

## Appendix E

### 'DRAFT CORE STRATEGY INCORPORATING PREFERRED OPTIONS' : AREA EAST COUNCILLOR WORKSHOP

8<sup>th</sup> July 2010, Churchfields, Wincanton

Attendees

Members:

Lucy Wallace  
Henry Hobhouse  
Anna Groskop  
Mike Lewis  
Tim Inglefield  
Colin Winder  
John Crossly

Area Development East Team:

Helen Rutter  
Pam Williams  
Mike Allen  
  
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?

- Concern that employment / Jobs will not match housing growth.
- Concern for Blackmore Vale villages (Templecombe, Henstridge & Milborne Port).
- Concern about forced development in some locations (Castle Cary).
- Housing growth will be monitored annually – The Core Strategy can be reviewed should housing numbers deviate from local targets.
- Concern about Greenfield employment development. For example Cadbury Business Park.
- Will local knowledge be a consideration in finalising growth figures?

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 with the exception of Castle Cary in Area East.
- Local businesses want to stay and grow.

**AREA EAST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT:**

*Generally agnostic on 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:

- Concern that employment applications are being refused and that this is stifling the economy.
- Suggested that employment land is allocated within the Core Strategy to help implement development.
- Concern that current policy will allow housing growth but will not encourage the necessary employment growth. Suggested that the Core Strategy includes a Phasing Policy that ensures employment comes ahead of housing.
- Concern that Templecombe & Henstridge are omitted from Settlement Hierarchy. The grouping of these settlements was discussed at the Parish Workshops but there was no local support for this approach.
- The Character of Towns was discussed. For example Templecombe as a railway hub and its importance to the wider community.
- Overall Settlement Hierarchy broadly supported.
- Concern that employment applications for small-scale industrial units at Castle Cary are being turned down and at the incremental loss of businesses in the town centre.
- Castle Cary is short of land for existing businesses.
- Would like land 'earmarked' for employment in Castle Cary
- How do we ensure that land for employment is in the Plan of Castle Cary?
- Housing types / tenure should match the required need in Castle Cary.
- The Castle Cary Town Council only wanted limited housing growth.
- Infrastructure within Castle Cary will not support proposed housing growth
- Castle Cary want to see jobs first.
- Primary School provision is currently at capacity.
- The quality of the Secondary School in Castle Cary needs to be improved.
- A lot of existing housing sites have not been developed in Castle Cary and would want to see these developed first

**AREA EAST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON AREA EAST SETTLEMENTS:**

- *Support for Market Town ('Policy B') status for Wincanton & Rural Centre (Policy C) status for Bruton and Milborne Port. And their respective scales of growth proposed*
- *Objections raised on Castle Cary's ('Policy B') status – Policy C status and a scale of growth of around 300 (including existing provision) proposed.*

**AREA EAST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON VISION AND GENERAL SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY**

*Support both but with a greater emphasis on Tourism within the Vision.*

**Session 3 – Rural Settlements Policy**

Points emerging:

- Support policy aim to strike a balance between growth at the right scale and protection of the countryside.
- Policy does not mention local employment issues: Manual labour, re-use of farm buildings, and preference for economic development over housing growth.
- Area East would like to see greater use of the Town and Village Plans prepared for each area as they set out the community aspirations and visions in greater detail. How do we ensure these are used? Planning policy has made an offer to support Town and Parish Plans and have used their visions in formulating the settlement visions for the Core Strategy.
- The determination of planning applications should reflect vision and policies.
- Support Conservation Areas and their continued use in planning policy.
- Are boundaries to be retained or removed from rural settlements? Towns (Policy B) & Rural Service Centres (Policy C) settlements will retain boundaries while villages will not have boundaries.

**AREA EAST RECOMMENDATION TO DX ON RURAL SETTLEMENT POLICY:**

***Support Policy.***

**Session 4 – Theme Discussion**

Draft Policy	Feedback	Recommendation to DX
<b>HOUSING</b>		
HG1	General support.	Supports policy
HG2	General support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that the Wincanton Key Site is not listed because site has been implemented.</li> </ul>	Supports policy
HG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The affordable housing thresholds reflect existing approach but at a lower percentage. A lower threshold would be unviable. Who judges viability? Viability is judged on an open book approach.</li> <li>• Affordable housing is excluded from CLG regulations.</li> </ul>	Supports policy
HG4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Mix, concern that there is an aging population in the district and that health issues will become more acute.</li> <li>• This policy refers to the Councils evidence base for the relevant Housing Mix.</li> </ul>	Supports policy
HG5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum housing density targets have been removed by Central Government.</li> <li>• Area East request that flexibility is given to standards to ensure that sufficient garden space is provided.</li> </ul>	Supports policy (but with additional work required to review density standards prior to finalising the policy in the Publication Plan to be submitted to Examination)

Draft Policy	Feedback	Recommendation to DX
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional work will be carried out to check housing densities are correct.</li> </ul>	
HG6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PDL target is 30% down from 60% to reflect past brownfield use. Is 30% achievable in all areas? For example there are very few Brownfield locations in Wincanton.</li> </ul>	support
HG7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GTAA will give us up to date information about Gypsy's and Travellers.</li> <li>The RSS has been abolished along with Gypsy targets.</li> <li>Suggested maximum site size should be limited to 2 or 3 pitches.</li> <li>When does an unauthorised site become authorised?</li> </ul>	Amend policy to reflect comments
HG8	General support.	support
HG9	Farm workers dwellings should meet the need of the holding not the needs of the individual. Dwellings are important for Agricultural, Horticultural and Equestrian holdings.	support
HG10	General support.	support
SS4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the past Planning Obligations have failed to be effective. For example allotments in North Cadbury were significantly delayed because of legal issues.</li> <li>Situation for Planning Obligations is currently unknown.</li> <li>Community Infrastructure Plan (CIL) will bring this information together. Castle Cary Town Council request this information when it is made available.</li> </ul>	support
<b>ECONOMIC PROSPERITY</b>		
EP1	Wincanton and Castle Cary numbers are low and don't seem to reflect the actual need.	Amend policy to reflect comments
EP2	General support.	support
EP3	This policy seeks to protect Office development and is linked with Policy EP4. Change of use applications must now actively market premises for an 18-month period, promoting inward investment.	support
EP5	Replacement within the Countryside. What % of the Farm business should a farm shop be to support farming enterprise? Link here with farm diversification policy.	support
EP6	Live / work units should only be located on acceptable housing sites where evidence of need is produced.	support

<b>Draft Policy</b>	<b>Feedback</b>	<b>Recommendation to DX</b>
EP11	Protection of the vitality and viability of the rural / local centres.	support
EP9-14	Retail hierarchy supported. As Yeovil will retain its market as well as the market towns. The supporting text explains that urban centres should be protected.	support
EP15	Protects local shops & community facilities. Working on policy to introduce charity.	Review in light of further officer clarification of policy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tourism Policy required in light of the demise of the RSS.</li> <li>• Tourism policy should allow tourism accommodation to be acceptable but preventing dwellings converting to market housing.</li> </ul>	Introduce policy to reflect comments
<b>TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY</b>		
TA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a low carbon policy and is moving away from targets.</li> <li>• Remove reference to 'smart' travel</li> <li>• Link to local public transport provision.</li> <li>• An easy win is to get information across to the public. For example designing in workspace provision for the future or Broadband.</li> <li>• Bus stop times keep changing as there are different operators. Information packs would solve this issue.</li> </ul>	Amend policy to reflect comments
TA2-6	General support.	support
TA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intention is to use Countywide Car parking standards but these will not be produced until November. We will stay with the SCC approach unless early drafts indicate a conflict of competing objectives</li> <li>• Bruton is desperately short of car parking space. This issue is recognised within the County Transport Plan. Is there a need for a new policy allocating car parking space?</li> <li>• Should we be promoting demand responsive transport not just public/community transport?</li> <li>• Electric vehicles / scooters need to be considered within the strategy?</li> <li>• Area East is different from other parts of Somerset and even Chard / Yeovil.</li> </ul>	Support policy but review policy in light of emerging County policies and standards in LTP3 Future Transport Plan (due November 10)
<b>HEALTH AND WELL-BEING</b>		
HW1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter has recently been updated.</li> </ul>	Review in the light of latest policy drafts

Draft Policy	Feedback	Recommendation to DX
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</b>		
EQ1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change policy seeks to reduce CO2 omissions and encourage renewable energy, flood plain adaptation, cost / viability of change For example the Code for Sustainable Homes.</li> <li>• Old Buildings are difficult to adapt but this is crucial to wider success.</li> </ul>	Amend policy to reflect comments
EQ2-5	No comments.	No recommendation made