- Community pressure.
- Petitions.
- Difficult to visualise 16,600 and its relationship to employment provision.

Evidence is key:

- Baker study on employment led growth.
- Infrastructure, key sites will remain with supporting infrastructure.
- Parish Cluster Meetings general support for growth proposed.
- Local businesses want to stay and grow.

AREA WEST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT:

General support for a provisional figure of 16,600 subject to consultation and further evidence gathering (including economic and household projections).

Session 2 – Vision, Settlement Hierarchy And Settlement Discussion

Points emerging:

Chard Sub Group:

- Supportive of Vision.
- Support settlement hierarchy.
- Concern at the loss of the phrase 'Market Town' – don't like 'service centres' – Chard is a town and would like this phrase in its description.
- Growth of ageing population is a concern – concern around provision of care for the growing elderly population.
- General support for Chard growth option 3 – supported by Area West.
- Concern about town centre, delivery of retail, suitable premises, viable business.
- Support 'B' status and growth levels in the settlement hierarchy.
- Transport interchange.
- Reopen Chard train station. Why: economic benefits to import and export and skills. Estimated cost is £1 million.
- Important to ensure the delivery of affordable housing.

AREA WEST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON CHARD:

- ***Supports Market Town ('Policy B') status***
- ***Supports Growth Option 3 with phased number of 2191 dwellings by end of plan period.***

Crewkerne Sub Group:

Vision

- Shortage of skilled labour
- No control over infrastructure, therefore difficult to balance with growth
- Funding for infrastructure – difficult/out of sync
- NB needs to be fully serviced

Settlement Hierarchy

- Broad consensus
- Future of Crewkerne
 - Possible demand for housing
 - But not necessarily employment
 - Flexible approach
 - but concern about incremental development will not generate sufficient revenue to fund major transport/road network improvements leading to congestion and Provision of new schools
- Names of policy B and C settlements Should be market towns and small country towns

AREA WEST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON CREWKERNE:

- ***Supports Market Town ('Policy B') status and broadly happy with scale of growth to 2026 (as long as infrastructure is provided as and when).***

- ***If Key Site fails will need to restrict growth of Crewkerne to existing commitments.***

Ilminster Sub Group:

- Support for Vision
- Support for settlement hierarchy
- Ilminster has already had over 400 houses with very little contribution towards the infrastructure.
- The Doctors Surgery is a prime example, no idea if this will ever be built.
- Ilminster needs a balance – housing versus employment/facilities (i.e. school).
- Employment allocation - loss of employment land due to flooding constraints – now to be a nature reserve.
- Allocated employment land well placed.
- No more housing until employment comes forward.
- Protection for retail.
- Main concern is how to ensure that employment comes forward before any more housing is built and to ensure that existing retail frontages are protected.

AREA WEST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON ILMINSTER:

- ***Supports Market Town ('Policy B') status.***
- ***Supports scale of employment and housing growth.***
- ***Seeks phasing policy to obtain employment provision prior to housing development.***

AREA WEST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON VISION AND SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

Supports both but Vision should explain requirement for infrastructure to be provided in consort with housing development.

Session 3 – Rural Settlements Policy

Points emerging:

- Struggle with the concept of not allowing some growth in villages especially where buses are available.
- Settlement clusters should be looked at.
- Develop supporting text to make it crystal clear re cluster being justification for sustainable development.
- Argument for piggy backing for rural exceptions.
- Whole life occupancy to address the needs of ageing local society.

AREA WEST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON RURAL SETTLEMENT POLICY:

Supports Policy and seeks emphasis in text for case for sustainable development to be made also in relation to appropriate village clusters.

Session 4 – Theme Discussion

Draft Policy	Session 1 Feedback	Session 2 Feedback	Recommendation to DX
HOUSING			
HG1	General support.	General support.	support
HG2	General support.	General support.	support
HG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that negotiations on affordable housing should take a firm line. • Any commuted sums to be retained for use in that settlement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial contributions should be required on all housing developments – even one property. • Ring fence commuted sums to geographic area/cluster. 	Amend policy to reflect comments
HG4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query re standards of Disability Act – lifetime build? • All sites (large or small) should be in keeping with surrounding area (2nd para). 	General support.	support
HG5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last para – circumstances? – need good justification. • Can only control use of best agricultural land for housing. 	Reference should be made to the fact that good design can lead to good quality high density development.	support
HG6	General support.	General support.	support
HG7	General support.	Last bullet comment – type of business important.	support
HG8	General support.	If extensions to a property result in that property being of a type that does not meet local need then potentially it could still become a second home.	support
HG9	Important policy is beefed up.	General support.	support
HG10	Important policy is beefed up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can't sell so these dwellings are becoming rental – therefore do provide local resource. • Not restrictive about who occupies but tie to sale. 	Amend policy to reflect comments
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY			
EP1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15ha for Chard reflects LDA work. Is 15ha enough? (considered to be so) • Phasing/delivery is key in Chard. 	support
EP2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment site 'Canal Way' missing from list. Threat from residential development. • Should these smaller sites be regarded as strategic? Not size but 	Amend policy to reflect comments

Draft Policy	Session 1 Feedback	Session 2 Feedback	Recommendation to DX
		strategic. • Not name sites? Just refer to 'saved' sites.	
EP3	New policy – sequential test is relevant as applied in policy		support
EP4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention/safeguarding of employment land Feel policy protects against housing 		support
EP5, 6 & 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that live/work units do not work Long term strategy to convert to housing 		support
EP6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the number of people who work from home? Hidden employment 		support
EP9 - 13		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retail, if at full capacity what happens? Redevelopment options. Size of units should be flexible. Retail frontage policy is limited. Area aspiration to safeguard all retail frontage Policy to maintain retail sector. 	Amend policy to reflect comments
EP13 & 14	Sets a maximum capacity for retail floorspace		support
EP15	Protects local shops & community facilities		Review in light of further officer clarification of policy
TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY			
TA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> promote modal shift (vii) planning obligation, open to negotiation subsidise bus fares? – covered by Green Travel voucher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low carbon policy. Smart cars, discounts. Fares are a commercial issue. Bring in community to travel e.g. timetables planning. Local Parishes work together. 	support
TA2	Yeovil based policy		Not considered
TA3	Yeovil based policy		Not considered
TA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chard badly needs a transport interchange v cycling & walking encouraged short cycle routes with no end points personal travel plans – good take up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chard. Bus timetables. The routing of buses. Double frequency of routes 	support

Draft Policy	Session 1 Feedback	Session 2 Feedback	Recommendation to DX
TA5 - 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover whole district. • Who owns new bus shelter? Parish and Town Councils will need contribution towards maintenance. • LED – display of traffic information. • County wide parking strategy. Draft is behind schedule, now due in November. 	support
TA6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of hours bus service – difficult issue • Is this appropriate to all development? 		support
TA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking standards – County work is behind timetable, will use old standards until replaced (November) • Police/enforcement of parking restrictions • Make a decision on parking standards in November when draft county standards published 		Support policy but review policy in light of emerging County policies and standards in LTP3 Future Transport Plan (due November 10)
HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			
HW1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should request contributions on all development. • Need timescale S106. 		See below
HW2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs depend on settlement, larger - may need theatres, smaller – village halls. • Must ensure contributions go to relevant settlements. 		See below
Health and Well Being policies			Review in the light of latest policy drafts

Draft Policy	Session 1 Feedback	Session 2 Feedback	Recommendation to DX
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY			
EQ1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand section on sustainable drainage systems – need to be maintained, must make provision for this (S106 contributions). • Can encourage Code level 3 but can't require. Should be current Building Regulation standards. • Any requirement should be for all development not just 'major' – Officer highlighted national policy does not support this. 	Amend policy to reflect comments
EQ2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change is a fundamental result of design/orientation. • Need to include layout/orientation in policy. • Can't live in past – must minimise energy consumption. 	Amend policy to reflect comments
EQ3		General support.	support
EQ4		General support.	support
EQ5		General support.	support