

**Draft Core Strategy (incorporating Preferred Options) October 2010
Summary of issues - Part 3 - Market Towns and Rural Centres**

Policy/Paragraph/Section	Summary of Issues	Officer Comment	Recommendation
Market Towns – Visions and Proposals			
Market Towns – Visions and Proposals (paras 6.1 – 6.3)	* Prefer greater growth at Crewkerne ahead of Wincanton.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Will School size be increased in Somerton, will pre school places be increased, will the train station be re-opened, will the medical centre, are roads going to be improved. How can extra houses be justified when there are still houses for sale.	The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Sept 2011) has identified key infrastructure issues that need to be achieved to accommodate additional development but no reference to the need for a new school has been identified. A new medical centre is currently subject to a planning application and has been identified in the IDP. The Core Strategy is a long term plan, and new houses will be required up to the year 2028 to satisfy demand and the IDP will be a rolling process	No change.
	* Disagree with findings of Settlement role and function study. Martock must have more than 700 jobs. This is half the number in Somerton, Martock has a reasonable number of shops and services, it has a trading estate like Somerton, it has Schools, Old Peoples Home, pubs and clubs, B&B, Library, Vets, Health Centre etc. all comparable with Somerton. Plus two garages and the Yandle complex. Compton Dundon is recorded as having 400 jobs. There is no way to check.	Incorrect - the Settlement Role and Function study identifies that Martock has around 800 jobs, which is more than half of Somerton (1,300). Compton Dundon has 200 jobs.	No change.
	* Somerton can be classified as a Market Town after all it has an old market cross dating back hundreds of years. However Somerton is only a Market Town to the same extent that Wells is a City. The broad brush classification must be kept in the context with the size of Somerton and the size of other market towns. Common sense must prevail to the quantity of the housing	The Settlement Role and Function study identifies that Somerton has a strong employment, retail and community role, meeting the criteria necessary to be considered a Market Town.	No change.
	* Somerset is a farming area providing food for the whole Country. Food from this area is some of the best in the world.	Noted. Best and most versatile agricultural land is present in South Somerset, and is an issue to be considered in the future development of the District.	No change.

	* Reference should be made to the NHS Trust response to infrastructure questionnaire. Large housing development policies, need to make provision for additional medical facilities. Specifically Yeovil and Chard including sites for health infrastructure	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does identify where additional health provision is needed and health authorities have been part of the IDP process	No change
	* It is important that some certainty is provided through the Core Strategy and that accommodating the growth requirements of the Market Towns is not left to chance. The Core Strategy seems to suggest that this process will be left to the SHLAA, but this could result in opportunities in excess of the strategic provision without any certainty as to what sites/locations are actually preferred - the SHLAA should only be used as part of the evidence base, not as policy itself. Therefore, a greater degree of certainty for the other Market Towns (Chard is already detailed) is required in setting a clear context for growth and identify directions of growth and make it explicit in policy.	Comment noted and broadly agreed. The scale of development and direction for the Market Towns are proposed and address these concerns.	Include the Market Town directions of growth in a policy.
	* Sections 6 and 7 omit the historic environment's relevance to the market towns and rural centres when it is in fact highly significant.	The historic environment is discussed at each settlements' spatial portrait, as appropriate.	No change.
	* Whilst HEA has been carried out for Yeovil no such approach has been taken for the other towns e.g. Chard.	A specific historic assessment was considered for Yeovil due to the scale of development proposed, the proximity of these to proposed growth and the value of historic assets in the vicinity. The historic environment has been considered for the Market Towns in sustainably appraising locations for directions of growth.	No change.
	* Paragraph 6.3 highlights there is a different scale of growth proposed for Chard. It is understood that a site allocations DPD is not going to be prepared. Respondents interests lie in Somerton. Since an allocations DPD is not going to be prepared it is important that accommodating the growth requirements of any Market Town.	Chard is the second largest settlement in the District, with a range of jobs, shops and services, that justifies the proposed scale of development and the required supporting evidence. The additional work at Chard by LDA consultants was also undertaken to help bring forward the Key Site. No decision has yet been made regarding an allocations DPD but a clear direction of growth will be established.	No change.
	* Seems surprising that only Yeovil and Chard get a "Transport" section of specific set of policies.	The degree of potential to achieve modal shift varies between settlements. A hierarchical approach has been taken as the ability to deliver this is greatest in Yeovil followed by Chard and then cascading down to other settlements.	No Change.

	* Given the proposed housing growth in Wincanton, Cary/Ansford and Milborne Port, the comparative proposed levels of additional employment land seems low for Wincanton and will fail to sustain the Council's policy of self containment. Danger of creating a commuter town in Wincanton on the A303. Suggest that the housing target in Wincanton is reduced to about 200 homes with the balance of about 150 re-distributed pro-rata to Castle Cary /Ansford and Milborne Port.	Noted. See para 6.110-115.	See changes proposed para 6.110-115.
Castle Cary /Ansford			
Spatial Portrait			
Spatial Portrait (paras 6.4 – 6.9)	* No longer a Norman Castle in Castle Cary.	Clarification noted.	Amend text to make reference to the 'remains' of a Motte and bailey Castle.
	* Castle Cary data is out of date, this needs further investigation.	Where practical the most up to date information will be used to inform the Core Strategy.	Update data where appropriate.
	* Object to proposed housing growth of 500 dwellings as this is a 33% increase. Would suggest growth of 300 dwellings.	It is consider that a total Castle Cary / Ansford housing growth of 400 dwellings would contribute towards creating a more self-contained settlement and reflect the towns status and scale as a Market Town. This provision can be accommodated by known sites and within landscape capacity. See Castle Cary Direction of Growth paper presented to Project Management Board.	Reduce housing provision for Castle Cary / Ansford to 400 to avoid excess provision and reflect town scale.
	* Object to housing development in fields to the north of Ansford Hill or South of Ansford Hill because of high landscape value. Preference to the north of Torbay Road subject to landscape constraints.	An assessment of options against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the North West of Castle Cary / Ansford (Option 1). Key determining factors relate to evidence presented in the Landscape Character Assessment that indicates that this area has a high-moderate capacity to accommodate built development, good access to employment and town centre facilities and known developer interest. See Castle Cary Direction for Growth paper presented to Project Management Board	That option 1 to the north of Torbay Road, and east and west of Station Road is taken forward as the preferred direction for growth at Castle Cary. · Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Castle Cary / Ansford the direction of strategic growth will be north of Torbay Road, and east and west of Station Road.

	* Support small and medium sized business growth to avoid dependency on a single employer.	Agreed that there needs to be a proper range and choice of job opportunities	Retain approach to employment provision for Castle Cary / Ansford at 3ha of employment land.
	* Object to a major supermarket chain in Castle Cary as they can have a negative impact on town centres. Large supermarkets are in easy reach by car at Shepton Mallet and Wincanton. Our local shops know their customers and provide a friendly local service.	No supermarket is proposed within the Core Strategy. Any application would be considered on its merits through a Development Management approach.	No change.
	* Support an early enlargement of Castle Cary primary school before situation becomes critical. Consider temporary classrooms adversely effect pupil and teacher learning.	A new 2 form entry primary school has been identified at Castle Cary as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	Amend supporting text to make reference to the need for a new 2 form entry school.
	* Consider Ansford School is reaching its natural life and is unsuited to 21st Century education. Priority to seek alternative site.	No requirement to replace Ansford school has been identified by SCC as Education Authority as part of the IDP.	No Change.
	* Object on the grounds of traffic generation exceeding road infrastructure capacity. This is typified by heavy goods vehicles that have hit buildings, causing damage and danger to pedestrians.	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. See Castle Cary scale of growth and direction for growth papers presented to Project Management Board. A proposals for a road associated with the preferred growth option will help address this concern.	Reduce housing provision for Castle Cary / Ansford to 400 to avoid excess provision and reflect town scale.
	* Traffic makes it difficult to cross the road specifically for old people and children.	This is not a Core Strategy issue but is the responsibility of Somerset County Councils Highways department.	No change.
	* Object to street parking and its impact on traffic.	This is not a Core Strategy issue but is the responsibility of Somerset County Councils Highways department in respect of road management and a police matter in respect of enforcement.	No change.
	* Preference is for Brownfield development in advance of Greenfield development.	PPS3 seeks to maximise the use of Previously Developed land however it is not possible to introduce a Policy that enforces this objective.	No change.

	* Object to development on agricultural land which has food potential.	Agree, the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land is regarded as a negative aspect of development on a Greenfield site however the scale of growth identified would be unlikely to be accommodated within the urban framework of the town. All 3 options for growth are on high quality agricultural land.	That option 1 to the north of Torbay Road, and east and west of Station Road is taken forward as the preferred direction for growth at Castle Cary.
	* Object to Castle Cary Employment allocation for 3 ha as this land is already available at the Crown Pet Food Factory allocation.	Ward Members formally requested in July 2010 that Castle Cary should be allocated an additional 3ha employment land. They argued that the existing employment allocation at Torbay Road had been developed at a lower density than had previously been expected and to make up for this lack of additional job formation for the town a further allocation was felt necessary. Policy Officers proposed an additional 3ha of employment land would be commensurate with the scale of the town. See Castle Cary scale of growth paper as presented to Project Management Board .	Retain approach to employment provision for Castle Cary / Ansford at 3ha of employment land.
	* Castle Cary should not grow as there is poor public transport provision. The bus service does not run on Sundays and is infrequent during the week. Trains do not leave Castle Cary Station at convenient times.	Opportunities to improve bus routes is an issue for Somerset County Council as Highways Authority as part of the Future Transport Plan (FTP) and not a Core Strategy issue. Specific site dangers are an operational issue and should be taken up with Transport in Somerset.	Reduce housing provision for Castle Cary / Ansford to 400 to avoid excess provision and reflect town scale.
	* Support local shops such as Green Grocers and butchers.	The town's scale of development will help retain local facilities	No Change.
	* Support mixed housing in Castle Cary.	Support noted. See Housing Paper on Policy HG5 Achieving a mix of Market Housing as presented to Project Management Board	No change.
	* New homes should have suitable parking.	Noted and agreed. See parking standards section. Note SCC's car parking standards are more generous in relation to residential car parking	No change.

	* An employment allocation of 3ha should not be subject to housing growth for 500 dwellings.	Disagree as employment and housing provision are inextricably linked. See also Castle Cary scale of growth paper.	Reduce housing provision for Castle Cary / Ansford to 400 to avoid excess provision and reflect town scale. Retain approach to employment provision for Castle Cary / Ansford at 3ha of employment land.
	* Essential to improve town centre car parking and safeguard the local private shops.	Safeguarding of shops is important and addressed as part of the retail policies. Parking provision needs to be considered alongside any proposed development.	No change.
	* Opportunity to develop the number 1/1A rtc bus route creatively to serve Castle Cary better for trains. The bus/rail interchange at Castle Cary for the larger buses which can't go into the station yard is extremely dangerous.	Opportunities to improve bus routes is an issue for Somerset County Council as Highways Authority as part of the Future Transport Plan (FTP) and not a Core Strategy issue. Specific site dangers are an operational issue and should be taken up with Transport in Somerset.	No change.
	* If more than half the population needs to commute elsewhere to work already, where would the employment be for these additional residents?	The District Council is seeking to allocate a further 3ha of employment land within the town and it could be expected that some of the jobs created will meet the needs of current and future residents and thereby reduce the level of out commuting.	Retain approach to employment provision for Castle Cary / Ansford at 3ha of employment land.
	*Environment Agency note that there are delineated groundwater source protection zones in the vicinity of Castle Cary, and depending on the location and nature of development, these zones may constrain development - add reference to zones in section.	Agree that delineated ground source protection zones should be mentioned within the Castle Cary / Ansford chapter as a relevant consideration.	Amend supporting text to make reference to delineated ground source protection zones.
Local Issues			
Local Issues (para 6.10)	* Whilst it is recognised that this paragraph is a statement derived from consultation it should be noted that it is likely to be difficult to reconcile some to these aspirations in practise e.g. 'better traffic flow through the town' and 'the resolution of parking problems (without	Noted.	No Change.
Local Aspirations			
Local Aspirations (para 6.11 – 6.12)	* Agree that facilities for younger people and traffic congestion are frequently cited as issues by the local community.	Noted.	No Change.

	* Cluster workshop identified the need for light industrial. Although it is noted that the Council position is that there is no demand. This ignores the fact that there is no land for companies to register an interest. No wish to be a B settlement as we don't have much in common with Bs such as Wincanton but are more in tune with medium sized towns like Bruton which is a C.	For Castle Cary / Ansford to continue to maintain its strong retail offer and its employment role the town should be classified as a Market Town as set out in Policy 'B' of the RSS Proposed Changes. The towns employment role is also strengthened by aspirations to expand the towns employment function, so as to maintain the settlement's function. This would provide the town with the best opportunity to maintain its strategic role in the East of the District.	Castle Cary / Ansford is classified as a Market Town
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (6.13 – 6.22)	* Are 500 dwellings really needed? Who is going to be able to afford to buy a house? Not the time for new businesses to be established. 3ha of employment land is too much. How many jobs were created at Royal Canin on a 9ha site?	It is consider that a total Castle Cary / Ansford's housing growth of 400 dwellings would contribute towards creating a more self-contained settlement and reflect the town's status and scale as a Market Town. This provision can be accommodated by known sites and within landscape capacity. Ward Members formally requested in July 2010 that Castle Cary should be allocated an additional 3ha employment land. They argued that the existing employment allocation at Torbay Road had been developed at a lower density than had previously been expected and to make up for this lack of additional job formation for the town a further allocation was felt necessary. Policy Officers proposed an additional 3ha of employment land would be commensurate with the scale of the town. See Castle Cary scale of growth paper as presented to Project Management Board	Reduce housing provision for Castle Cary / Ansford to 400 to avoid excess provision and reflect town scale. Retain approach to employment provision for Castle Cary / Ansford at 3ha of employment land.
	* Can existing infrastructure cope? Health Centre, Dental Surgery, School, Sewerage, roads etc..	The IDP has identified what infrastructure will be required and this does include a new primary school and replacement surgery	No change
	* There is already sufficient housing include a wide range of affordable housing.	It is consider that a total Castle Cary / Ansford's housing growth of 400 dwellings would contribute towards creating a more self-contained settlement and reflect the town's status and scale as a Market Town. This provision can be accommodated by known sites and within landscape capacity.	Reduce housing provision for Castle Cary / Ansford to 400 to avoid excess provision and reflect town scale.

	* Castle Cary is a market town and not because of any Core Strategy criteria but because it's a market town by royal charter. We have a market place and a Market house. Interestingly the district council identify Castle Cary as a market town for housing but the County Council do not.	For Castle Cary / Ansford to continue to maintain its strong retail offer and its employment role the town should be classified as a Market Town as set out in Policy 'B' of the RSS Proposed Changes. The towns employment role is also strengthened by aspirations to expand the towns employment function, so as to maintain the settlement's function. This would provide the town with the best opportunity to maintain its strategic role in the East of the District. See Castle Cary status as a Market Town paper as presented to Project Management Board.	Castle Cary / Ansford is classified as a Market Town
	* Paragraph 6.14 has no meaning.	Disagree meaning is clear.	No Change.
	* Paragraph 6.20 Do we need another supermarket?	Retail study identifies the need to maintain the existing function of town centre as a shopping destination. Any planning application will need to be considered under Development Management approach	No change
	* South Somerset has access to a potential source of high quality employees due to its proximity to Bristol University, UWE, and local technical schools.	Noted.	No change
	* Concern about traffic congestion. Capital tied up in goods in transit can be high; Capital tied up in people commuting is higher than some areas; bottlenecks can and do develop; problems are aggravated in the Summer month by tourists and increased on street parking aggravates traffic flows following a relaxation of the planning rules. Problems are going to increase on the following routes: A37, A59, A60, A371, A359, A360 etc which deters businesses.	Somerset County Council as Highways Authority have not raised any concerns regarding the scale of direction of Castle Cary's growth. Strategic transport issues are considered in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change.
	Area needs employer who produce added value goods. Provision of jobs should be a key consideration. Why are we not attracting more firms to Somerset, particularly those in added value areas? and with the recession about to bite, how can we make expansion in the Somerset area economically viable?	Agree that we need to make South Somerset in general and Castle Cary / Ansford specifically more attractive for new firms and businesses to move into the area and thereby increase economic potential. With this in mind it is proposed an additional 3ha of employment land would be commensurate with the scale of the town. The attraction of firms that will complement and add value to the district is an economic development issue. See Castle Cary scale of growth paper as presented to Project Management Board.	Retain approach to employment provision for Castle Cary / Ansford at 3ha of employment land.

	*Environment Agency note that the preferred option is subject to surface water flooding and so a strategic approach to surface water is sought. Any development should make sure the existing watercourse/ditch is preserved.	Agree that surface water flooding / drainage should be mentioned within the Castle Cary / Ansford chapter as a relevant consideration.	Amend supporting text to make reference to surface water flooding.
	* Supports Option 1 - growth figure are about right.	It is consider that a total Castle Cary / Ansford's housing growth of 400 dwellings would contribute towards creating a more self-contained settlement and reflect the towns status and scale as a Market Town. This provision can be accommodated by known sites and within landscape capacity. The preferred direction for Castle Cary / Ansford's direction for growth is discussed below.	That option 1 to the north of Torbay Road, and east and west of Station Road is taken forward as the preferred direction for growth at Castle Cary.
	*Support Option 1. Option 3 contains a number of mature trees (TPOs) and resist their loss. The density would also cause a lot of additional traffic on an already busy road.	An assessment of options against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the North West of Castle Cary / Ansford (Option 1). Key determining factors relate to evidence presented in the Landscape Character Assessment that indicates that this area has a high-moderate capacity to accommodate built development, good access to employment and town centre facilities and known developer interest. See Castle Cary direction for growth paper as presented to Project Management Board. 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.	That option 1 to the north of Torbay Road, and east and west of Station Road is taken forward as the preferred direction for growth at Castle Cary.

	<p>*Support Option 1 it is the most suitable land to deliver the strategic development requirements under the plan period and will have the least impact on the periphery landscape. Site put forward can deliver highways improvements and is an reasonable proximity to existing employment land and no flood. Site Plans and detail info submitted (see 4315713 &4223137).</p>	<p>An assessment of options against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, presents a clear case for determining a preferred location for growth to the North West of Castle Cary / Ansford (Option 1). Key determining factors relate to evidence presented in the Landscape Character Assessment that indicates that this area has a high-moderate capacity to accommodate built development, good access to employment and town centre facilities and known developer interest. Somerset County Council as highways authority have requested that a link road is included within any scheme in this location between Torbay Road and Station Road. See Castle Cary direction for growth paper as presented to Project Management Board. A link road has been indicated as viable by prospective developers and presented in association with development. It would improve access to the existing employment area.</p>	<p>That option 1 to the north of Torbay Road, and east and west of Station Road is taken forward as the preferred direction for growth at Castle Cary. Amend policy to require development between Torbay Road and Station Road to make provision for a link road.</p>
Chard			
Spatial Portrait			
Spatial Portrait (paras 6.23 – 6.28)	<p>* Paragraph 6.28 identifies a range of local issues including traffic problems. It suggests an alternative route between A358 Furnham Road and A 358 Tatworth Road is required and refers to the Chard Regeneration Plan however this does not offer a viable and suitable solution and there is no requirement for the route to be delivered in its entirety. The question remains how the eastern relief road will be funded in its entirety and is the proposal viable? The failure of the Council to address this matter is an illustration of the unsoundness of the Plan and the lack of evidence to support the strategy.</p>	<p>SSDC has sought specific advice and expertise to assist in facilitating the delivery of the strategic allocation. A Delivery Team headed by the Economic Development Manger has been set up and a Feasibility Report produced. The Chard Regeneration Framework Implementation Plan (2010) sets out a phased approach to the delivery of the growth that can come forward in manageable sections without placing undue pressure on the highway network, there is currently no viable solution that would see the eastern distributor road fully funded up front however, the feasibility report presents a delivery mechanism to achieve Phase 2 of the proposed development. There is recognised governance arrangements to manage delivery of the larger strategic allocation in its entirety.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* Paragraph 6.28 - recognises the need to set out the local issues and in particular the delivery of the Local Plan allocation. The Chard Regeneration Framework is supported as a mechanism to achieve solutions to these issues.	Support noted.	No change.
	*Environment Agency note that there are delineated groundwater source protection zones in the vicinity of Chard, and depending on the location and nature of development, these zones may constrain development - add reference to zones in section.	Noted. It is agreed that it might be beneficial to add a sentence making reference to the groundwater protection zone to the south of Chard although the growth area does not extend into the area as shown in the South Somerset Local Plan (2006).	Add a sentence referring to the delineated groundwater source protection zone to the south of Chard.
	*Reference to the Blackdown Hills AONB needs to be made to fully recognise the importance of the town's landscape setting.	The Blackdown Hills are mentioned in paragraph 6.23, however it is considered that it should be made clear that they are an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Amend paragraph 6.23 to include AONB after "Blackdown Hills"
Local Issues			
Local Issues			
Chard Regeneration Framework			
Chard Regeneration Framework (paras 6.29 – 6.34)	Paras 6.33-6.34: Object to the view that the Chard Regeneration Framework was involved in pro-active local engagement with key stakeholders and the local community. As a key stakeholder and landowner of one of the sites considered through the Regen Framework concerned by the lack of engagement and inability to provide effective input into the direction of the proposed growth strategy for Chard. Question the weight that can be afforded to the Regen Framework without proper transparent scrutiny of its content including the formal opportunity to make representations on the alternative approaches. Regen Frameworks should be pursued as a DPD so that it is subject to the same level of scrutiny as a statutory development plan. To present the options as 'set packages' seems to circumvent the tests of soundness regarding the need to test alternatives. Para 58 of PPS3 advises that previous commitments should not simply be rolled forward unless it can be demonstrated that these sites are developable.	SSDC staff have worked closely with local community groups, landowners and other stakeholders, including the Town Council over a number of years as the Chard Regeneration Plan has emerged. The inclusion of the strategic allocation at Chard within the Draft Core Strategy presents the opportunity to make comments on the Regeneration Plan as part of a formal planning process. The Regeneration Plan has considered 4 Options for growth and the most sustainable Option (3) has been chosen as preferred. It is acknowledged that infrastructure needs to be delivered to support growth, development phases are expected to be delivered in the order set out in the Chard Implementation Plan and any deviation of those phases should be justified and it should be demonstrated that the proposal will not compromise delivery of the total growth. See also Chard discussion paper – Chard Strategic Growth Area Allocation as presented to PMB. The Chard Regeneration Framework is being pursued through the Core Strategy and so allowing full continuity through the formal Core Strategy process.	No change.

Chard Vision			
Chard Vision (paras 6.35 – 6.37)	* Support the broad aims of Vision.	Support noted.	No change.
	*The Vision should be revised to make reference to the vital role that hotels and tourist accommodation in the area play in supporting and enhancing local services, facilities and employment and specifically refer to Cricket St. Thomas Hotel.	The Vision for Chard has been drafted as part of the Chard Regeneration Plan. The Draft Core Strategy Vision (para.3.8) makes reference to building on existing facilities and functions in Market Towns and refers to the economic and regeneration and prosperity of Chard. Paragraph 6.27 makes specific reference to Cricket St Thomas Wildlife Park and paragraph 9.58 refers to the importance of tourism to the local economy, it would not be appropriate to mention one hotel above others the vicinity, it is therefore considered that this issue is adequately addressed in the Draft Core Strategy.	Amend paragraph 6.27 to refer to Cricket St Thomas Hotel and delete reference to Cricket St Thomas Wildlife Park.
	* Statement at para 6.34 is unclear.	Disagree. The proposals for Chard have and will continue to receive widespread consultation as part of the Core Strategy process. A public consultation event was held on 11th September 2010 at The Guildhall Chard with the aim of explaining the contents of the Regeneration Plan and explaining how it will feed into the Core Strategy. It is considered that this paragraph added context to the Draft Core Strategy but would not be necessary to include it in the Submission Plan.	Delete paragraph 6.34 for Draft Submission Plan.
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
Scale and location of Growth			
Scale and location of Growth (paras 6.38 – 6.39)	* No HEA has been carried out for Chard - the industrial assets of the cloth and other industrial heritage need to be assessed and fully understood in terms of their contribution towards the distinctive quality of the town before further growth is imposed.	Whilst a HEA has not been carried out for Chard LDA, consultants did carry out a Conservation Area Appraisal to identify the key heritage assets of Chard, these have been taken into account in the proposals set out in the Chard Regeneration Plan (October 2009). The strategic allocation at Chard builds upon the existing SSLP Key Site allocation (KS/CHAR/1) which has already been through a statutory process.	No change.

	<p>* Para 6.38: Focussing growth on areas that have the greatest need for and capacity to accept change. This does not flow from the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy . The key criteria needs to be the ability to provide sustainable development options which would limit the need to travel. Development of land at Snowdon Farm would make a valuable contribution to more sustainable patterns of development (set out in promotional document submitted with rep). Despite the need to deliver highway infrastructure improvements consider that there is no justification for putting more sustainable sites beyond the plan period.</p>	<p>The Snowdon Farm site is held to be sustainable by the developer given its proximity to the A30, their agreement with the various landowners comprising the plot and the comparatively low infrastructure & utility costs required in bringing this site forward. The site is identified as part of the residential development area within the Chard Regeneration Scheme (CRS), but only within the maximum growth Option 4 (growth to natural limits). Growth Option 4 was found through the Sustainability Appraisal process to be less beneficial to the town than growth to preferred Option 3 level, not least as some of the towns' junctions begin to collapse under the volume of associated traffic (PBA 'Saturn' modelling provided evidence of this in the Transport Assessment). The site was not included within Option 3 because of the visual impact of development on the elevated Western edge of the town and because the proposed road layout connects sites within the Eastern growth area in such a way as to distribute traffic by reducing pressure at the Convent signals</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>(continued) in the most deliverable way. There are design issues in relation to this site, which have been discussed with SSDC officers. These concern the specimen trees to the north of the plot and the area of protection they require. It has also been noted that the site, lying uphill of the town centre, is not well served by public transport and could potentially add significant vehicle pressure at the central A30-A358 Covent Link junction which, when extant planning permissions are factored in is believed to be at capacity.</p>	
<p>Option 1: Town Centre Regeneration (paras 6.40 – 6.41)</p>	<p>* Only option 1 refers to the relocation of the football club - the football clubs needs to be relocated to a suitable ground for it's league status.</p>	<p>Each of the growth options for Chard include the relocation of Chard Town Football Club paragraphs 6.42 and 6.43 make it clear that options 2 and 3 follow on from Option 1.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* Favour this Option.	Noted. The Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that Option 3 presents the benefits of large scale growth, including town centre regeneration and the relocation of Chard Town Football Club without the disbenefits of undue traffic congestion and pollution. The costly transport infrastructure is required in the early phases almost regardless of the level of growth given the reduced capacity of the convent signals junction (A30/A358), especially when extant planning consents are taken into consideration. Option 3 presents a good balance between required growth in the town and development on a scale that can fund significant infrastructure. Option 1 would not bring about the overall infrastructure improvements required to unlock the growth potential of Chard nor would it deliver the number of dwellings required to meet the strategic objectives of the plan.	No change.
Option 2: Eastern Growth Area (part) (para 6.42)	*Some of proposed land allocations are illogical. Block of development between Forton Road and disused railway is incongruous and should be reduced. Oaklands Avenue and Touches Lane, 2 small blocks have been split into two, they should be reamalgamated.	Option 2 is not the preferred option for growth. However, the parcels of land selected for growth as part of Option 2 have been identified as part of the work undertaken by LDA and are considered to be capable of delivery in such a way as to reduce the impact on the infrastructure of Chard.	No change.
Option 3: Eastern Growth Area (Full Build Out) (para 6.43)	* Support option 3 on the basis that there will not be undue traffic congestion.	Support noted.	No change.
Option 4: Growth to Natural Limits (para 6.44)	* Land at Snowdon Farm is in Option 4 and would come forward beyond the plan period but is immediately available and deliverable within the first 5 yrs of the plan period. It is within easy walking distance of the town centre and has excellent pedestrian links to all services and facilities. The site could contribute towards infrastructure at key junctions. This land should be considered as part of Options 1, 2 & 3 and will contribute to wider regeneration objectives.	The issues regarding Snowdon Farm are addressed in response to paragraph 6.38 above.	No change.

	* Strongly object to any housing being built north of Chard bordering Cuttifords Door. And should be retained for agriculture and nothing else. The hedgerow backing Denning Close, Tudor Court and houses on the Redstart Estate should be retained as the northern boundary to Chard. Any development at this height would impose on Cuttifords Door and Combe St Nicholas. Roads in this area could not cope with the additional traffic. Hedgerow supports lots of wildlife such as badgers, bats, foxes and bird species. Any major development should be to the South east of Chard supported by a by-pass from the A358 to Hornsbury Mill.	Noted. Whilst Growth Option 4 includes development north of Redstart Road/Denning Close, this has not been identified as the preferred option for growth.	No change.
	* Object to option 4. Redstart Road, has an abundance of wildlife, badgers, birds and squirrels. There is traffic congestion during school terms. Glynswood is used as a short cut especially for lorries. There is already a business park in Chard which is under used. Option 3 is preferred. Chard should remain a small market town.	See response above.	No change.
Chard Employment Land Requirement			
Chard Employment Land Requirement (paras 6.45 – 6.47)	No comments received	N/A	N/A
Sustainability Appraisal of Options			
Sustainability Appraisal of Options (paras 6.48 – 6.50)	* Agree that Option 4 is a step too far.	Noted.	No change.
Chard Growth Area			
Policy CV1 Chard Growth Area (and paras 6.51 – 6.53)	* Fear of development at Crowshute/Snowdon Park recreational area, leaving no accessible green area.	Potential development of land at Crowshute/Snowdon Park is identified as part of growth Option 4, however growth Option 3 has been chosen as the preferred option and this does not include development in that area nor does it include development in the vicinity of St Mary's Close.	No change.
	* Building beyond St Mary's Close is badly thought out. The close is very narrow and the fields above prone to flooding.	See response above.	No change.

	* Concern that east of Chard is to be developed, blocking views of Windwhistle Hill.	Noted, however development on the eastern side of Chard has been planned for well over 10 years (Chard Key Site allocation), added to this the impact on views will very much depend on the design, layout and massing of the final proposal.	No change.
	* Keep historic names of local areas in any new development.	Noted, although this is not a planning matter and will be dealt with by the Engineering and Property Services Team at South Somerset District Council.	No change.
	* Mitigation measures for European Protected Species should be detailed at this stage of plan development, otherwise it could be considered not to be robust through non delivery of housing areas due to the presence of EPS.	This comment has been discussed further with the County Ecologist and he has recommended that some text is added to say that the presence of EPS will need to be taken into account and compensatory off site habitat creation may be required.	Amend paragraph 6.53 to include text explaining that the presence of EPS will need to be taken into account and compensatory off site habitat creation may be required.
	* Support allocation of strategic growth at Chard and option 3 as the basis for delivery	Support noted.	No change.
	*Level of growth under Option 3 is too high. A reduced and reconfigured Option 2 is more appropriate.	The Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that Option 3 presents the benefits of large scale growth, including town centre regeneration and the relocation of Chard Town Football Club without the disbenefits of undue traffic congestion and pollution. The costly transport infrastructure is required in the early phases almost regardless of the level of growth given the reduced capacity of the convent signals junction (A30/A358), especially when extant planning consents are taken into consideration. Option 3 presents a good balance between required growth in the town and development on a scale that can fund significant infrastructure.	No change.

	<p>*The strategy for Chard should be based on Option 2, not 3, forming a ceiling for development (1366 approx) - reasons 1) Chard consistently failed to deliver growth, Consortium no longer exists, 2) Chard Vision does not rely on high levels of peripheral growth, but on an economic strategy, 3) case and logic for proposed level of growth is not explained, SA does not clarify, 4) Option 3 delivers little additional benefit to Option 2, 5) Option 3 extends outside plan period.</p>	<p>SSDC is seeking specific advice and expertise to assist in facilitating the delivery of the strategic allocation. A Delivery Team headed by the Economic Development Manger has been set up. Both the Chard Regeneration Plan and Implementation Plan show how the roads within the strategic allocation could be set out and delivered in a phased approach that would minimise the impact on traffic flows within the rest of the town. The key driver of the phasing is the need to incrementally increase the capacity of the highways infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic as the town grows, in particular to relieve the Convent Signals (Furnham Road/Fore Street/East Street). The phasing scheme suggested by LDA seeks to bring forward development in a number of phases in which the need for major upfront investment is minimised and, where possible, positive cash flow is maintained.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>(continued) The proposal no longer includes the distributor road shown as part of the saved Chard Key Site allocation (KS/CHAR/1) as this has proved to be an impediment to the delivery of the overall scheme particularly due to issues of viability. The levels of growth across the District will be monitored and reviewed as the plan progresses this will include how much growth is directed towards Yeovil and Chard. The Feasibility Report that has been undertaken for the Delivery Team shows that the strategic allocation is viable, particularly once the first 2 phases have been deliverer and that a mechanism exists to secure its delivery.</p>	

	<p>* Over the last 10yrs SSDC have failed to deliver the Chard Key site development (identified in the adopted South Somerset Local Plan) - for a number of reasons including ownership, viability, lack of planning brief and the reluctance to adapt to change. In the meantime Land at Mount Hindrance has been available and deliverable for housing and an extension to the Business Park for the whole of this period, however the Council's view was that the site was too intrusive in the landscape . However, this view has changed as part of the site has been identified for an extension to the Business park and the relocation of the football club. Respondents have submitted a masterplan for an Eco-Village on land at Mount Hindrance - can be delivered in the first 5</p>	See response above.	No change
	<p>* Paragraph 6.57 - states that Chard is dependent on the implementation of the MOVA enhancements to the Convent Signals and the Millfield link. - this is dependent on public funding from the HCA who now have a much diminished role and no access to funding. So the strategy for Chard is unsound as it cannot be delivered. If the Council include land at Mount Hindrance for mixed use development the employment and housing can be delivered early in the plan period together with the preferred location of the football club. This land should be included to avoid another 10yrs of stagnation in the</p>	See response above. Funding for the MOVA enhancements has now been secured.	No change
	<p>*Requires infrastructure and investment on a scale which is unlikely to be forthcoming.</p>	See response above. Work done on the IDP and CIL Evidence Base shows a funding requirement of Phase 2 that is manageable.	No change.
	<p>* Support the Proposal. However, need to bear in mind the difficulties associated with delivering the eastern link road in relation to the local plan allocation - delivery should be on a phased basis to assist viability.</p>	Support noted. See response above.	No change.

	<p>*Concern that expansion of Chard will lead to increased traffic flow on the A358 through Donyatt where the volume of traffic is already a hazard to pedestrians and the properties along the roadside. The traffic will be an increased strain on the old narrow bridge, which if closed would have a considerable impact on accessibility. The A358 from Ilminster to Chard can not take large lorries. The junction by Focus is on a blind junction and should have traffic lights.</p>	<p>Matters of detail such as the final road layout will be assessed and considered as part of the planning application process, there will also be the opportunity to make comments on what is being proposed; the layout presented by LDA in the Regeneration Plan may not be exactly the same as the final submitted scheme. The requirement for improvements to the A358 in locations such as Donyatt elsewhere is a matter for the Highway Authority (Somerset County Council). SCC have not indicated that the road through Donyatt is a constraint to Chard's overall development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>*Object to the proposed road at Touches Lane, it will have a detrimental effect on Chard Reservoir and Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted there are concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on Chard Reservoir and Nature Reserve plans for a new road at Touches Lane are not new and formed part of the adopted Key Site allocation (KS/CHAR/1) which has been through a statutory process including consideration at Public Local Inquiry.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Preferred option for growth does not flow from the Vision and Objectives for the Core Strategy. The option seeks the development of peripheral unsustainable sites ahead of more sustainable ones. Disregards the benefits of land at Snowdon Farm. Believe that the overarching objective of the growth strategy is to improve road infrastructure rather than securing sustainable patterns of development. Applying a levy to all development sites irrespective of location would ensure key highway infrastructure is delivered. Proposed growth to the east of Chard will not deliver an improved range mix and quality of housing within walking distance of the town centre whereas land at</p>	<p>The respondent is absolutely correct in noting the significance of bringing forward road infrastructure improvements at the same time as the development given the adverse social, environmental and economic implications of additional congestion at the convent link signals. The Highway Authority (SCC) has endorsed the view that securing improvements in infrastructure is the route to delivering sustainable development in Chard. Affordable housing would be expected to be provided as part of any housing development that meets the approved threshold.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Support the identification of existing Chard Town Football Club for residential development as well as the identification of a site north of the town for a new community and football facility and home for Chard Town Football Club.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Policy CV1 proposes a rigid allocation of housing that is not a flexible approach to the supply of land for housing in the context of PPS3. Policy is therefore not flexible or deliverable and is considered unsound.</p>	<p>The approach to the delivery of housing set out in the Draft Core Strategy is considered to be flexible and in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3). South Somerset District Council currently has a 5 year supply of housing land. The Chard Regeneration Plan sets out to achieve the long term social, economic and environmental objectives for Chard. Further work has been undertaken by the Delivery Team (building on that carried out by LDA) to ensure that the proposal is deliverable and viable.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Stage 2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment assessed the impact on the Somerset Levels and Moors as 'Low'. RSPB do not agree with this and believe parts experience high levels of disturbance. Believe that the assessment of visitor use and behaviour is superficial. Particular concern are 'in combination' recreational pressures on SL&M from draft settlement policies.</p>	<p>The Somerset Levels and Moors Habitats Regulations Assessment states that unless new residents in Yeovil and other larger settlements have a particular interest in visiting the Levels and Moors i.e. bird interest, new residents are not expected to be visiting the site in any significant numbers. Additionally, bird species are not concentrated in areas where visitors tend to be due to a lack of suitable habitat. Natural England and Somerset County Council did not have any criticisms of the Somerset Levels and Moors HRA; indeed the HRA specifically states that "consultation with Natural England revealed that levels of recreational disturbance throughout the site are currently low" (section 5.1.1, 6.1).</p>	<p>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 Proposed Submission stage of the Core Strategy.</p>
	<p>* 5th bullet should recognise that this includes walking and cycling infrastructure/improvements in addition to roads.</p>	<p>It is considered that the wording in Policy CV1 is adequate as highway infrastructure does include pavements and cycle provision; additionally paragraph 6.52 of the Draft Core Strategy refers to improved legibility, this includes access via walking and cycling, however there may be some benefit in making this clearer.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.52 to include reference to walking and cycling infrastructure.</p>
	<p>* Creation of any new highway infrastructure or improvements of existing routes would need to be solely funded through developers or other third parties.</p>	<p>This is a comment from the Highway Authority (SCC) and is noted. SSDC have sought funding towards the Chard Regeneration Plan as part of the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) process and have made a bid to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). Decision on CIL expenditure have yet to be determined but this could be a source of funding for Chard.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Strongly object as Option 3 (essentially the old Local Plan Key Site allocation) will not deliver the housing and employment required in the plan period nor will it deliver the infrastructure including an eastern bypass that is required to accommodate the scale of growth proposed. The proposals are not viable and there is no credible evidence base to support these proposals. Seems the council will be relying on a level of public sector investment from the HCA., however given recent cuts it is highly unlikely that public sector money will be available. Therefore highly unlikely that the whole of Option 3 will be developed which can only exacerbate traffic problems in the centre and delay balanced growth.</p>	<p>See response above. SSDC is seeking specific advice and expertise to assist in facilitating the delivery of the strategic allocation. A Delivery Team headed by the Economic Development Manger has been set up. Both the Chard Regeneration Plan and Implementation Plan show how the roads within the strategic allocation could be set out and delivered in a phased approach that would minimise the impact on traffic flows within the rest of the town. The key driver of the phasing is the need to incrementally increase the capacity of the highways infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic as the town grows, in particular to relieve the Convent Signals (Furnham Road/Fore Street/East Street). The phasing scheme suggested by LDA seeks to bring forward development in a number of phases in which the need for major upfront investment is minimised and, where possible, positive cash flow is maintained.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>(continued) The proposal no longer includes the distributor road shown as part of the saved Chard Key Site allocation (KS/CHAR/1) as this has proved to be an impediment to the delivery of the overall scheme particularly due to issues of viability. The levels of growth across the District will be monitored and reviewed as the plan progresses this will include how much growth is directed towards Yeovil and Chard. The Feasibility Report that has been undertaken for the Delivery Team shows that the strategic allocation is viable, particularly once the first 2 phases have been delivered and that a mechanism exists to secure its delivery.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Would like to see a variety of quality individual shops which would draw people from the surrounding areas. There are sufficient supermarkets.</p>	<p>The Retail Study update, 2009 (published 2010) shows that there are already a number of independent comparison retailers in Chard, however currently there is a higher than national average vacancy rate (12%). The Core Strategy can only provide policies to facilitate the provision, delivery and retention of retail premises, the market will dictate the type of retailer that wishes to operate from Chard. If there is housing growth and employment opportunities are created then retailers are more likely to see the economic potential of operating in Chard.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Concerned that any building in the Forton Road area will increase the volume of traffic to a "main road" situation and increase the danger at the Axminster Road junction.</p>	<p>Noted. The Axminster junction has been modelled in the CRF Transport Assessment and shows the junction remaining functional. The Highway Authority (SCC) have accepted the general principle of the proposals for Chard. Detailed issues such as highway safety, road alignment and layout will be addressed as part of any planning application process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Concerned about the use of Henderson Drive as a through route to Millfield from the east i.e. Axminster Road/Forton Road side of town and the use for all construction traffic for the development around Lordleaze. Henderson Road would be difficult to widen without threatening residential areas.</p>	<p>The primary distribution route (including access to Millfields) is the outer road running south of Holbear - it has always been anticipated that this would accommodate the higher volume of traffic as the new development associated with the provision of this road will be built with this volume in mind.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Support new transport proposals in respect of new roads and links but think proposed cycle lanes need to be looked at in more detail as these are not always well used e.g. in Exeter. As long as roads are surfaced in a non-noisy material it is all a good idea. Traffic lights along Furnham Road need to prioritise more effectively.</p>	<p>Support noted. These are detailed matters which will be addressed by the Highway Authority at the planning application stage.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Support Option 3. Benefits of Option 3 include: Permeability and connectivity of movements within the town centre will be improved; improvements to physical, social and economic environment of the town centre providing opportunities for start-up businesses and revised retail offer; range and quality of housing will be improved delivering significantly more housing than the Local Plan including affordable housing; promotion of economic growth; delivery of 2 primary schools; historic environment will be maintained, additional link roads around the east of the town will ease levels of traffic dependent on Henderson Drive and Oaklands Avenue; Sports and open space provision. The likely negative effects (loss of greenfield/agricultural land, impact on wildlife and sites of geological conservation) can be mitigated through measures such as protection of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure provision.</p>	Support noted.	No change.
	<p>* Have interest in the Lordleaze Hotel - keen to see any improvement to the access to the hotel and any increase in employment and population in the area. 3 star hotel with 25 rooms so any increase in trade is to be encouraged. Fully support any improvement.</p>	Support noted.	No change.
	<p>* Plan at exhibition held on 11/09/10 shows that consideration is being given to opening up Holly Terrace as a through way to the new development site. This is a very quiet terrace and a private road which all property owners have a responsibility to contribute towards maintaining the road and drainage systems. Road currently needs resurfacing. Totally against opening up this private road as a thoroughfare - will cause nuisance from anti social behaviour to residents of Holly Terrace. Plans show enough public walk ways without including Holly Terrace. Developer has already purchased 4 properties at the end of Holly Terrace adjoining the Air Control site, this includes the only official turning area and should be considered in any plans if the 4 properties are demolished.</p>	Concern noted. This is a matter of detail that would be addressed at the planning application stage rather than a Core Strategy issue.	No change.

	* Any growth of Chard should include improvement of the A358. Good farming land should not be used for housing and employment development.	The Chard Regeneration Plan shows a new road linking to the A358 at the northern end (opposite the business park and extending south. In accordance with Planning Policy Statement 7 it is accepted that where possible the best quality agricultural land should be protected from development and some areas of the strategic allocation are within Grade 2 agricultural land, however this land has already been allocated as part of the Key Site, therefore the principle of development has been accepted in this location through a statutory process.	No change.
	* 3207 dwellings is more than outlined in the previously submitted Infrastructure Questionnaire (2,191). Primary Care Trust consider that further medical facilities will be needed to support the full 3207 dwellings and this additional provision will be needed at the out.	The housing figures have subsequently been revised to reflect the extension to the plan period (to 2028) and existing commitments a total of 3,237 dwellings are now proposed in Chard, of which 1,340 are proposed within the growth area to 2028 and 1,376 post 2028. The IDP identifies replacement health facilities for Tavistock Medical Centre as 'Necessary' infrastructure.	Amend draft Core Strategy Policies CV1 and CV2 to reflect revised housing figures.
Phasing and Delivery			
Policy CV2 Chard Phasing (and paras 6.54 – 6.57)	* Support Policy.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Object to rigid phasing of implementation plan as phase 3 could provide highway improvements	The Chard Regeneration Framework Implementation Plan (2010) shows one way growth can be delivered however development can come forward in a number of different sequences as long as the developer can demonstrate that the proposal will not compromise the delivery of the total growth, this is reflected in draft Policy CV2 Chard Phasing.	No change.

	*Delete the requirement for housing beyond the plan period and redirect it to Yeovil.	It may be that the later phases of the scheme may be able to come forward within the plan period although this would be dependent on the necessary highway infrastructure being in place. Delivery of the whole strategic allocation will bring about the maximum social, economic and environmental benefit to Chard and it would not be appropriate to only allocated that which would occur within the plan period. Yeovil's growth is base on its own requirements and represents a balance of growth across the different Market towns and Rural Centres and Chard's growth should not be reallocated elsewhere.	No change.
	*Object to Option 3, want it replaced with Option 2, hence object to phasing policy.	This issue is addressed in the responses to draft Policy CV1.	No change.
	* Para 6.55 - objection to new road through Chard Reservoir - will damage an area that is an asset to local people. A beauty spot will be replaced by noise and pollution. Nature Reserve should be protected. Concern regarding the impact on wildlife. Loss of informal recreation. Road will become a rat run littered with dead animals.	Whilst it is accepted there are concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on Chard Reservoir and Nature Reserve, plans for a new road at Touches Lane are not new and formed part of the adopted Key Site allocation (KS/CHAR/1) which has been through a statutory process including consideration at Public Local Inquiry.	No change.

	<p>* Given the estimated cost of the Millfield Link and the ransom issue likely to require CPO it is unlikely that the Millfield Link will be delivered in 2-3 yrs as stated in LDA's implementation plan. Because of the need to have a 5yr housing land supply advocate that sustainable sites which are deliverable now with the potential to reduce car usage and not exacerbate traffic capacity problems should be prioritised e.g. Snowdon Farm, Chard.</p>	<p>SSDC currently has a 5 year land supply and this will continue to be monitored. The Snowdon Farm site is identified as part of the residential development area within the Chard Regeneration Scheme (CRS), but only within the maximum growth Option 4 (growth to natural limits). Growth Option 4 was found through the Sustainability Appraisal process to be less beneficial to the town than growth to preferred Option 3 level, not least as some of the towns' junctions begin to collapse under the volume of associated traffic (PBA 'Saturn' modelling provided evidence of this in the Transport Assessment). The site was not included within Option 3 because of the visual impact of development on the elevated Western edge of the town and because the proposed road layout connects sites within the Eastern growth area in such a way as to distribute traffic by reducing pressure at the Convent signals in the most deliverable way. The respondent is absolutely correct in noting the significance of bringing forward road infrastructure improvements at the</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>(continued) same time as the development given the adverse social, environmental and economic implications of additional congestion at the Convent link signals. The Highway Authority (SCC) has endorsed the view that securing improvements in infrastructure is the route to delivering sustainable development in Chard. A start in 2016 for Chard Phase 2 development is now assumed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Phase 1 of the Regeneration Framework includes a triangular extension of land in open countryside whilst more readily available land closer to the town centre has been omitted. Policy only makes provision for 328 new allocations in Chard. This should be increased to achieve the Core Strategy's strategic objectives . Para 52 of PPS3 refers to the need to have a flexible land supply. The identification of additional sites would help to absorb any shortfall in delivery from Yeovil urban extension.</p>	<p>The first phase of development must deliver transport infrastructure on the Eastern Growth Area and this will come forward through the road required to serve the development. Development solely within the Town Centre would not achieve this and would only serve to further congest the central junction (unless it can be demonstrated that this is not the case). The point in relation to the triangular piece of land in open countryside if accepted and should be removed as a specific Phase 1 proposal.</p>	<p>Delete triangular land in open countryside as a specific provision of Phase 1 development.</p>

	<p>* Concerns re: phasing of development not being adequately justified on the basis of traffic modelling results. Sites have not been justified against wide accessibility principles (Respondent submitted a review of the PBA Transport Appraisal). Modelling work should be re-run and land at Snowdon Farm included in early phases of development. Original SHLAA contained an inaccuracy regarding access which has been clarified in the 2010 update.</p>	<p>The respondent's transport review was forwarded to Patrick Moss (formerly of PBA now working as part of Moss Naylor Young Limited) he has commented as follows: <i>We did indeed state that the assessment only demonstrated that the particular phasing worked, it could not be taken to mean that other phasings would not work, simply they had not been tested. We are fully aware that development seldom comes forward in the desired order and left the door open for developers to make a case for a different phasing. I would suggest, however, that it is for the developers to undertake this and this paper quite clearly does not demonstrate anything.</i></p> <p><i>The paper also correctly identifies that the model used the same trip rate for all areas of Chard, and in reality this will vary from area to area. However this was a strategic model and thus such refinements went beyond the clients needs, which was to demonstrate the broad feasibility or otherwise of making the transport network function. I would also suggest that such variances will be small:</i></p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

		<p><i>The same percentage of the residents of Snowdon Farm will commute to Taunton as any other part of Chard, and from Snowdon Farm they must pass through a large part of the town whereas a resident on the north side of town would not. I doubt it's going to make that much difference to a network that is overloaded using our assumption. With regard to the through route in the South West Quadrant, I believe we did test this and it was very little used due to the number of trip ends in the vicinity of the Crowshute Link. In addition, it transpired that the only available route was not politically palatable and as the route offered no benefit there was no point in predating a potential issue over it.</i></p> <p><i>..... Snowdon Farm was only ever tested as part of phase ten. "Phase 9 plus Snowdon Farm" was never tested, and thus the model does not advise on the impact of Snowdon Farm alone. The model is considered fit for purpose.</i></p>	No change.
	* Support policy approach to development is reasonable.	Support noted.	No change.
	* LDA Implementation Plan is a well considered document and sets out a logical phased approach to development where major upfront investment is minimised. Support Phase 1 approach and particularly the 80 dwellings to the east of Oaklands Ave. This site will be able to set a bench mark for high quality design but will also bring forward finance to town centre infrastructure and deliver affordable homes. No reason why Phase 1 should not start without delay.	Support noted. The 80 dwelling site to the east of Oaklands Avenue is not specifically justified as Phase 1 allocation and so should be removed.	Delete triangular land in open countryside as a specific provision of Phase 1 development.

	<p>* Whilst including detailed phasing Chard Implementation Plan does not include information on viability. It is noted that public sector funding will be needed to assist delivery however the Coalition Gov is cutting public sector spending therefore have concerns as to whether the wider proposals for Chard are achievable. Notwithstanding this Cavanna Homes (South West) Ltd and Chard Town FC are jointly promoting the redevelopment of the football club as well as the new community and football facility. Proposal is available, achievable and deliverable but cannot provide additional funding over and above what is required to deliver the site. Certainty is needed as soon as possible</p>	<p>The Chard Regeneration Framework Implementation Plan tests the proposals for Chard against a broad development appraisal and identifies where proposals lack economic viability and require public support to come forward. SSDC has sought specific advice and expertise to assist in facilitating the delivery of the strategic allocation. A Delivery Team headed by the Economic Development Manger has been set up and consultants Thomas Lister Ltd have produced a Feasibility Report which demonstrates that the project is viable particularly once the first 2 phases have been built.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Phasing of development can be achieved whether housing delivery is linked to a masterplan or not.</p>	<p>A masterplan approach to development has been endorsed by SSDC, Somerset County Council and Chard Town Council. Only a holistic approach to development in Chard will provide for the level of growth Chard needs to meet the aims of the Chard Vision.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Paragraphs 6.56 & 6.57 -This level of reference to a specific traffic signal software tool seems too detailed for a core strategy. A more generic description would be more appropriate such as allowing development within the highway capacity that can reasonably be achieved without major improvements.</p>	<p>Agreed that these paragraphs are very specific and could be simplified.</p>	<p>Simplify paragraphs 6.56 & 6.57 to refer more generally to highway improvements required to unlock growth.</p>
	<p>* South Somerset Local Plan made it clear that the Chard Key site should not be delivered in a piecemeal fashion and significant development should not come forward without any guarantee that the whole Distributor Road will be delivered. The work undertaken by LDA now appears to suggest that the percentage of through traffic was higher in 1994 than now and conclude that the level of through traffic is insufficient to justify a road in the form of a 'bypass' - this is at odds with the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p>Whilst the Chard Key Site allocation sought to bring forward the eastern distributor road this has proved to be an impediment to the delivery of the growth for Chard. The road layout presented in the Chard Regeneration Plan is designed to relieve pressure on the central junction and allow for phased development without relying on the delivery of one distributor road. This approach is considered to be the far more pragmatic approach which maximises viability whilst providing the highest realistic level of regeneration. Section 4 of the Chard Regeneration Framework Strategic Transport Appraisal (2010) explains that the Local Plan 'by -pass, approach " .. raises issues both in policy and practical terms. In policy terms it is considered that this would be an inappropriate level of provision.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		<p>(continued) A bypass is not considered appropriate because through traffic is not considered the fundamental cause of traffic problems, even if the level of through traffic from the SCC survey in the 1990's is used, 20% through traffic indicates that 80% will remain on the highway network even if a bypass is built. In the peak, the period when capacity problems will arise, then a bypass route is likely to remove only 10% of traffic." The masterplan therefore proposes new highway infrastructure to be internal to the development, except where it is necessary to leave the built up area to achieve highway links.</p>	No change.
	<p>Whilst part of the land at Mount Hindrance is identified for growth at no time was the landowner contacted about these proposals and despite a request were not allowed to meet with the Council before the LDA work was published. If a meeting had taken place the Council could have been informed that the Football Club wish to be located on the western side of the site and the remainder of the site could have been considered for the delivery of housing and a route from Crimchard to Furnham Road thus avoiding the rat run through Cuttisford Door and alleviating the existing accident black spot at Hornbury Mill. The proposal in the Core Strategy is an ill-conceived attempt to re-hash the failed strategy in the adopted Local Plan. It has been maintained for 15 yrs that the land at Mount Hindrance is available, but allocating only part of the site makes no sense in development terms. Strongly object to Council's proposals. Land at Mount Hindrance is suitable, available and deliverable. The Key Site cannot be delivered and land at Mount Hindrance should be included in the early phases.</p>	<p>It is considered that SDDC maintained communication with Blackburn Trust agents throughout the LDA masterplanning process. A representative attended the Developer Consultation on the Trust's behalf and commended the approach taken by the work. Officers met both agents on numerous occasions throughout the development of the Chard Regeneration Framework and were open in sharing its (draft) contents and the rationale LDA employed in making proposals for the Trust's landholding. Each meeting was recorded and minuted. The same open approach was taken with numerous landowners and developers from the Schemes inception, through local business and resident's consultations and have done so since the public exhibition on 11th Sept 2010. It's worth noting that communication has been maintained with the Chard Town Football Club, both through their representation on the Chard Community Forum and directly in meetings, their aspirations helped identify the proposed site as most suitable on balance for their relocation.</p>	No change.

		(continued) Part of the Mount Hindrance site is within the proposed allocation. The wider site (23.5 ha) was considered by the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry where he identified that there were clear landscape reasons for not allocating the land as there would be a harmful visual impact upon the northern edge of the town. Coalescence with Cuttifords Door is also an issue of concern. See response to Policy CV1 above regarding delivery of proposed growth.	No change.
	* The Chard Regeneration Framework on which the Council have based their strategy is ill conceived, with no evidence base or viability assessment and has been delivered to the Council to justify their failed Key Site proposals in the Local Plan. It does not tackle the issues of delivering housing and employment and evades the issue to through traffic. There has been no engagement with key stakeholders. How can the Council to seek to advance a strategy that has failed despite favourable market conditions?	Additional viability work has been undertaken. See response to Policy CV1 regarding delivery of proposed growth.	No change.
	* It is nonsense to suggest that the requirement for the Distributor Road has gone away. National statistics show that car usage has grown year on year. However now suggested that an internal distributor road utilising existing street would be more deliverable in terms of cost and will be able to accommodate through traffic .	See responses to Policy CV1. The Chard Regeneration Framework and its associated Transport Assessment clearly show how the proposed road system and phasing policy serve to enable growth whilst sufficiently relieving the Convent Link junction in the centre of town.	No change.
	* Cuttifords Door & District residents Association support Phase 1 on the Regeneration Framework Re: the relocation of the football club and employment land west of the existing business park (on the understanding that the cost of land, roads and services is covered by the landowners - the Blackburn Trust). Concerns re CRF are: 1. lack of economic feasibility studies, public funding and reaction of landowners. 2. Alleviation of traffic at the junction of the A30 and A358. 3. Cost , co-ordination and implementation of the many phases.	See response to Policy CV1 regarding delivery of proposed growth. Support for Phase 1 is welcome. In relation to 1. LDA have done an economic assessment and Phase 2 is subject to an economic assessment through the CEDA Feasibility Study. The IDP identifies a funding gap and a CIL approach provides an opportunity for funding long with others being explored. Regarding 2 & 3 Chard Regeneration Framework and Strategic Transport Assessment present a way forward where is a clear phasing strategy is presented.	No change.

	<p>* PINS Frontloading project visiting Inspector (Nov 2009) - noted that a masterplan was being prepared and that detailed policies would be included to guide planning applications in accordance with the masterplan this has not happened as the Council have failed to provide a viable plan for Chard.</p>	<p>The masterplan has been incorporated into the Draft Core Strategy in the form of a strategic allocation. As explained in the responses to Policy CV1 additional viability work has been undertaken that builds on that already carried out by LDA and presented in the Implementation Plan. This shows a way forward to deliver Phase 2 and get the Strategic allocation progressing.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>* Chard has a green core consisting of the Rugby Club, Cricket Club and Football Club. Oppose the redevelopment of the current Chard Football Club ground. 1. It should be retained as a football ground for the Chard teams that play in the Perry Street league. 2. Should be retained a part of a 'green lung' (Green Heart). 3. 400 plus dwellings on this land will completely snarl up the town centre, there is not sufficient egress from the site. Proposals that diminish this green core should be rejected.</p>	<p>It has been a long term aspiration of Chard Town Football Club to relocate to new premises in order meet the football league's standards. The redevelopment of the existing ground will help to provide the funding for the new one. The Implementation Plan suggests that approx 100 new homes could be delivered on the football ground site. It is understood that all the football clubs that currently use the existing Chard ground will have access to the new facilities once built (including those that play in the Perry Street league). The masterplan shows a 'Green Heart' being retained in Chard.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>* Given the comments in the Strategic Transport Appraisal Report that the phasing scenario presented in the Implementation Plan is not the only one that would work it is considered that the phrase re: phases being "delivered in the order set out in the Chard Implementation Plan" is unnecessary. However, the clarification that deviation from the implementation plan is subject to the delivery of the total growth not being compromised is welcomed.</p>	<p>It is considered that the link to the phasing sequence outlined in the Implementation Plan should be retained as this presents a workable Option that delivers growth and infrastructure in a co-ordinated and timely manner. The basic position is that if development is coming out of sequence there must be evidence of how they can provide for sufficient capacity in the central junction to accommodate their development and facilitate ongoing phased growth. The CRS does present one way of sequencing growth (the Transport Assessment makes it clear that there are very few ways other than that proposed of sequencing transport infrastructure), if a deviation from this comes forward, the onus is on the developer to evidence how that will facilitate the overall scheme. The inclusion of the text stating that "any deviation from the phasing sequence should be justified and it should be demonstrated that the proposal will not compromise the delivery of the total growth" allows for flexibility should it be justified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Respondent has submitted a detailed document setting out an alternative including plans, photographs and costings. Considers the Chard Regeneration Plan contains unbuildable plans, gives unsubstantiated opinions and omits vital details - should be audited for errors and omissions. The loss of the eastern relief road is short term thinking of the worst sort. Avishayes area will be abandoned to heavy traffic - costs will be higher than expected and the plans are dangerous. No radical proposal for traffic management in the town centre is proposed - has one been considered and rejected? Respondent considers that the alternative presented should be seriously considered as it largely replaces the need for a relief road and provides a foundation for Town Centre rejuvenation - proposals are based on the approach take in Lyndhurst, New Forest.</p>	<p>Having looked at Lyndhurst in the New Forest and Chard, the justification for the comparison of their road systems is not clear. Oaklands Avenue was designed and built to perform a distribution function therefore to ignore the development purpose of a significant section of existing road in favour of building a new one at substantial cost seems illogical. The respondent's proposed alternative road layout is likely to cost in the region of £200,000 -£300,000 more than the layout proposed in the Regeneration Plan, this is a significant sum of money particularly when viability is an issue.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Concerned that Touches Lane and Oaklands Avenue should not evolve into a pseudo ring road by stealth. Accepted that Oaklands Drive will provide local access to new housing and that a new road south of Oaklands Drive/A30 junction will provide a new access route for commercial traffic serving the Millfields Industrial Area entering Chard via the A30 Windwhistle Ridge route, but remains a risk that Touches Lane will provide an unplanned link to this new road. Touches Lane currently has a rural character , in keeping with the Nature Reserve it adjoins. No new link road should be built to the A358 north of Chaffcombe Road. Important that Touches Lane/Oaklands Drive does not become a rat run for boy racers.</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted there are concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on Chard Reservoir and Nature Reserve plans for a new road at Touches Lane are not new and formed part of the adopted Key Site allocation (KS/CHAR/1) which has been through a statutory process including consideration at Public Local Inquiry. Touches Lane will not be an unplanned link.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>* Plans that Chard will become a major shopping centre will never be fulfilled in the near future. Too close to Taunton, Yeovil and Exeter - have seen similar plans in Crowborough, East Sussex fail. Chard will remain a local shopping centre for daily needs. Would like to see a variety of quality individual shops, which would draw people from the surrounding areas</p>	<p>The Retail Study update shows that there are already a number of independent comparison retailers in Chard, however currently there is a higher than national average vacancy rate (12%). The Core Strategy can only provide policies to facilitate the provision, delivery and retention of retail premises, the market will dictate the type of retailer that wishes to operate from Chard. It is accepted that consumers may travel further afield for some types of shopping but Chard does provide a good range of retail opportunities for day to day needs and has the 2nd highest level of floor area in the District after Yeovil. The Retail Study shows that Chard performs better than Honiton and Glastonbury on the VenueScore rankings. The Chard Regeneration Framework includes plans for Town Centre Regeneration (particularly on the ACI Boden site) including additional retail offer and environmental improvements.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Plans for the neighbourhood centres are ill conceived. The Avishayes shops serving the Henderson Park area already struggle any shops in the Oaklands Drive, Lordleaze site will not be viable. Chard is not big enough to support facilities of this size.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood centres are proposed to provide for local daily needs and might be expected to provide facilities such as a GP surgery, pub , small local shop, hairdresser etc and are not expected to compete with the offer in the Town Centre.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Proposals to build 2 new Town Squares are at risk of providing locations for nothing but anti social behaviour as they are remote and away from public scrutiny. Space scale paved areas with setting could be more appropriate.</p>	<p>The likely social impacts of proposals will be assessed as part of the Development Management process. The designs set out in the masterplan are indicative and the final design will be not be known until a planning application is submitted. Communal areas can provide opportunities for social cohesion and community activity.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* East Street urgently needs improvement for safety reasons. Would benefit by converting it to one-way (east bound) with a new road south of East Street connecting into the A358/Silver Street, south of the Central Motors traffic lights for west bound traffic. Traffic lights would need to be relocated.</p>	<p>Improvements to East Street are planned as part of the Chard Regeneration Framework. This is design led rather than transport led aspiration and would have to be funded through developer contributions - would be very difficult to achieve in the early phases. Somerset County Council has not raised issue regarding safety along East Street.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Chard Obligations			
Policy CV3 Chard obligations (and paras 6.58 - 6.60)	* Application of Policy CV3 should facilitate the delivery of infrastructure in a timely manner.	In accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, 2010 planning obligations are expected to meet the following 3 tests, they must be: 1. Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms 2. Directly related to the development; and 3. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As more details have emerged regarding the likely approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it has become clear that the tariff approach based on the Chard Implementation Plan and set out in draft Policy CV3 will not be acceptable, CIL priorities will be set at a District level. It is therefore considered that Policy SS7 Planning Obligations can be applied on site specific obligations and the intended introduction of CIL will provide an opportunity to acquire and distribute funds on a priority basis. Policy CV3 is no longer necessary or appropriate.	Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.
	* Proposals on the eastern margins of the town will have to bear significant infrastructure costs, these costs together with the proposed social and physical infrastructure is likely to limit the ability of landowners to fund all the elements of the scheme, including affordable housing. The lessons from 15 years of trying to implement Chard should be fully taken into account.	The CIL Evidence Base work suggests that Chard will be viable even in today's market, although with a lower CIL rate and lower affordable housing provision, unless public funding is brought in to bridge the gap.	Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.
	* Unclear if the policy is seeking contributions from strategic allocations alone or all development in Chard. Development of Snowdon Farm has the potential to fund and deliver early improvements to the Convent Junction and the Millfield Link subject to meeting the test in Circular 05/2005.	The CIL Evidence Base work suggests that Chard will be viable even in today's market, although with a lower CIL rate and lower affordable housing provision, unless public funding is brought in to bridge the gap. Funding for early improvements to the Convent Link traffic lights has already been secured in order to support the identified strategic growth.	Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.
	* Needs to be a direct link between contributions and development.	See first response to CV3 above.	Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.
	* Planning obligations can be achieved without being linked to a masterplan.	See first response to CV3 above.	Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.
	* Any transport-related obligations will need to be solely funded through developers or other third parties.	See first response to CV3 above.	Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.

	<p>* Policy is not strong enough and does not secure all the benefits on a comprehensive basis. Council has capitulated to the Key Site landowners on current planning policy in an attempt to generate any form of development no matter how un-coordinated or piecemeal notwithstanding the inability for the same landowners to deliver development over the last 15yrs. If the development was not viable at the height to of the residential market it is unlikely to be deliverable now not withstanding the Council have done a complete volte face on the original requirements of the Adopted Local Plan that required a comprehensive approach , associated facilities and open space and a distributor road all planned as part of a comprehensive brief.</p>	<p>See first response to CV3 above and response to Policy CV1 regarding delivery.</p>	<p>Delete Policy CV3 and accompanying text.</p>
	<p>* Support the reference to viability in this policy.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
Retail Provision			
Retail Provision (paras 6.61 - 6.62)			
Transport Matters			
Rail			
Rail (paras 6.63 - 6.64)	<p>* Support proposal to re-open the railway station.</p>	<p>Noted - Please see responses to the following 2 comments below.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Regarding feasibility study for Chard Junction - whilst reference is made to SCC undertaking a feasibility study , any interested party could undertake such a study . Many recent station re-openings have been the result of studies funded by developers.</p>	<p>The County Council have indicated that such a feasibility study and subsequent construction would be "likely to cost several million pounds". Chard is a small market town and the level of development envisaged in the Core Strategy (2,400 dwellings) would be unlikely to fund this in addition to the other infrastructure and facilities that will be necessary to enable and service such development.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	Paragraph 6.64 - Whilst appreciating the factors in the decision that there is not enough evidence to protect land at Chard Junction for future rail use SCC would like to reiterate their desire to see the site protected for future transport uses.	Given SCC's decision as the transport authority not to purchase the land from British Rail Board (Residuary) (BRBR) Ltd and their comments with regard to the cost and that "at present there is no agreed business case demonstrating that the re-opening of the station would be a viable proposition" then the Core Strategy has no evidence to protect the site for future transport uses. The land in question has now been sold and any subsequent move to now protect this land would result in planning blight and the likely serving of a planning blight notice on this authority.	Change to reflect that the land in question has now been sold and any subsequent move to now protect this land would result in planning blight and the likely serving of a planning blight notice on this authority.
Local Bus Services			
Local Bus Services (paras 6.65 - 6.66)	No comments received	N/A	N/A
Walking and Cycling			
Walking and Cycling (paras 6.67 - 6.70)	* Paragraph 6.69 - note that SCC Cycling Strategy contained in LTP2 has been updated as part of current policy refresh.	Noted	Change to will reflect Countywide parking standards
	* Paragraph 6.70 - potential problems with the interpretation of the word "secure"- would not want developers to adopt a weak interpretation. Retail and employment cycle parking should also be "convenient". Refer to SCC Travel Plans SPD or Cycling Strategy.	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).
Measures to encourage Modal Shift in Chard			
Measures to encourage Modal Shift in Chard (para 6.71)	* Paragraph 6.71 (2) - Reference "dependent on the outcomes from the County Council FTP" is incorrect. Should be 'dependent on the County Council's transport implementation plan'.	Noted - amend to include 'dependent on the County Council's transport implementation plans emerging from the Future Transport Plan'.	Amend supporting text.

	<p>* Paragraph 6.71 (3) - Policy on bus shelters may not always use planning obligations to best effect. Whilst welcome their costs are significant - should be carefully considered if a standard cost of £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 therefore needs to be more flexible and allow a comparable enhancement to be made where there is evidence it would prove more effective than a bus shelter. 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. Should be made clear if 400m refers to the edge of the development.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Amend supporting text to include provision and on-going maintenance. Add foot note re threshold</p>
	<p>* Paragraph 6.71 (4) - 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. Cycle storage measures mentioned her could usefully be applied</p>	<p>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. Cycle parking will be in line with the SCC cycle parking strategy.</p>	<p>Amend text to delete 'within 400 metres of the site'</p>
Modal Shift for Chard			
Policy CV4 Modal Shift for Chard	<p>* Support measures in Policy CV4 including personalised travel planning for residents and</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Needs to be a direct link between contributions and development.</p>	<p>Agree. On site will be addressed through Planning Obligation Policies. Offsite will be addressed through CIL and recommendations should reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend text to note that on site contributions will be addressed through Planning Obligation Policies and offsite will be addressed through CIL.</p>

	* 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.	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. Cycle parking will be in line with the SCC cycle parking strategy.	Amend text to delete 'within 400 metres of the site'
	* 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)
	* Would be better to specify a required frequency for public transport services rather than use terms such as 'double frequency'.	The Chard Regeneration Framework Transport Assessment uses the term 'Doubling the frequency' and use is therefore consistent..	No Change.
Crewkerne			
Spatial Portrait			
Spatial Portrait (6.72 - 6.77)	*Support the vision and proposals for Crewkerne, agree that additional development will assist in the improved sustainability of the settlement.	Support Noted.	No Change.
	*Environment Agency note that there is no mention of flood risk in Crewkerne, Goulds Brook has long sections of culvert. Aside from the flood risk issues, the stream corridor is completely disrupted and there is no continuity of habitat.	Noted. It is agreed that for consistency, the issue of flood risk in the Goulds Brook area should be added to the Local Issues and Constraints section under Crewkerne.	Amend supporting text to refer to flood risk in Goulds Brook vicinity.
	*Environment Agency note that there are delineated groundwater source protection zones in the vicinity of Crewkerne, and depending on the location and nature of development, these zones may constrain development - add reference to zones in section.	Noted. It is agreed that it might be beneficial to add a sentence making reference to the groundwater protection zones in Crewkerne - but saved SSLP Policy EU7 deals with this issue.	Amend supporting text to refer to the delineated groundwater source protection zones in Crewkerne.

Local Issues and Constraints			
Local Issues and Constraints (para 6.78)	* Local issues - there is a significant dormouse population to the east of the town, south of the A30. Text should be amended accordingly.	The local issues and constraints listed are those that were identified in consultation with the local community through the Town and Parish Council workshops, therefore it would not be appropriate to amend the list.	No Change.
	*Support the vision and proposals for Crewkerne, agree that additional development will assist in the improved sustainability of the settlement.	Support Noted.	No Change.
Local Aspirations			
Local Aspirations (para 6.79)	* Welcome the identification of broad support for the CLR site derived from The Community Plan for Crewkerne and District (2005/06) - this community support is increasingly important under the "localism"	Support Noted.	No Change.
	* Spatial portrait is not justified as the proposed allocations do not meet local aspirations such as car parking and traffic congestion relief. Spatial portrait is therefore unsound and inflexible as it does not allow for other developments to come forward that would assist in the delivery of such local aspirations.	Traffic Management in Crewkerne was one of the biggest issues raised by the public in ABCD's Community Plan. Somerset County Council have drawn up, in consultation with the community , a series of traffic managment ideas for Crewkerne, which need to be incorporated into a traffic management strategy. This is an issue for Somerset County Council to take forward through their Local Transport Plan and is not a Core Strategy matter. In terms of the Core Strategy, the CLR site (identified as a Strategic Housing Site in Policy HG1) will provide a link road between the A30 and A356 and a link road between Blacknell Lane and this proposed A30/A356 link road. The CLR road is recognised in Somerset County Council's report as presenting a real opportunity to divert traffic from the town centre and it's construction should be a matter of urgency.	No Change.

What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 6.80 - 6.85)	* Response to "What is a Market Town?" - Re Crewkerne - understands to term to mean a place that does have a real, regular weekly market. What has happened to the market stall holders that have virtually disappeared since Waitrose case was built? Would like to see an area provided for these stall holders. It is a total embarrassment to call Crewkerne a "Market Town" at present. Suggest a meeting with the owners of Falkland square to discuss the issue. A regular market is a boost to the local community and visitors. This facility would benefit children and the elderly.	The definition of a Market Town in planning terms, set out in para 4.18, is a place that meets the following criteria (Baker Associates Settlement Role and Function Study (2009)): *there is an existing concentration of business and employment and realistic potential for employment opportunities to be developed and enhanced *there are shopping, cultural, religious, faith, educational, health and public services that can be provided to meet the needs of the settlement and the surrounding area * there are sustainable transport modes that can be maintained or developed to meet identified community needs in the settlement and surrounding area. The study identifies Crewkerne as meeting all of the above criteria, with a strong employment role relative to other settlements, and acts as a service centre for those settlements surrounding it (benefiting from a range of strategic and non-strategic education, health, retail, financial, leisure and community facilities and services) and has sustainable travel opportunities. Crewkerne is therefore rightly identified as a Market Town. The provision of a regular market	No Change.
	* Support the provision of 525 dwellings on the CLR site, and the planning obligation packages associated with the current "resolution to grant consent" are subject to ongoing negotiation with an agreed position anticipated.	Support Noted.	No Change.
	* Support the eastern expansion of Crewkerne but suggest that dwelling numbers at Crewkerne should be increased by a further 300-400. This would help meet the shortfall identified against the current evidence base. And would contribute to the costs of highway improvements. There would also need to be a commensurate increase in employment land provision. The Housing provision should be distributed differently.	The scale of growth recommended in the draft Core Strategy reflects the town's economic growth potential and the trajectory shows this growth is possible. There is no evidence of a further need for housing in Crewkerne beyond the additional 127 residual dwellings, or over and above the commitments (which includes the saved allocation to the east of Crewkerne, which now has a resolution to grant planning permission) , therefore no case is made to change the Core Strategy position, which is a result of evidence from the Settlement Role and Function Study.	No Change.
	*Crewkerne should deliver 200 extra houses.	See response above.	No Change.

	<p>*Object to the housing development, it will generate traffic as there are no jobs in the town and people will need to travel elsewhere - this will lead to highways issues and road infrastructure is poor.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has sought to provide a sufficient amount of employment land to accommodate jobs for the potential number of economically active persons who will live in the new homes in Crewkerne. As part of the Strategic Housing & Employment Site (CLR) 10.1 hectares of employment land will be available for businesses. When the CLR site is developed, it will unlock this significant employment site which has the potential to generate many jobs in the settlement and its future growth could be greater than past performance.</p> <p>The planning permission for the saved allocation (CLR) will deliver highways improvements, including a new link road connecting the A30 to the A356, which will effectively by-pass the town centre, alleviating some of the existing highways capacity issues, whilst accommodating the increased traffic generated from the development of the site.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Any new homes should be at an affordable price.</p>	<p>Policy HG4:Provision of Affordable Housing seeks the provision of 35% affordable housing in developments over 6 dwellings or 0.1 hectares in Market Towns. It would be unviable to deliver all of Crewkerne's growth as affordable housing as no one would finance such a scheme.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* CLR plans not represent a cohesive or complimentary solution. It will attract traffic through the town centre to meet the A30 . Plans will make it easier for traffic to go via Misterton. There is no long term strategic solution for Misterton's traffic congestion. Traffic from North West Somerset to South Dorset is increasing. Another relief road is needed.</p>	<p>Traffic Management in Crewkerne was one of the biggest issues raised by the public in ABCD's Community Plan. Somerset County Council have drawn up, in consultation with the community, a series of traffic management ideas for Crewkerne, which need to be incorporated into a traffic management strategy. This is an issue for Somerset County Council to take forward through their Local Transport Plan and is not a Core Strategy matter.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	<p>* Need to improve road infrastructure between Lyme Road to Roundham (A30).</p>	<p>Traffic Management in Crewkerne was one of the biggest issues raised by the public in ABCD's Community Plan. Somerset County Council have drawn up, in consultation with the community, a series of traffic management ideas for Crewkerne, which need to be incorporated into a traffic management strategy. This is an issue for Somerset County Council to take forward through their Local Transport Plan and is not a Core Strategy matter.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* CLR proposed route will be of great benefit to the town. But done not believe it will have any effect on traffic speed/flow. Road obstacles should be used to achieve this. Better route planning using 'one -way streets' would improve things further.</p>	<p>Traffic Management in Crewkerne was one of the biggest issues raised by the public in ABCD's Community Plan. Somerset County Council have drawn up, in consultation with the community, a series of traffic management ideas for Crewkerne, which need to be incorporated into a traffic management strategy. This is an issue for Somerset County Council to take forward through their Local Transport Plan and is not a Core Strategy matter.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Roads are inadequate even for current levels of traffic. Any further development will need significantly improved road access. Only sensible approach is what is done when the Street Fair is on I.e. one way westbound for Market Street and clockwise rotation around the Town Hall for eastbound traffic. Any vehicle that cannot achieve this should be banned from the town. No need to 'one way' North Street.</p>	<p>Traffic Management in Crewkerne was one of the biggest issues raised by the public in ABCD's Community Plan. Somerset County Council have drawn up, in consultation with the community, a series of traffic management ideas for Crewkerne, which need to be incorporated into a traffic management strategy. This is an issue for Somerset County Council to take forward through their Local Transport Plan and is not a Core Strategy matter.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	* Misterton Parish Council want to ensure that their aim of having a bypass connecting the North Perrott Road with the CLR development via Rose Lane is carried forward in the Core Strategy.	Supporting text in paragraph 15.18 of the SSLP includes reference to a relief road for Misterton, stating that at some point in the future it may be appropriate. The supporting text to the SSLP is not saved and Misterton is not identified as a Market Town or Rural Centre. Given the current economic climate, it is likely to be difficult to fund critical infrastructure that has been identified for the Core Strategy, aside from other infrastructure that has not been identified as essential or necessary. In the future there may be funding available, but this is difficult to predict. The IDP has not identified the need for this infrastructure during the plan period	No Change.
	*The Core Strategy should safeguard the land that could provide the CLR Link Road (a relief road for Misterton) as per the Local Plan.	The CLR site (saved allocation to the east of Crewkerne) now has a resolution to grant planning permission, and as part of that permission a link road will be built between the A30 and A356. The route of the link road can be illustrated on the proposals map as part of the Strategic Housing and Employment Site. Regarding a relief road for Misterton, please see previous comment.	Illustrate CLR link road on proposals map.
	*The land adjacent to Henhayes Recreational Field on the north eastern side is the only suitable parcel of land for additional long-stay parking in Crewkerne (been agreed with SSDC) - this land needs to be allocated for car parking for if it is used for an alternative use it will have a significant adverse impact on the economic prosperity of the town.	This is not a strategic issue. Should Crewkerne wish to consider a neighbourhood plan this could form a spatial element and could be taken forward through Development Management means.	No Change.
	*Local Plan allocations CR/CREW/9 and 10 need to be carried forward to safeguard the amenity value of the land - CR/CREW/9 is close to Henhayes Recreation Ground and there is a shortfall of pitches for adult and	CR/CREW/9 and CR/CREW/10 were not part of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan, if Crewkerne wishes to protect this land, it could be considered through a Neighbourhood Plan.	No Change.
	* The library and recycling centre are essential.	Agree that the library and recycling centre are essential facilities, but they are delivered by the County Council and are not Core Strategy issues.	No Change.

	* Core Shopping Frontage appears to have shrunk 17-31 Market Street - All Market Square, 1 Church Street, 2-10 Church Street, 1-9 East Street - please check the Inset Map before reprinting.	Core Shopping Frontages were replaced with Primary Shopping Frontages as part of the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan in February 2004. The Primary Shopping Frontages as shown on the Saved South Somerset Local Plan have not been changed since adoption in 2006. The Primary Shopping Frontages should remain as is shown on the SSLP proposals map.	No Change.
	* Would like to see more solar power being used in the town with management from the District Council.	Noted, Policy EQ1 is supportive of such measures.	No Change.
Ilminster			
Spatial Portrait			
	Paragraph 6.88 - Concern has been raised over the asserted requirement for new road infrastructure. SCC are not aware of any proposals highlighted in spatial maps, proposed sources of funding or evidence for the requirement. It should be noted that additional infrastructure would need to be solely funded through developers or other third parties. Would appreciate clarification on these matters.	The Local Issues identified in paragraph 6.88 of the Core Strategy represent the issues raised by Town Councillors as being of significance to Ilminster. The Town Council have an aspiration for a road from Shudrick Lane to Bay Hill and residential development in this location. The options for the Directions of Growth for Ilminster have been revisited and as a result of public opinion and the sustainability appraisal, Option1 is now favoured over the draft Core Strategy Preferred Direction of Growth (Option 2). A requirement as part of Option 1 will be a road and the development of this road has been considered as part of the IDP and it is considered that it would be viable to be provided by the developer.	Amend the preferred Direction of Growth for Ilminster from Option 2 to Option 1 and indicate the need for a road from Shudrick Lane to Townsend as part of the residential scheme.
	*47% of Ilminster's population do not work in Ilminster. There is an active retired population and it is a centre for many rural villages to access services and facilities.	Paragraph 6.88 needs clarifying as there is confusion over terminology. The South Somerset Settlement Role and Function Study (April 2009) states that 47.7% of people who work in Ilminster, live there (Level of self containment). This does not mean that 47% of Ilminster's population work, because only 67% of Ilminster's total population are economically active, it means that of that 67%, 47% of them live and work in the settlement.	Amend wording in paragraph 6.88 to clarify terminology - "The parish has the 6th highest level of self containment in the District with 47.7% of economically active residents, working locally....".
	*Tourism is also important to the town.	Noted, but do not feel that this should be included in the Core Strategy.	No Change.
	*Ilminster is on the national cycle network.	Noted, but do not feel that this should be included in the Core Strategy.	No Change.

Local Issues			
Local Issues	* The A358 from Ilminster to Taunton is overloaded. Ilminster is a dormitory town to Taunton. Road should be rebuilt.	The A358 is in the jurisdiction of the Highways Authority, this is not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	*The main roundabout for the A303 in Ilminster is over used at present and more houses will add to the problem.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified that this roundabout requires improvement as a result of the proposed growth but any impact as a result of any specific planning application will still need to be mitigated in normal way.	No Change
	* Ilminster has been designed for the coach and horse. All roads seem to lead to Tesco. Canal Way has cars parked on both sides of the road.	Observation noted.	No Change.
	* Taunton is only 12 miles away should have a cycle route or bring back the railway.	Neither of these are Core Strategy matters. It is the responsibility of Somerset County Council (highlighted in the LTP) to work with rail operators to improve rail infrastructure across the District. Regarding the cycle route, Sustrans is working in partnership with the County and District Council to provide 'The Stop Line Way' which is a walking and cycling path from Weston-super-Mare to Seaton, which would link Ilminster to Taunton.	No Change.
	* Ilminster does not have a direct bus service to Yeovil.	This point is noted, but bus services are delivered by commercial operators and are therefore not a Core Strategy issue.	No Change.
	*Add poor pedestrian and cycle routes between areas of the town - people have to drive between geographically close locations as they are not linked.	This issue could be explored through a Neighbourhood Plan, which could seek developers to improve pedestrian and cyclist accessibility/provide routes as part of their developments.	No Change.
	*The risk of surface water flooding is not mentioned.	The Environment Agency comment "We have no specific information regarding the flood risk issue you refer to. This could be more of a local land drainage issue".	No Change.
Local Aspirations			
Local Aspirations (para 6.89)	* The town is lacking a sports hall, general indoor sporting facilities and synthetic turf pitches. It requires some additional grass pitch facilities (Brittens Field is being negotiated). Town Council does not accept that this should be a long-term priority (post 2018) and urge it be given a higher priority. A swimming pool is a high priority for the town and wish to see it included in the list of infrastructure aspirations. Wish their aspirations for a school to be retained.	Noted. In terms of Ilminster being a long-term priority for the provision of a sports hall and a synthetic turf pitch, this status comes from the District Council's PPG17 report, produced by the Council's Health & Well being Group. The IDP identified the infrastructure required alongside development and also recommends priorities for infrastructure.	No Change.

	* Land east of Swanmead School should be dedicated and protected adjacent to the playing fields for further extension of the play area if the school were to extend at all.	The role of the Core Strategy is to identify strategic sites for development. Strategic sites are those that are central to achievement of the strategy. PPS12 is clear that non strategic sites should not be included in the Core Strategy as it could delay progress. The suggested allocation is a non strategic one and therefore not appropriate to include in the Core Strategy. Somerset County Council will be consulted on the proposed change to the Direction of Growth (to Option 1).	No Change.
	*Ilminster Town Centre - Gooch and Housego building should be developed for the enhancement of the town centre. Attractive courtyard lends itself to town centre enhancement. Swan shopping centre also needs attention, lying idle and is an eyesore.	The South Somerset Retail Study recognises the potential of the Gooch and Housego building "it offers the opportunity to provide a mixed use development which could include some retail uses at ground floor level.". This potential is articulated in the Core Strategy, it is therefore now down to the market to bring forward this site.	No Change.
	*Add the following aspirations 1)link Ilminster to National Cycle Network 2)replace 3-tier school system 3)enhance the appearance of Station Road entrance to Ilminster along A303.	These are local aspirations that need to be pursued outside of the Core Strategy.	No Change.
	*Land for an Eastern Relief Road should be identified to alleviate town centre congestion and pedestrianise the town centre. The road should be paid for by S106 and public money. It should also be included in the Somerset Local Transport Plan.	Somerset County Council, as the Highways Authority is responsible for highways infrastructure and funds transport schemes, they have clearly indicated that there would be no public money for such a scheme. The District Council is looking at the prospect of such a road coming into existence through the development of houses in the South West of Ilminster and it would appear that this would be a viable prospect for the developer of this site as part of any planning application.	Amend direction of growth to the South West.
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 6.90 - 6.94)	*Support provision of employment land.	Support Noted.	No Change.

	<p>Ilminster does not need any additional employment land, there is ample land (still undeveloped) which has been available for employment for many years.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy does not propose any additional employment land in Ilminster above and beyond the existing supply (23.05). 18.75 hectares of employment land are being carried forward through Policy EP1 as Strategic Employment Sites (allocated in the South Somerset Local Plan and yet to be developed). 0.65 hectares has already been built, 0.12 hectares is vacant land and 3.53 hectares has planning permission or is under construction.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>*Object to the scale of residential development proposed, 150 would be more suitable for a small town.</p>	<p>The Settlement Role and Function Study provides evidence of the need for the scale of growth identified in the draft Core Strategy. The study states that the population of Ilminster is due to increase by 1200 people by 2026 giving a requirement of 566 additional dwellings (based on 2.12 people per household). Providing less houses would not cater for the need and would in fact result in a reduction in the population of Ilminster by the end of the Plan period, which would not allow the settlement to grow or attain the enhanced facilities required locally, neither would it assist in the desire to raise the settlement's level of self-containment.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>*Do not believe that Ilminster requires an additional 340 homes, the 191 already committed is sufficient, especially combined with the Canal Way development, this should be ample for the town, or it will lose its character.</p>	<p>The Settlement Role and Function Study provides evidence of the need for the scale of growth identified in the draft Core Strategy. The study states that the population of Ilminster is due to increase by 1200 people by 2026 giving a requirement of 566 additional dwellings (based on 2.12 people per household). Providing less houses would not cater for the need and would in fact result in a reduction in the population of Ilminster by the end of the Plan period, which would not allow the settlement to grow or attain the enhanced facilities required locally, neither would it assist in the desire to raise the settlement's level of self-containment.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	*Do not believe that Ilminster needs additional housing until jobs are available.	The Core Strategy seeks to deliver balanced employment and housing growth, with employment taking the lead, to reflect the emphasis on economic-led development. When determining the level of housing provision for Ilminster, economic growth forecasts were taken into account, this is because economic changes are a key driver affecting housing demand. Additionally, in order to support economic expansion, a comparable level of homes is needed to support the growth of economically active residents. Whilst both jobs and housing are very much interlinked, from a sustainability perspective, the level and distribution of housing and jobs should be guided by the economic potential of the District (and subsequently Ilminster). In actual fact Ilminster has an existing strategic employment land allocation (carried forward from the Local Plan) meaning the 19.4 hectares of land exceeds the settlements specific employment land requirements, based on past economic and housing growth. The employment and residential land are both required.	No Change.
	Any new housing that is built in Ilminster should include p.v electricity generation to get consent.	Draft Core Strategy Policy EQ1 has requirements for new development to address climate change. Requiring all houses to have p.v. to get consent is onerous and would not be an appropriate measure as it is above and beyond legislative measures.	No Change.
	*There are a plethora of brownfield sites that could be developed for residential development if it were needed. Greenfield sites should not be developed	The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2010) demonstrates that there is only approximately 113 dwellings that could come forward on Brownfield sites.	No Change.
	*To accommodate the growth, additional infrastructure (schools, health services, shops, recreational services) will be required.	Noted. The IDP has assessed the level of infrastructure required and potential sources of funding to deliver said infrastructure. This indicates that additional sports facilities and a replacement health centre would be required but no additional school provision has been indicated. retail policy considers the need for additional shops based on the evidence base.	No Change.

<p>DIRECTION OF GROWTH - OPTION 1</p>	<p>*OPTION 1 - Object - further development would increase traffic on a very narrow lane, which cannot be improved along the Western end because of the width. Would also exit onto a very substandard bend/junction at Shudrick Lane/Ditton Street. This road is completely unsuitable for further development envisaged.</p>	<p>See "Direction of Growth for Ilminster" report as presented to Project Management Board which gives more detail, but in summary given the finely balanced nature of the Sustainability Appraisal in respects of Options 1 and 2, the potential changes that may be introduced by CIL, the response of the Town Council and the revised site size, it is considered that the preferred direction of growth for Ilminster be revised from Option 2 - South West to Option 1 - South East. This revision is on the basis that the highways and viability issues raised above have been resolved through evidence in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan work and the Highway Capacity Assessment for residential development East of Shudrick Lane (October 2011). The highways capacity work concludes that a road linking Shudrick Lane and Townsend has sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated traffic generation and makes recommendations for additional highways infrastructure to ensure a safe and viable development in the location of Option1 (includes traffic calming, 20mph speed limits, signalisation and Travel Plans).</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 1- Object - would require a large, expensive, unsightly roundabout junction off foot of Kingstone Hill, would generate additional vehicular movements on an already busy road.</p>	<p>No detailed junction has been designed and this would need to be considered as part of any planning application, however, the Highway Capacity Assessment for residential development East of Shudrick Lane (October 2011) does not indicate the need for a roundabout. Vehicle movements have been considered as part of a transport assessment and are considered acceptable in principle.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

	<p>*OPTION 1 - comprises high grade, fertile agricultural land.</p>	<p>The land is currently ungraded in respects of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 1 - In the Ilminster Town Plan 1983 the land in Option 1 was designated under Policy C1 as a Special Landscape Area. This should be kept as an amenity for the local community to enjoy.</p>	<p>The saved policies and proposals of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006) supersede the Ilminster Town Plan. The land designated as a Local Wildlife/Geology Site would be afforded the relevant protection under saved Policy EC6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, beyond this the land has no landuse designation.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 1 - If developed it should be low density , in line with the previous development brief for the area (pre Tesco development).</p>	<p>The density of any forthcoming development will be considered through the development management process.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

	<p>*OPTION 1 - is full of wildlife - deers, foxes, badgers and slow worms.</p>	<p>The European Protected Species in South Somerset (2009) identifies that some parts of the option are within the foraging areas for Pipistrelle Bats and discussions with the District Council Ecologist has highlighted that there are badgers in the area. The principle of development on this site is however accepted and it is considered that development can take place with mitigation measures in place.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 1 - Shudrick Valley is one of outstanding beauty and further incursion of building into the countryside here would detract from its appearance. Development would destroy the vista effect of the valley leading to the Pretwood Copse, Baker's Copse and the adjoining wildlife/geology local area.</p>	<p>There have been concerns raised regarding the impact of development on the landscape of Ilminster in this location. The Ilminster Peripheral Landscape Study (November 2007) illustrates that the land to the east of Shudrick Lane has the capacity to be developed to varying degrees in a manner which would respect landscape sensitivities, because of the close proximity to existing urban form which makes the land in terms of landscape sensitivity low. The landscape appraisal identifies an area within which development could occur and defines areas beyond which development would not be appropriate because of the landscape value. The Landscape concerns raised in the responses are not considered strong enough to counter the position stated in the Landscape Appraisal.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 1 - It is appreciated that the opening up of the eastern valley beyond Shudrick Lane would allow for some new housing development, which would make a contribution to the costs of a new road. In the event that this was insufficient to meet the overall sum required, the Council would argue that roads of community benefit should expect adequate public funding and not be reliant solely on Section 106 contributions. The Council would strongly urge that this development be introduced into the LDF and that equal efforts are made to secure its inclusion in the Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>The Town Council’s aspiration for an Eastern Relief Road has been explored with Somerset County Council who have confirmed that there would be no public funding for a road in this location, the road would need to be funded through developer contributions. The estimated cost of such a road would be in the order of £2.1m. The Highway Capacity Assessment for residential development East of Shudrick Lane (October 2011) concludes that a road linking Shudrick Lane and Townsend is required and the Infrastructure Development Plan concludes that developer contributions can viably fund that road.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a ‘Direction of Growth’ policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

	<p>*OPTION 1 - Town Council support this option.</p>	<p>The overall Sustainability Appraisal findings for this option favoured neutral or positive outcomes, the site is in close proximity to essential services and infrastructure, although further from the employment land allocation than either of the other options. The inability of the site to deliver all of the 340 dwellings, and therefore the requirement for two sites weighted negatively against the option. This Option has been given further consideration on the basis that the decision to favour Option 2 (preferred option) over Option 1 was a finely balanced decision in sustainability terms and in light of the overwhelming Town Council's support for this Option. It is suggested for the reasons outlined in the "Direction of Growth for Ilminster" report as presented to Project Management Board, that Option 1 now be the preferred option. The requirement for a link road between Shudrick Lane and Townsend has been identified in the Highways Capacity report, but the need for an Eastern Relief Road (onto Bay Hill) is not supported in this same report.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>DIRECTION OF GROWTH - OPTION 2 (DRAFT CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED DIRECTION)</p>	<p>*OPTION 2 - Town Council feels that their vision for Ilminster has been ignored. Option 2 (preferred option) for housing development on land running up to the fringes of Herne Hill is totally opposed and at variance with the TC Vision. TC has long favoured development along Shudrick Lane which will make the much needed Eastern Relief Road more feasible. Additionally, the TC wish to see a Sports Centre developed on Britdens Field, in order to achieve this the land to the west for both pitches and recreational space would be frustrated by housing development in this area. The settlement is unbalanced, the Core Strategy should redress this unbalance - lack of employment and community facilities and too much housing. Ilminster's housing figure should be flexible - balance between housing and employment is the key, cannot sign up to a 2009 figure.</p>	<p>The overall Sustainability Appraisal findings for this option favoured neutral or positive outcomes, the site is in close proximity to essential services and infrastructure, although further from the employment land allocation than either of the other options. The inability of the site to deliver all of the 340 dwellings, and therefore the requirement for two sites weighted negatively against the option. This Option has been given further consideration on the basis that the decision to favour Option 2 (preferred option) over Option 1 was a finely balanced decision in sustainability terms and in light of the overwhelming Town Council's support for this Option. It is suggested for the reasons outlined in the "Direction of Growth for Ilminster" report as presented to Project Management Board, that Option 1 now be the preferred option. The requirement for a link road between Shudrick Lane and Townsend has been identified in the Highways Capacity report, but the need for an Eastern Relief Road (onto Bay Hill) is not supported in this same report.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>* OPTION 2 - Object to the Preferred direction of growth, it will further unbalance the town. Option 1 (from Shudrick Lane) is more sustainable.</p>	<p>The overall Sustainability Appraisal findings for this option favoured neutral or positive outcomes, the site is in close proximity to essential services and infrastructure, although further from the employment land allocation than either of the other options. The inability of the site to deliver all of the 340 dwellings, and therefore the requirement for two sites weighted negatively against the option. This Option has been given further consideration on the basis that the decision to favour Option 2 (preferred option) over Option 1 was a finely balanced decision in sustainability terms and in light of the overwhelming Town Council's support for this Option. It is suggested for the reasons outlined in the "Direction of Growth for Ilminster" report as presented to Project Management Board, that Option 1 now be the preferred option. The requirement for a link road between Shudrick Lane and Townsend has been identified in the Highways Capacity report, but the need for an Eastern Relief Road (onto Bay Hill) is not supported in this same report.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 2 - Support, the land has easy and less costly vehicular and pedestrian access and is in close proximity to the proposed doctors surgery.</p>	<p>Support Noted.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

	<p>*OPTION 2 - Area south of Canal Way appears to be the best of the three areas. Land west of the current development is designated for light industrial use. As there is housing in this location anyway more logical</p>	<p>The overall Sustainability Appraisal findings for this option favoured neutral or positive outcomes, the site is in close proximity to essential services and infrastructure, although further from the employment land allocation than either of the other options. The inability of the site to deliver all of the 340 dwellings, and therefore the requirement for two sites weighted negatively against the option. This Option has been given further consideration on the basis that the decision to favour Option 2 (preferred option) over Option 1 was a finely balanced decision in sustainability terms and in light of the overwhelming Town Council's support for this Option. It is suggested for the reasons outlined in the "Direction of Growth for Ilminster" report as presented to Project Management Board, that Option 1 now be the preferred option. The requirement for a link road between Shudrick Lane and Townsend has been identified in the Highways Capacity report, but the need for an Eastern Relief Road (onto Bay Hill) is not supported in this same report.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>*OPTION 2 - (1) The preferred option continues the trend for incorporating Donyatt into "Greater Ilminster". If this were developed would like assurance that there would be no link for vehicles between the new development and the existing track and poorly maintained lanes leading into Lower Donyatt village.</p>	<p>It is suggested that the direction of growth now change to Option 1. However: (1) as a general principle planning policy would seek to avoid the coalescence of settlements. (2) The development of Herne Hill is not envisaged. (3) Somerset County Council, as the Highways Authority have not made any comments substantiating this statement. (4) The Environment Agency have identified that the land is designated as mostly Flood Zone 1, residential development, classed as 'more vulnerable' development in PPS25 is acceptable in Flood Zone 1. (5) Somerset County Council's County Farms department have stated that whilst the farm's (Cold Harbour Farm) viability would be affected by loss of land, the County Council's current policy regarding the whole County Farm Estate is no longer focused on providing farming opportunities and some farms are now being sold.. Those farms being 'retained' (which includes Cold Harbour Farm) are now held specifically by SCC for their future development potential.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 2 - (2) Object, Herne Hill is owned by Town Council and used for local recreational purposes. The link between town and country should be maintained.</p>	<p>The land around the dismantled railway line is identified in the South Somerset Local Plan, as being a Local Wildlife/Geology Site would be afforded the relevant protection under saved Policy EC6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, if the site were developed in that direction. *The Environment Agency have identified that the land is designated as mostly Flood Zone 1, residential development, classed as 'more vulnerable' development in PPS25 is acceptable in Flood Zone 1. *Somerset County Council's County Farms department have stated that whilst the farm's (Cold Harbour Farm) viability would be affected by loss of land, the County Council's current policy regarding the whole County Farm Estate is no longer focused on providing farming opportunities and some farms are now being sold.. Those farms being 'retained' (which includes Cold Harbour Farm) are now held specifically by SCC for their future development potential.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

	<p>*OPTION 2 - (3) Why put all the housing in one block, the roads to the east and north are not adequate for the volume of traffic.</p>	<p>The land around the dismantled railway line is identified in the South Somerset Local Plan, as being a Local Wildlife/Geology Site would be afforded the relevant protection under saved Policy EC6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, if the site were developed in that direction. *The Environment Agency have identified that the land is designated as mostly Flood Zone 1, residential development, classed as 'more vulnerable' development in PPS25 is acceptable in Flood Zone 1. *Somerset County Council's County Farms department have stated that whilst the farm's (Cold Harbour Farm) viability would be affected by loss of land, the County Council's current policy regarding the whole County Farm Estate is no longer focused on providing farming opportunities and some farms are now being sold.. Those farms being 'retained' (which includes Cold Harbour Farm) are now held specifically by SCC for their future development potential.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 2 - (4) Object, flood zone.</p>	<p>The land around the dismantled railway line is identified in the South Somerset Local Plan, as being a Local Wildlife/Geology Site would be afforded the relevant protection under saved Policy EC6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, if the site were developed in that direction. *The Environment Agency have identified that the land is designated as mostly Flood Zone 1, residential development, classed as 'more vulnerable' development in PPS25 is acceptable in Flood Zone 1. *Somerset County Council's County Farms department have stated that whilst the farm's (Cold Harbour Farm) viability would be affected by loss of land, the County Council's current policy regarding the whole County Farm Estate is no longer focused on providing farming opportunities and some farms are now being sold.. Those farms being 'retained' (which includes Cold Harbour Farm) are now held specifically by SCC for their future development potential.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

	<p>*OPTION 2 - (5) Cold Harbour Farm is an important resource, there is a need for families to begin careers in agriculture - County farms represent an opportunity. Cold Harbour Farm is not linked via roads to Ilminster, object to any road improvements to Park Lane and Church Lane as it would lead to dangerous rat runs to Chard, affecting Donyatt. (6) Former railway cutting which forms northern border to Cold Harbour is a Local Nature Reserve, development could threaten natural history.</p>	<p>The land around the dismantled railway line is identified in the South Somerset Local Plan, as being a Local Wildlife/Geology Site would be afforded the relevant protection under saved Policy EC6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, if the site were developed in that direction. *The Environment Agency have identified that the land is designated as mostly Flood Zone 1, residential development, classed as 'more vulnerable' development in PPS25 is acceptable in Flood Zone 1. *Somerset County Council's County Farms department have stated that whilst the farm's (Cold Harbour Farm) viability would be affected by loss of land, the County Council's current policy regarding the whole County Farm Estate is no longer focused on providing farming opportunities and some farms are now being sold.. Those farms being 'retained' (which includes Cold Harbour Farm) are now held specifically by SCC for their future development potential.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>
	<p>*OPTION 2 - Preferred option is totally wrong will lose playing fields. Option 1 acceptable for 50 dwellings only. Option 3 acceptable 50 dwellings (off Winterhay Lane).</p>	<p>Noted. In the interest of sustainable use of the land, developing only 50 dwellings at Option 1 would be unsustainable and would not meet the need required which is commensurate with the town's status.</p>	<p>Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.</p>

DIRECTION OF GROWTH - OPTION 3	* OPTION 3 - Access to the town via New Road is a nightmare now. House occupiers have no option but to park either side of the road as it climbs to "The Heights" in the Beacon area. It is often impossible for two cars to pass now, and terrain would need major road works.	It is suggested that the direction of growth now change to Option 1. However: Somerset County Council's Highways comments in relation to the SHLAA confirm that access could be achieved and development accommodated in the wider network subject to improvement to A303 junction and to improvements to Station Road access from the A303.	Revise the preferred direction of growth to be Draft Core Strategy Option 1 – South East. (2) Include a 'Direction of Growth' policy in the Core Strategy, which indicates that in Ilminster the direction of strategic growth will be to the South East.
	*There is very little social housing in Ilminster, need small maisonettes for local children to buy.	Policy HG4:Provision of Affordable Housing seeks the provision of 35% affordable housing in developments over 6 dwellings or 0.1 hectares in Market Towns. 340 new dwellings are to be delivered in Ilminster to 2028, resulting in a potential 119 affordable houses.	No Change.
Somerton			
Spatial Portrait			
Spatial Portrait (paras 6.95 - 6.96)	* Somerton has developed from a tight village community into a considerably larger village over the last 40 years which is still hanging on to its community spirit, although the strains are showing.	Noted.	No change.
	* Secondary children attend Huish Episcopi Secondary School because there is no alternative, not because there is a close relationship between Somerton and Langport.	The lack of alternative to Huish Episcopi school infers a close relationship between the two settlements as it necessitates many Somerton residents travelling to Langport/Huish Episcopi on a regular basis both for the school and sports facilities. Many residents also use the supermarket at Langport.	No change.
	* Only Pitney would regard Somerton as its natural service centre in the north of the district, the other settlements would look to Langport, Street, Martock or	Noted. However, there are a number of other small villages around Somerton who would use the centre for daily needs	No change.
	* Somerton has never been a proper town, demonstrated by being by-passed by the ancient road system in spite of being one of the few crossing points of the River Cary. Somerton briefly took over as county town in the 13th-14th century for about 60 years before Ilchester reverted back to being the county town and Somerton declined to a minor rural centre.	Noted.	No change.

	* Although there is good public transport to Yeovil, Street and Taunton, there is no link to Castle Cary where the nearest railway station is, and no way of reaching Martock, Ilminster or the south of the district.	There is potential to travel by public transport to Castle Cary, Martock, Ilminster via Yeovil, but accept this is unlikely to be feasible. However, the relatively good bus links to Yeovil, Street and Taunton mean there is access to jobs, shops, services and leisure facilities in those larger centres	No change.
Local Issues			
Local Issues (para 6.97)	* Support from the Environment Agency.	Support noted.	No change.
	* Should be sensitive to the amount of development in Somerton in the last 30 years that did not enhance the built environment and caused surface water drainage problems, without necessary employment opportunities and contrary to wishes of local people to remain a rural community.	Noted. New development should be well designed, with sufficient infrastructure capacity and job provision.	No change.
	* It is acknowledged that the Council has undertaken a significant degree of technical assessment and local consultation in identifying levels of growth and understand more fully the issues affecting Somerton.	Noted.	No change.
Local Aspirations			
Local Aspirations (paras 6.98 - 6.99)	* Do not agree that facilities for young people are lacking - there is a large playing field, skate park and the town council have set aside money for a youth hall.	Lack of facilities for young people is identified in the Somerton Town Plan (2005).	No change.
	* Very concerned that the town centre is looking very run down and it is a great shame that the retirement development wasn't pursued.	Noted. A retirement development in town centre has recently been allowed on appeal and a further scheme to rebuild the GP surgery has been approved recently.	No change.
	* Somerton has got too many allotments.	Noted.	No change.
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 6.100 - 6.105)	* Support development in Somerton to assist in maintaining and improving the vitality and viability of the town centre.	Noted.	No change.
	* Support retail in town centre - more shops will be needed, particularly independent shops, but not a major supermarket.	The Retail Study states the natural catchment and expenditure capacity of the centre will limit the potential for large-scale additional provision.	No change.
	* The Town Council offices should be moved to the town centre.	Noted, but this is outside the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.

	* How can the shift towards Bancombe Road trading estate at the expense of the town centre be avoided? E.g. nursery school and community centre have already moved there.	National policy (PPS4) sets out 'town centre uses' that should be located in the town centre, including retail, leisure, entertainment facilities, offices, arts, culture development.	Refer to issue of other uses moving to Bancombe Road trading estate, but make clear that planning policy promotes the town centre's vitality and vibrancy.
	* Are more houses good for the town centre because of additional trade generated, or bad because more cars reduce parking availability and trade is stifled? Or is the amount of residents using the town centre so small that there will be little effect?	Additional residents should help support the town centre economy. The District Wide Car Parking Strategy (2007) highlighted that the supply of car parking spaces does currently meet demand in Somerton, but this strategy is due to be reviewed.	No change.
	* More housing in Somerton will adversely affect the current shops.	More residents should mean more support for local shops.	No change.
	* Somerton has not got a proper shopping centre, there are too many charity shops and empty shops.	Somerton is orientated towards a top-up shopping function, and has a reasonably healthy, well kept and attractive town centre; although shop vacancies (16%) are well above the national average (South Somerset Retail Study 2010).	No change.
	* How are we going to encourage businesses and shops to Somerton - not going to encourage major retail outside Yeovil.	The Core Strategy makes provision for employment land and is supportive of retail in the town centre. The Retail Study states the natural catchment and expenditure capacity of the centre will limit the potential for large-scale additional provision.	No change.
	* Use the 'Big Lottery fund' to buy the area that has recently been refused planning permission for a retirement village in the town centre, and use the planning agreed for an underground car park and 27 apartments and have the rest as open space for the community, bringing the four empty shops back into use. Is there anything that SSDC can do to force people to	Use of the 'Big Lottery fund' is outside the remit of the core strategy. The scheme for a retirement village has recently been approved following an appeal.	No change.
	* More town centre car parking should be provided, including road side parking throughout the town; as well as a coach drop off point that would help attract tourism. People shop elsewhere because the car parks are often full with workers cars. Provide more town centre car parking by demolishing the houses down in Pestors Lane behind the derelict shops.	The District Wide Car Parking Strategy (2007) highlighted that the supply of car parking spaces does currently meet demand in Somerton, but this strategy is due to be reviewed.	No change.

	* The historic character of Somerton town centre would make it impossible to develop on a considerable scale, particularly due to access problems.	Somerton's highly valued historic town centre will be an important issue in considering its future growth.	No change.
	* Congestion in town centre caused by too many cars, inadequate roads for heavy lorries, and narrow roads/pavements needs to be tackled through traffic calming measures e.g. widen pavements, pedestrian/one way system. Road access from the south is already dangerous and difficult - more residents would increase this road usage.	The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers infrastructure requirements as a result of new development. No additional highway works have been specifically identified in the IDP but any site specific proposals will need to be considered as part of any planning applications made.	No change
	* Need to ensure road safety for walkers and cyclists - Behind Berry near the fire station is very busy and needs a crossing, and the traffic that will be directed down Etsome Terrace as a result of the Northfield development is a dangerous proposal. A mini roundabout is needed at the junction of Cartway Lane and Langport Road and zebra crossing for bridleway and sports field.	Any specific infrastructure projects required to accommodate the proposed level of growth for Somerton have been identified within the IDP - these have not been identified as required by SCC as Highway Authority. Other infrastructure would be a requirement of specific planning applications and would be considered under planning obligations policies.	No change
	* Some system of residential parking is required to ensure its availability in Somerton centre.	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy but was not considered necessary in the District Wide Car Parking Strategy (2007) - this strategy is due to be reviewed.	No change.
	* If Somerton is to have more housing, more access for wheelchair users should be provided.	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.
	* Local shops will only survive if the free parking is ringfenced for shoppers only.	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.
	* Local shop rents/rates should be lowered to encourage traders.	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.
	* Improvements to public transport are required if more homes are to be built e.g. more frequent buses- particularly given that 60% of Somerton residents work elsewhere, cheaper, provide link to Town Hall, railway stations. There is no bus that gets into Yeovil to start work by 8.30am; does not adequately serve Huish 6th form.	Agree that public transport improvements would be preferable, and there is potential for new development to fund public transport improvements, but funding cuts may reduce services in the short term.	No change.
	* There should be another bus stop on the route 54 returning from Taunton between West End and Behind Berry for passengers living at Sutton Road, Polham Lane area as the distance between stops is currently too	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.
	* The current plans by Somerset County Council to cut support for the rural bus network will certainly reduce Somerton's public transport service.	Noted.	No change.

	* The railway station should be reopened at Somerton as the nearest station is Castle Cary. There are many people who travel to work, school or college in Taunton who would benefit from a rail link.	Although a laudable objective, there is no evidence that re-opening Somerton train station is a feasible option. Local Transport Plan 2 only considered re-opening Chard Junction.	No change.
	* Improvements to the cycle network around the town should occur if Somerton is to have more housing.	Any planning application will need to take into account sustainable transport and the ability to access facilities by means other than the car	No change
	* Acquire the Old Town Hall before increasing the size of Somerton and use it as a library as promised years ago.	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.
	* Need to keep library and banks for residents and businesses, essential for sustained growth and habitation.	Agree that library and banks are important local facilities - additional housing/employment development can help support these facilities.	No change.
	* Medical centre is in right location but needs extending on the same site or nearby to be bigger and improve the service as it is already at capacity.	Noted - a planning application for a new medical facility in the town has been approved. The IDP has indicated the need for a replacement surgery.	No change
	* Despite copious amounts of detail, there is vital information missing e.g. key infrastructure issues in Somerton such as doctors surgery, lack of open space and sporting facilities, lack of school/pre-school places and no room for expansion, high cost of public transport, present bus service will not cope with additional population.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers the infrastructure requirements as a result of new development. The IDP has indicated the need for a replacement surgery and for some additional sports provision needed in Somerton	No change
	* The infrastructure requirements resulting from 500 homes would cost more than developer contributions could fund, and given the economic situation where will this infrastructure come from?	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers the infrastructure requirements and funding streams as a result of new development. Viability will remain important to ensure new growth is viable but this doesn't necessarily deliver infrastructure. Planning obligations policies require that site specific infrastructure is provided and strategic infrastructure is likely to be considered by Community Infrastructure levy in the future.	No change
	* Need to ensure that developer funding is collected to meet expected population growth.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will consider infrastructure requirements as a result of new development. A Community Infrastructure Levy 'charging schedule' can be adopted after Core Strategy adoption which will attract money for strategic infrastructure with site specific infrastructure remaining under planning obligations.	No change.

	* It is considered that through appropriate levels of growth, many of the local aspirations can be met as well as alleviating some of the shortcomings affecting community uses, such as pressure on the doctor's surgery. Development can bring about improvements to public transport services and address concerns regarding lack of facilities for children, teenagers and	Noted.	No change.
	* More allotments should be provided if new development is required in Somerton.	New allotments have recently been permitted, but this is a function for the Town Council and is not a Core Strategy issue.	No change
	* There is a lack of youth facilities to enable social events that should be addressed if Somerton is to have more housing e.g. cinema.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has indicated the need for additional youth facilities. A cinema would need to be promoted by a commercial operator.	No change
	* A petrol station should be built if new homes are developed in Somerton.	A petrol station would need to be promoted by a commercial operator.	No change.
	* A fundamental weakness is that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being produced at the end of the process and not the beginning. This is such an important part of the process that it needs to be seen up front so that it can be examined and commented as part of the core strategy process.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been produced to inform the Proposed Submission Plan, which will be available as part of the evidence base in early 2012.	No change
	* The police and fire stations need to be fully manned if more homes are built in Somerton - the police presence is insufficient for such a population increase.	This is not within the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change.
	* Dental services are not adequate for such a population increase resulting from 500 homes.	The IDP has not indicated the need for any additional dental facilities in Somerton	No change.
	* Somerton requires a small hospital like Verrington.	Somerton is of insufficient size and is in relatively close proximity to West Mendip Hospital at Glastonbury as well as Yeovil Hospital so the draft IDP does not indicate the need for any further hospital facilities with the area.	No change.
	* Flooding is a major problem already and improvements to drains and sewers are required to prevent localised flooding.	No flood alleviation requirements have been identified in the IDP.	No change.
	* Need jobs and homes for younger people and professional/high tech employees so they can stay and contribute to Somerton's prosperity, particularly affordable homes.	Noted and agreed. A balance of jobs and homes at Somerton is proposed.	No change.

	* No indication has been given as to where the employment land will be located and the proposed increase in employment provision by 420 may well prove to be overambitious, meaning people will have to seek work away from town.	Broad locations for new development are set out i.e. to the west of the town. Housing and jobs growth are balanced to ensure that new residents of Somerton have the opportunity to also work in the town in order to reduce commuting.	No change.
	* Assumption that jobs will simply 'arrive' as required seems to be unfathomable.	The Core Strategy supports economic growth generally, and encourages jobs through identifying broad locations for new development, including employment and housing.	No change.
	* The suggestion that 2.77 ha of employment land would provide employment opportunities for an additional 1200-1500 residents seems grossly optimistic, leading to greater commuting out of Somerton and therefore increasing CO2 emissions.	The Employment Land Review Stage 3 identified a gross need for 2.77 ha of 'B' use employment land to support housing growth.	Propose additional 3 ha of 'B' use employment land at Somerton.
	* Where will the hectare of employment land be located (if Badgers Cross the roads are inadequate) and what type and how many jobs will be created? There are very few large employers in this region of Somerset and no incentives to relocate other employers here - the creation of new jobs is highly unlikely given the current economic situation.	The direction of 'strategic' growth is indicated to the west of the town, although this does not preclude small scale employment development elsewhere. The Core Strategy is a long term plan looking up to the year 2028 so it is envisaged that although economic growth has been slow in the early years of the plan, the economy should recover in the near future.	Identify the west of Somerton as the broad location for strategic development, whilst acknowledging that small scale economic could take place elsewhere at the town.
	* Agree that we need jobs and local businesses but they have to have a reason to come to Somerton - many of the businesses currently on the trading estate are not run by Somerton people and many employ people from elsewhere.	New housing development and additional residents at the town would help boost Somerton's economy. It is not possible for the Core Strategy to enforce where workers come from.	No change.
	* With an increase of population from new homes, shops and jobs should come of their own accord.	Noted.	No change.
	* There are empty properties in and around Somerton that should be redeveloped first e.g. a group of new build homes in Compton Dundon have remain empty for over 12 months - why build new homes when they too could remain empty?	The Core Strategy is a long term plan looking up to the year 2028 so new build homes will be required in addition to any redevelopment opportunities that may arise in the town.	No change.
	* A self-contained sustainable community should be provided, including a balance of house types and affordable homes, and schooling, jobs, health services, shopping, leisure facilities etc.	Noted - the creation of sustainable communities is supported in national planning policy and Core Strategy objectives.	No change.
	* The new homes might be for wealthy people - how will sufficient affordable housing be provided when social housing only occurs on large developments?	Core Strategy Policy HG4 sets a threshold of 6 dwellings for when affordable housing should be provided.	No change.

	* Past housing growth has led to towns choked with traffic, not solved the endemic problem of lack of affordable housing, lack of 'family friendly' development and lack of local job opportunities. Wish to see Somerton grow and develop but don't want to see it subsumed by 'bolt on' housing programme that kills off	Additional housing would mean more affordable homes, and a mix of homes to meet needs should be provided. Sufficient jobs for new residents should be provided.	No change.
	* The density of the proposed developments are too high and out of character for a small town, which can produce tense people. Densities should be in line with existing Somerton housing development.	The national requirement for a minimum of 30 dwellings per ha has been removed (PPS3), allowing a more localised approach to housing densities to be set.	See proposed density policy
	* The age profile of Somerton is slanted towards older people and should not be unduly disturbed.	A mix of housing should be provided to accommodate all needs (PPS3, SHMA).	No change.
	* Potential threat of water pollution on the Somerset Levels and Moors caused by increasing housing and industry in Somerton. Therefore reduce housing development at Somerton.	The Habitats Regulations Assessment considered the impact of the proposed growth at Somerton to have an acceptable impact upon the Somerset Levels and Moors.	No change.
	* Oppose any development on Greenfield sites outside the current development limit - there are dozens of brownfield sites and derelict buildings in Somerton that should be redeveloped. Concentrate on infill and housing expansion in smaller blocks rather than one big	Evidence in the SHLAA indicates few sites are available within the town, which would not be sufficient to accommodate the proposed scale of development at Somerton.	No change.
	* There should be more emphasis on the use of brownfield land in Somerton.	National policy (PPS3) promotes the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, as reflected in the supporting text to Core Strategy Policy HG3.	No change.
	* It is not true that there is greater potential for new development at Somerton than nearby Langport/Huish Episcopi which has higher levels of flood risk, as Huish Episcopi has dry land to the east and north which is suitable for development.	The availability of land at Langport/Huish Episcopi outside Flood Zone 3 to the east and north is noted, and is now included in the direction for development at Langport/Huish Episcopi.	No change.
	* Object to any proposal that will convert Somerton into a dormitory town.	The Core Strategy seeks to provide a balance of housing and jobs to ensure that new residents can both live and work in the town.	No change.
	* The core strategy contains lots of detail on planning policy but very little information about proposals for towns such as Somerton beyond the basic 'how many houses and where they should go'.	Disagree - the settlement sections include a spatial portrait, local issues, local aspirations, and what the Core Strategy will deliver in terms of housing, employment, retail and key infrastructure issues.	No change.

	* Concern regarding the impact of additional traffic on the historic environment.	It is important to conserve and enhance Somerton's historic character, particularly considering impacts upon the Conservation Area. However, it is not considered that this represents an over-riding constraint to the scale of development suggested at Somerton, and national policy, supported by local policy and development management policies will ensure the historic environment is fully considered in any future development proposals.	No change.
	* It is necessary to draw a line as to the boundary of Somerton - the Milllands has been used to the east, why not St Cleers Orchard/Field Close to the west.	These represent the current development area boundaries at Somerton, but it is necessary to extend the town in order to accommodate the proposed housing growth at Somerton.	No change.
	* There does not appear to have been any development to the north or south of Somerton for some time.	The south was considered as Option 1, but ruled out due to environmental constraints and lack of evidence that the land is available for housing. Development to the north was not considered due to adverse landscape impact, flood risk, lack of land availability.	No change
	* The development of Somerton over the next 15 years must be well-thought out in a comprehensive shared vision for the future, by all of the community so that the decisions in the Core Strategy do not blight the town and surrounding countryside.	Noted.	No change.
	* Land at Badger's Cross would be better used for sympathetic housing rather than industrial use.	The isolated location of Badger's Cross would make it unacceptable for new housing, and it is not within any of the options considered for new development.	No change.
	* Development of land to the North and South (Option 1) of the town is unacceptable due to unsuitable topography, flood risk, adverse visual impact and lack of	Agree.	No change
	* Oppose development at Option 1 as this would spoil easy access to the countryside, particularly for older residents.	A Right of Way traverses this option that should be avoided if development was to take place, but there is a lack of evidence as to site availability in this area, and environmental constraints. This is not the preferred option being taken forward	No change
	* Potential to develop Option 1 as it is closest to town centre and in order to 'balance' out the town, but there would need to be a large investment in the roads to achieve this i.e. Pestors Lane, Parsonage Hill, Badgers Cross Lane (from Sutton Road), Perry Hill road.	Option 1 does offer good access to the town centre, but accept that road improvements are likely to be necessary given the road network around the option. This is not the preferred option being taken forward	No change

	* Locate new development to the south and east of Somerton, near the B3151 - this is within walking distance of the town centre, there would be easy access for lorries, encourage passing trade from B3151.	Accept the benefits of close proximity to the town centre, but the presence of the Conservation Area to the east will limit development that would be acceptable here, and the landscape study identifies a low to moderate capacity to accommodate development. This is not the preferred option being taken forward	No change
	* Support development of Option 2 (preferred option) - submission of land in northern part of this option (along Cartway Lane).	Support noted.	Incorporate Option 2 within Somerton's direction of development.
	* Option 2 has merit if reduced by 100 houses.	It is proposed to lower the scale of housing development at Somerton to better reflect the characteristics of the town and to avoid excess district wide provision.	See proposed levels of growth section
	* Given the proposed development at Somerton, consider building new train station - the area of Option 2 would be the best location and any development in this area should consider a new train station.	Feasibility assessment would be required prior to any firm proposal in the Core Strategy to build a new train station, but it is considered unlikely that the proposed level of development would be sufficient to fund a new station in Somerton. This would need to be considered as part of any future Transport Plan by the County Council	No change.
	* Option 2 should not be developed as Ricksey Lane is well used by walkers and riders and Somerton would lose a precious area of open space amenity.	There is a Right of Way which crosses Option 2 which should be protected from development or re-routed.	No change.
	* Option 2 should not go ahead as this is furthest and therefore most inaccessible from the town centre, and would encourage car travel for which the road network is insufficient, increase CO2 emissions, cause air pollution and will mean the west side of town will become a dormitory area serving larger developments like Yeovil, Chard and Crewkerne and not Somerton itself.	Options 2 and 3 are similar distances from the town centre (approx 1km). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not indicated the need for any 'strategic' road improvements that may be necessary to accommodate new development but site specific considerations will need to be taken into account if any planning application is made. There is potential that new residents will travel to towns elsewhere, but this should be mitigated through appropriate job creation and community facilities and services at Somerton.	No change.
	* The area at Option 2 between Langport Road and Sutton Road has a history of flooding, making Ricksey Lane impassable, and several attempts to alleviate this have all failed. Environment Agency request further work to evaluate the flood risk of the preferred site as it is susceptible to surface water flooding.	Although Option 2 is not within an area of medium/high fluvial flood risk, the SFRA identifies surface water flooding is an issue in the southern section, which will require further work to assess and mitigate.	Ensure flooding issue is addressed at Somerton's direction of growth.

	* Object to Option 2 due to the presence of wildlife, protected species and habitats, including deer.	There are no designated wildlife sites in Option 2, but the south east part is within the foraging range for pipistrelle bats (European Protected Species) so mitigation measures will be needed.	No change.
	* The railway bridge on Ricksey Lane (Option 2) is very narrow, as is Ricksey Lane - need a link to the B3165 through Melbury to enable traffic to reach the south without coming back through the town centre to reach the Sutton Road.	No strategic road improvements have been identified as part of the IDP but any proposal will need to consider traffic movement	No change.
	* The railway line adjacent to Option 2 is constantly being worked on which continues all night long - this will negatively effect future residents' amenity. Also need to ensure the barrier separating the railway from the houses is maintained.	Noise from the railway line is not considered to represent an overriding constraint that would prevent new development, although mitigation measures may be required.	No change.
	* If development occurs to the west of town, expand the existing sports pitches, provide general open access amenity areas, and move the community centre to its rightful place at the heart of the sports field.	Issues such as these will need to be considered as and when proposals within the direction of growth at the town come forward.	No change.
	* Concern that if development is built in Option 2 it will benefit shopping in Tesco, Langport, as there is very little parking in Somerton.	The District Wide Car Parking Strategy (2007) highlighted that the supply of car parking spaces does currently meet demand in Somerton, but this strategy is due to be reviewed. Survey work carried out as part of a recent planning appeal did not identify a lack of capacity as being an issue in Somerton's car parks.	No change.
	* Object to Option 2 as it is good quality agricultural land.	Option 2 is not classed as Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land.	No change.
	* 280 homes on the western side of Somerton is ill conceived and inappropriate.	The level of housing at Somerton has been reduced to reflect town scale and avoid excess provision. A comparison of directions for growth around the town has identified the west as the best location.	No change.
	* Somerton must take extra houses due to flooding at Langport/Huish Episcopi, but why is the restriction on development to the furthest end of the town not viewed as a constraint at Somerton?	The lack of potential development sites within Somerton means that development on the periphery of the town is necessary to meet the needs of the town up to the year 2028. Given the constraints of closer areas to the north, east and south, the most appropriate location has been identified to the west.	No change.

	* The land south of Langport Road in Option 2 (identified on submitted plan) is strongly supported in locating new development, and is of a scale that could accommodate housing, employment and convenience retail development if appropriate. A series of technical studies are being prepared (by RPS planning consultants) to investigate the potential of developing	Support noted.	No change.
	* Off-site open space provision may be the best option in potential development at land south of Langport Road, Somerton given the site adjoins an existing children's play area and wider Category 1 sports pitch provision. It is more likely that enhanced provision within the existing areas of open space on the western side of Somerton will be more desirable than piecemeal provision on the development site, subject to robust public consultation.	Noted - details such as these will need to be considered as and when proposals within the direction of growth at the town come forward.	No change.
	* The section of Option 2 north of Langport Road and Option 3 north of Bancombe Road should be the preferred option, as this would give better road access to the town, better opportunity for workers to access the trading estate, and would avoid the south western part of Option 2 which is subject to severe flooding every	If the northern section of Option 3 is deleted due to adverse landscape impact, there is little to choose between the remainder of Option 3 and Option 2 in terms of key planning issues.	Propose a broader direction of growth at Somerton, encompassing Option 2 and the southern part of Option 3.
	* New development should be built in Option 3.	The northern section of Option 3 should be deleted due to adverse landscape impact and lack of evidence that this land is available for development.	Propose a broader direction of growth at Somerton, encompassing Option 2 and the southern part of Option 3.
	* The Northfield area is best to start building as it is high and dry, with good access to the existing sewage plant, although roads will require alteration to ensure traffic flows easily as can only be reached by a very narrow lane with houses on both sides, or through residential	Agree that the Northfield area is outside the area of fluvial flood risk. No strategic road improvements have been identified as part of the IDP but any proposal will need to consider traffic movement.	Incorporate Northfield area within Somerton's direction of growth.
	* If new houses are to be built in Bancombe Road already, it makes sense to continue along that road (Option 3) as road access should already have been sorted, less visual impact on other houses, any extension to the trading estate could be to the west.	Support for option 3 is noted, although development in the northern section would have an adverse landscape impact.	Incorporate southern part of Option 3 within Somerton's direction of growth.
	* Remove north section of Option 3 as development north of Bradley Hill Lane would intrude into one of the most beautiful areas of countryside in the county.	Agree - this land is shown as being highly valued in the Peripheral Landscape study.	Remove north section of Option 3 in the direction for growth.
	* Agree that areas to the north and east flood.	Noted.	No change.

	* Only one direction of growth would move the town away from shops and facilities; instead spread the growth around the town such as beyond St Cleers, south of the Mill stream, towards Ricksey Lane.	Other areas around the town have been ruled out due to environmental constraints and lack of evidence of land availability.	No change.
	* Build new development on the edge of Kingsdon, the old Somerton Wireless station, or Compton Dundon to help support their school, instead of Somerton.	These are all less sustainable locations than the edge of Somerton, and would result in large scale development in the countryside away from existing towns, necessitating new residents to travel some distance to work, shops, and key services, which is likely to be by car given the lack of alternatives.	No change.
	* How can 60% of residents not live "locally"?	Assume this a reference to the relatively low self containment at Somerton, where over 60% of residents travelling to work elsewhere.	No change.
Wincanton			
Spatial Portrait			
Spatial Portrait (paras 6.106 - 6.107)	No comments received	N/A	N/A
Local Issues			
Local Issues	* Western approach to Wincanton is depressing and needs to be addressed. The ramshackle appearance of the old Cow and Gate factory and its surrounding businesses are an eyesore. Replacement with more attractive buildings is long over due.	Concern noted. It is important to retain existing land in employment use in Wincanton in order to retain job opportunities for local people. The appearance of the buildings and land on the western approach to Wincanton is the responsibility of the landowner.	No change.
	* Recall commenting as part number of consultations over the years e.g. state of the gutters and downpipes in High Street - have seen little evidence of improvement; also suggested creating 2 or 3 loading bays in the wide pavement on Carrington Way, extension of footpath in West Hill from King Arthur's School to the junction of Dancing Lane. Also about 2 yrs ago there was a petition to rationalise the speed limits between Wincanton and Templecombe - what became of all these suggestions? We have been consulted on widely - need to see something done.	It is believed that gutters and down pipes were flagged up as part of the Conservation Area Assessment work, issues such as loading bays and speed limits would have to be taken up with Somerset County Council as the Highway Authority. Whilst these matters are important in the local environment they are not strategic Core Strategy issues.	No change.

	<p>*It is unclear how the "Local Issues" were derived - where did they come from? Unsubstantiated.</p>	<p>The "Local Issues" were derived from the Parish Cluster Meetings, Wincanton People's Plan and known constraints. Planning permission was granted for a new Medical Centre at New Barns Farm in June 2010 (10/00014/REM). A revised proposal to for a Medical Centre including a pharmacy was refused by Area East Committee in April 2011.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Paragraph 6.107 recognises that Wincanton has a strategic role in the provision of facilities. The role of Wincanton Racecourse within the District should be a strategic consideration. The racecourse should be subject to a policy that recognises the role of the racecourse and that aids the ability for the racecourse to refurbish and develop itself to protect its long term future as an internationally important sporting venue (suggested policy wording provided). Policy is required to ensure the future vitality and viability of the racecourse. Given recent changes in media rights, income has been reduced and the racecourse may have to diversify or consolidate the racecourse functions during the plan period to remain financially viable e.g. by providing hotel or conference facilities as has been the case at Epsom Downs and Sandown Park.</p>	<p>Whilst it is recognised that Wincanton Racecourse is an asset to the town, it is considered that the diversification of it's facilities can be addressed through the Development Management process and it is not necessary to have a strategic policy directly relating to the facility. Wincanton People's Plan recognises the role the Racecourse plays in the local economy and it is considered that a reference to the Racecourse should be made in the Spatial Portrait for Wincanton recognising it's role in the local economy.</p>	<p>Amend the Spatial Portrait for Wincanton to include a reference to Wincanton Racecourse and it's role in the local economy.</p>

Local Aspirations			
Local Aspirations (paras 6.108 - 6.109)	*Town Council and Local People do not want additional 350 houses, under localism our views should count, coupled with abolition of RSS there is no justification for the housing. None of the local aspirations reflect a desire to see Wincanton grow by approx 20% (350 dwellings plus Key Sites).	Local concern has been expressed regarding the scale of growth proposed in Wincanton and it is accepted that Wincanton does have a relatively high level of existing commitments compared to the other Market Towns in the District (3rd highest after Chard and Crewkerne). Most other Market Towns within the District are proposed to see a total housing provision of around 400-500 dwellings over the plan period and this has been taken into account when considering the overall strategic approach to the levels of growth required across the whole of the District in the light of the evidence arising from the Baker Report . As a consequence, as part of that strategic approach it is considered that there should be no provision made for additional housing growth on top of those existing commitments. The retention of the Development Area means that opportunities for windfall development will still exist.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.
	* Proposed housing growth is not in balance with employment growth.	See response above. Concern has been expressed regarding the balance between housing and employment growth in the town; within Wincanton there is an aspiration to maintain a vibrant Town Centre and facilitate employment growth. It has been argued that Wincanton has seen significant losses of employment land to residential development compared with other settlements and the supply quoted in the ELR is incorrect - the 2 ha of vacant employment land currently calculated as part of the supply is not truly 'available' for employment use (this matter would need further investigation), and 1 hectare of 'B' use employment land has been lost from the New Barns Farm Key Site (ELR attributed 2.2 ha to this site). Discussions have also taken place with the Economic Development Manager and it is considered that that Wincanton's proximity to the A303 and the south east makes it well placed in terms of transport connectivity.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.

		(continued) Whilst Wincanton has a supply of 3.61 ha, it is suggested that an additional 5 ha be provided as a minimum, taking the Wincanton figure up to 8.61ha. This will make Wincanton more attractive to potential developers, providing the opportunity to have a range and choice of sites and help support a more balanced, self contained settlement. The loss of further employment land to residential development in the future should be resisted through planning policy and it has been noted in the Draft Core Strategy that the Development Management process should be mindful of employment losses, Policy SS5 is clear that the ELR figures are a "minimum".	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	* Town will not be able to handle the increase in traffic and pedestrians or provide jobs. The 1.24 jobs per economically active person will drop. What is the current unemployment rate in Wincanton?	See response above. In 2001, 2.8% of the population of Wincanton were unemployed (Nomis). In May 2011, 1.3% were collecting job seekers allowance (Nomis) .	No change.
	* Re: efforts to regenerate town centre shopping - have started with an own goal by allowing the Health centre to relocate - this will be a disadvantage to many. People will be drawn away from the Town Centre particularly if a Pharmacy is incorporated. A number of years ago the same thing happened with the swimming pool.	It is agreed that it would be preferable for the Health Centre to remain in Wincanton Town Centre however the District Council has granted consent for a new centre to be erected at New Barns Farm, that consent has yet to be implemented.	No change.

What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 6.110 - 6.115)	* Support the principle of mixed use development on preferred Option 1 - particularly land north of Dancing Lane.	Support noted. However see response below.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.
	* Wincanton cannot cope with/does not need 350 more new houses in addition to what is already committed.	Local concern has been expressed regarding the scale of growth proposed in Wincanton and it is accepted that Wincanton does have a relatively high level of existing commitments compared to the other Market Towns in the District (3rd highest after Chard and Crewkerne). Most other Market Towns within the District are proposed to see a total housing provision of around 400-500 dwellings over the plan period and this has been taken into account when considering the overall strategic approach to the levels of growth required across the whole of the District in the light of the evidence arising from the Baker Report . As a consequence, as part of that strategic approach it is considered that there should be no provision made for additional housing growth on top of those existing commitments. The retention of the Development Area means that opportunities for windfall development will still exist.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.

	<p>* Not convinced that existing commitments will even come forward.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Coalition Govs plans imply greater consultation and buy-in from local people. If the 703 existing commitments are built and occupied this will result in C. 1500 additional residents (average 2.12 adults per household) and their cars. Wincanton has a population of just over 5,000 this implies a roughly 30% increase in the population of the town. This will have significant implications for social the cohesion of the town - will people be able to find jobs. Congestion is likely to arise on the High Street.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Rumoured that most of the homes will be social housing. National statistics suggest that this will bring problems and pressure for the local police force. Do not want the crime rate to go up. Car us</p>	<p>See response above. Draft Core Strategy Policy HG4 seeks 35% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Who will live in the new homes? No point in building more homes as there are many unsold and empty properties and many unemployed people in Wincanton. Has a survey been carried out to ascertain the level of unoccupied housing in Wincanton? If not this needs to be done.</p>	<p>See response above. No survey of the number of occupied houses in Wincanton has been undertaken.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Given the proposed housing growth in Wincanton, Cary/Ansford and Milborne Port, the comparative proposed levels of additional employment land seems low for Wincanton and will fail to sustain the Council's policy of self containment. Danger of creating a commuter town in Wincanton on the A303. Suggest that the housing target is reduced to about 200 homes with the balance of about 150 re-distributed pro-rata to Castle Cary /Ansford and Milborne Port.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>*The 703 homes already committed in Wincanton will result in a 40% increase in the population, to propose more housing is ridiculous. These commitments should be built and phased first and impacts of those developments considered before additional housing.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>*There is no need for the additional housing at present time in Wincanton - there is major growth on 2 sites, coupled with numerous infill sites and conversions. Lack of need coupled with the loss of employment land and shops (SSDC have allowed residential land to be lost to housing and shops to be converted), there will be nowhere for people to work.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* It is not sustainable to plan another 350 homes until the current oversupply of dwellings is reduced and more job opportunities are created locally.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* If Option 1 is taken forward Dancing Lane and the surrounding roads would not cope with the traffic. Traffic is already a problem in Dancing Lane with 20mph. Access onto on West Hill from Dancing Lane and Springfield Road is already precarious. Would increase town centre congestion. No safe or practical way of accessing land to the north of Dancing Lane. New homes will generate in the region of 500 additional cars and then employment traffic on top of that. Emergency vehicles need access to the hospital. Access via the hospital grounds would be dangerous.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Concern regarding the loss of access to the countryside in the vicinity of the preferred option. Ruining opportunities for children to play in the trees and fields, taking away their freedom and childhood and then their children's future. * Respondent aged 10 concern that if houses are built behind her home on Dancing Lane she will not be able to play in the fields with her friends nor walk her dog there anymore.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Increase in roads and housing at a time of recession if implemented could result in the same impacts as in Ireland - large numbers of empty houses and local discontent. A tour of surrounding villages will dispel the myth that the area is thriving. Proposals should be more suitable and sustainable, expansion should be for the local community not for the sake of dogma or theory.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* With 250 homes already due to come forward in the next 2 yrs. Wincanton needs more employment before houses. Not enough job opportunities for the new homes. The previous Gov's pressure to build has resulted in too many dwellings being approved. The recession may continue for a number of years</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* If planned development goes ahead house prices will go down.</p>	<p>See response above. If more homes become available within the housing market and this results in making homes more affordable, this would be a positive as young people or others who currently cannot afford to enter the housing market might be able to. However, the fact that house prices might be reduced as result of new development is not a planning matter.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* How will new jobs be created ? Shops and businesses are closing all the time. Need employment before housing.</p>	<p>See response above and recommendation to comments made on paragraphs 6.108 - 6.109.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.</p>
	<p>* Proposal will provide short term employment for builders who live out of town and would not be concerned by the impact on Wincanton. There are already too many people commuting out of town and more housing will not bring benefits to Wincanton. Need to attract more employment to the area rents and rates seem to be a problem. Proposals should come forward from anywhere around the town and dealt with on their merits.</p>	<p>See response above and recommendation to comments made on paragraphs 6.108 - 6.10</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.</p>

	<p>* Many people cannot afford homes have difficulty obtaining a mortgage and there is not enough stable employment available locally.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Too much land has been has been lost to Greenfield sites and over 2 ha of employment land lost to housing. Coalition Gov promises to maintain Green Belt and SSSIs. Should not just pay lip service to preserving the countryside around Wincanton.</p>	<p>See response above. There is no Green Belt land within South Somerset District.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Strongly object to houses/flats being built on land in and around Verrington Hospital. Bought property as currently have uninterrupted views. No access available apart from through Verrington Hospital car park. Building would cause disturbance for local residents.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Welcome the inclusion of land at Dancing Lane to the rear of Verrington Hospital in the Preferred Option. Land is suitable, available and viable and could accommodate approx 55 dwellings.</p>	<p>Noted, although the proposed revised strategic approach means that this land is no longer within the preferred direction for growth. See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>If growth proposals go ahead out commuting will increase.</p>	<p>See response above. The proposed revised strategic approach is likely to help reduce out commuting although it is recognised that it is a matter of personal choice where people live and work.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Local sports field which is of benefit to the local youth will be destroyed. What will be done about replacement? It should be designated a No Development Area. The school was given the playing fields off Dancing Lane because they were out of space when the swimming pool and car park were built. The School is a Sports College.</p>	<p>The direction of growth, whilst including the playing fields, did not presume that all the land would be developed as there are other policy issues with loss of playing fields. However, in view of the change in the scale of development required in Wincanton, this land is no longer included in the preferred direction of growth.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Has been suggested that King Arthur's School does not have the capacity to absorb the additional growth - this is not the case. Role over the last 5 yrs has declined from 750 to approx 500 and there is plenty of space on site to replace old or erect new buildings. The loss of the additional field north of Dancing Lane would be an issue but not one the school could resolve. Whilst there are some negative aspects o the proposal should not lose site of the many advantages of an expanding and vibrant community. A town like Wincanton cannot stand still, it needs to develop to thrive , it needs new people, new ideas, new businesses or it will contract and die.</p>	<p>Support noted but see response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Nowhere is a secondary school mentioned - where will all the additional children be educated?</p>	<p>See response above. It is noted that the response received from King Arthur's School supported the level of growth proposed in the Draft Core Strategy. See comment above left.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* What evidence is there that Wincanton needs all these new homes? Lot of general statements but no evidence of need for the proposal.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* If Wincanton does need more housing the A303 would be the preferred option.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Students of King Arthur's School would be at risk from traffic - concerned there might be a fatality.</p>	<p>Noted. See response above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>Migration of development to the west is likely to harm existing businesses in the High Street and reduce existing employment opportunities. SA assumes there are limited opportunities within Option 4 for creating of developing amenities without discussing with the landowners. Development along Bayford Hill provides an opportunity to create an access that could connect the existing land locked housing development and provides equal opportunity (with Option 1) for amenity space. The topography and parkland environment of Bayford Hill provides a unique opportunity for a highly attractive residential development within walking distance of the High Street. Concerns about the impact of Option 4 on townscape and landscape can be addressed by careful design and use of materials, and green space. Option 1 extends to an elevated position making it visible in the wider area.</p>	<p>See 2nd response to paras 6.108 - 6.109. The revised strategic approach means that a direction of growth for employment use only needs to be identified and Option 1 provides the best location in terms of access to the trunk road network, and minimises the impact of goods traffic on the Wincanton road network.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.</p>

	Further development to the west is limited by topography., development to the north and west would have less environmental impact, be more attractive, more likely to reduce the need to drive to the centre, be more balanced and help retain a vibrant Town Centre.	See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.108 - 6.109.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.
	* Wincanton has received significant growth already such as at the Old Railway Station, Rochfords old site, parts of Wincanton Logistics old HQ, both sides of North Street, either side of Bayford Hill, Moor Lane and Station Road, South Street and new areas such as the Key site development and the plot on the way to Bayford. This makes up the 703 dwellings recorded as committed. A further 350 dwellings will have an undue impact on the town.	See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.110 - 6.115.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.
	* Object to the housing growth in fields behind Dancing Lane. Proposal is outside development boundary, growth should be concentrated within the urban area first.	See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.110 - 6.115.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.
	*Not convinced by Option 1, it includes land to the north which is a totally new direction of development, it is unneeded and beyond the traditional development boundary. Using SHLAA is flawed.	See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.110 - 6.115.	Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District.

	<p>*Wincanton Town Council strongly object to 350 additional homes as 703 existing commitments have yet to be built - no further development for 10 years until the New Barns Farm and Deanesly Way developments have been assessed for the impact on the town's infrastructure. Disagree that growth in housing will bring employment opportunities and community benefit - Wincanton has lost employment land to housing and has failed to attract business despite its location, excellent road network - require evidence of statement. Option 1 is already used by locals as a recreational area, wish to retain the little open space in the Town and not develop despite comment requisite amount of open space will be delivered. Last Full Council meeting several residents disapproved and Wincanton Town Council (in light of Localism agenda) are objecting on their behalf. Should evidence indicate other than above, may reconsider.</p>	<p>See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.108 - 6.109.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>*Object inadequate public transport and transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.108 - 6.109. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has assessed the strategic transport infrastructure needs of any proposed growth but none has been identified as being required in Wincanton. Site specific impacts will be assessed as part of any planning application made.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>*Land Identified in Option 1 (preferred option) includes Ancient pre 17th Century historic enclosed land of significant landscape character and visual amenity north of Dancing Lane - this land includes mixed hedgerows and high grade agricultural of historic significance, it should be Green Belt.</p>	<p>See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.108 - 6.109. There is no Green Belt land in South Somerset District. It is accepted that the area of land identified as part of Option did extend into an area of land north of Dancing Lane identified in the Wincanton Peripheral Landscape Study (2008) as having a moderate to low capacity of accommodate built development.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>*Option 1 is not sustainable or justified - *Grade 1 Agricultural Land * of significant landscape character and amenity *Poor transportation access * brownfield land for employment has not been considered first *SSDC landscape study does not support employment land on Option 1.</p>	<p>See response above and 2nd response to paras 6.108 - 6.109. It is noted that a small area of land south of Sunnydene Farm is Grade 1 Agricultural Land. See comments regarding provision of employment land below.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>*Support the preferred option for the direction of growth - this accords with what was originally allocated in the 1998 Deposit Draft Local Plan, following a Landscape Impact Assessment. Inspector at the time limited the level of growth based on brownfield potential, much of which has now been completed.</p>	<p>Support noted. However see responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>*Forward states that growth in housing must be balanced with jobs, community services and local amenities. 350 homes to Wincanton will not ensure these other forms of infrastructure, the jobs and services should be there first.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>*If development has to go ahead suggest a phasing approach 1) completion of the 703 committed homes by 2026 2) assessment of need and impact to ensure all 703 are required 3) commitment and approval on a phased basis 4) consideration of need for 350 homes after 2026 at the earliest.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. The Core Strategy will be reviewed in time.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>*Phasing is required, from the way the plan is currently written all the development could come forward in year one, it is a 15 year plan, it should have phasing and milestones indicated throughout those 15yrs. For example, assess the situation in 10yrs</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Would be more sensible to extend the New Barns Farm site.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. It is now proposed that land to the south of New Barns Farm be identified as the preferred direction for strategic employment growth.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Instead of building on Greenfield land brownfield sites such as the Old Cow & Gate Factory site or Long Close this would help regenerate the town rather than take away green field land.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. The reuse of brownfield land is encouraged however Draft Core Strategy policies seek to retain land in employment use.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Resident of Dancing Lane - was assured that the law relating to the fields behind their property would not be changed and the land not developed.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. No resident can ever be given a 100% guarantee that the land around them will never be developed in any way especially on the edge of a town.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>*All proposed options appear to be shading areas around existing developments - this does not appear radical or innovative and risks overloading outdated infrastructures, failing to maintain the green balance.</p>	<p>The option of building a new settlement in the District has been looked at and dismissed as part of the consideration of the growth proposals for Yeovil. Where growth is proposed the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will consider the infrastructure needs arising from that growth.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Land at Verrington Road is also suitable for housing development (not in preferred Option). SHLAA site E/WINC/0008. Site is accessible, of low visual sensitivity and a 5 minute walk from the Town Centre. This land should be included in the preferred area for growth.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. Identification of land as being suitable, available and viable for housing development in the SHLAA does not mean it should be allocated or give planning permission. The SHLAA is completed on a without policy consideration basis.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Green space within and around towns are the reason people move to South Somerset - they make an important contribution to the environment in which to live. Seems irresponsible of the council to seek land and encourage speculators.</p>	<p>Agreed that green space within and around towns in South Somerset are important.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Development of preferred option will result in the loss of views from existing properties.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. Agreed that views from existing properties may change but this is not a spatial planning issue.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* There is no timescale to 2026 and therefore there is likely to be an influx of unneeded, undesirable and opportunistic planning applications in 2012.</p>	<p>The plan period is now proposed to be extended to 2028. Housing development is not phased within the Draft Core Strategy however delivery will be monitored and there is a requirement to ensure that there is a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land across the district. Market forces will dictate how much development comes forward at any one time.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Preferred Option extends into Charlton Musgrove Parish. Has the policy on protecting the countryside by only allowing 'in fill' changed?</p>	<p>Planning policy still takes a restrictive approach to development in the countryside however, there is no reason why a direction for strategic growth cannot extend across a parish boundary, but the proposed revised strategic approach to growth in Wincanton means that preferred direction of growth no longer extends into Charlton Musgrove Parish.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Character of Wincanton will be destroyed.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. This comment was in response to the proposed additional housing growth</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Density of development in Option 1 will be at best 30 dph . Valley at Verrington is in Charlton Musgrove parish and is an overwhelmingly rural unspoilt area. Housing density in the valley is at most half an acre per property. To put a housing estate and accompanying infrastructure in the valley would totally decimate it and destroy the tranquil beauty of the landscape. Also likely to damage the race course and associated businesses. Whilst in principle Wincanton needs more suitable, sustainable employment before large quantities of housing are built Core Strategy does not take account of the amendment to PPS3 and the removal of the strict requirement for a maximum density of 30 dph. If account were to be taken of the housing in the surrounding area very low density development would be the preference. High density housing will destroy all that attracts people to the town.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above and responses to Policy HG2 Housing density (Paras 8.8-8.10).</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Argument that build more houses and make business land available and the town will thrive does not add up. Have any alternatives to blobbing up existing towns been considered.</p>	<p>See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. Three options for the distribution of growth outside of Yeovil have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal these included Business as usual (2006-2009 completion rate projected forward over a 20 year period), a 2:1 split between Market Towns and Rural Centres and a concentrated approach to growth outside of Yeovil, focussed on the Market Towns. The preferred option was the 2:1 split between Market Towns and Rural Centres.</p>	<p>Amend the total housing provision for Wincanton to 703 dwellings (700 - rounded) to reflect the overall strategic approach to the delivery of housing across the District. Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* More employment is needed before housing. Wishes of Wincanton People's Plan have been ignored.</p>	<p>Concern has been expressed regarding the balance between housing and employment growth in the town; within Wincanton there is an aspiration to maintain a vibrant Town Centre and facilitate employment growth. It has been argued that Wincanton has seen significant losses of employment land to residential development compared with other settlements and the supply quoted in the Employment Land Review (ELR) is incorrect - the 2 ha of vacant employment land currently calculated as part of the supply is not truly 'available' for employment use (this matter would need further investigation), and 1 ha of 'B' use employment land has been lost from the New Barns Farm Key Site (ELR attributed 2.2 ha to this site). Discussions have also taken place with the Economic Development Manager and it is considered that Wincanton's proximity to the A303 and the south east makes it well placed in terms of transport connectivity. Whilst Wincanton has a supply of 3.61 ha, it is suggested that an additional</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.</p>
		<p>(continued) 5 ha be provided as a minimum, taking the Wincanton figure up to 8.61 ha. This will make Wincanton more attractive to potential developers, providing the opportunity to have a range and choice of sites and help support a more balanced, self contained settlement. The loss of further employment land to residential development in the future should be resisted through planning policy and it has been noted in the Draft Core Strategy that the Development Management process should be mindful of employment losses, Policy SS5 is clear that the ELR figures are a "minimum".</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	* Employment figures seem arbitrary. Surely existing large employers such as RNAS Yeovilton, Westlands helicopters and Thales will provide sufficient jobs for new inhabitants. The 1.5ha of employment land means nothing unless it has occupiers.	See response above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	* Strategy seems to focus on housing first and jobs second. This is the wrong way round. Unless jobs are created there can be no justification for increasing the housing stock to the extent envisaged. Simply relying on the A303 is not enough.	See response above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	* The strategy is neither fair or feasible. Unfair distribution of housing growth at Wincanton. There is no employment demand within the town.	See response above. The ELR and Business Workspace Demand study identify a need for employment land in Wincanton. The trend in past jobs growth in Wincanton has been identified in the paper presented to Project Management Board and it is anticipated that this level of growth will continue and needs to be catered for.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	*Support need for 1.5ha of employment land, may not be enough though.	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.

	*Unemployment ratio in Wincanton is lower than South Somerset and national average, but a large proportion of those working travel out of Wincanton for work. To rebalance the issue Wincanton requires 6ha of employment land, not 1.5ha - based on fact that lapsed land is not available, employment land has been lost to housing and need to work more locally to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Wincanton needs jobs for local people who cannot travel. Jobs in Wincanton will support the High Street, which has been struggling.	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. It is proposed to provide 8.61ha of employment land in Wincanton over the plan period (3.61 ha existing commitments plus an addition 5 ha).	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	*Support need for 1.5ha of employment land, may not be enough though.	Support noted. See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	*Unemployment ratio in Wincanton is lower than South Somerset and national average, but a large proportion of those working travel out of Wincanton for work. To rebalance the issue Wincanton requires 6ha of employment land, not 1.5ha - based on fact that	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	* Preferred Option is much larger than the other 3 how can this meet the sustainability criteria? Land to the north/north west has narrow lanes with many cars parked on the street, traffic flow will be dangerous particularly when the hilly roads freeze. If further growth is needed it should be to the west between West Hill and the A303 interchange which will give easy access to the A303, will be close to the new Dr's surgery, new primary school and businesses.	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.

	* Propose that it is made clear that the most appropriate location for employment development would be adjacent to the existing concentration of employment uses centred on Dykes Way.	Agree. See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	*There seems to be an over provision of housing, not sufficient employment land. If it is to continue to be self contained and not a dormitory of Yeovil, requires employment land. If further housing is needed because jobs have been provided for, area to west of New Barns Farm is the best option and Moor Lane should be considered.	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	Should develop between Lawrence Hill and West Hill.	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.
	* 60% of workers do not work in the town. It should not become a suburb of Yeovil.	See responses to paras 6.108 - 6.109 above. As Paragraph 6.107 of the Draft Core Strategy explains the findings of the South Somerset Role and Function Study Final Report April 2009 identifies Wincanton as one of 9 settlements across the District which account for 77% of all job provision and therefore displays a strong employment role relative to other settlements. It has the 4th highest level of self-containment in the district and ranks highly in terms of employment density with 1.24 jobs per economically active person.	Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.

	<p>* Directing all future growth in Wincanton to the west (Option 1) is very unbalanced and will lead to an element of isolation and may lead to an increase in commuting and unsustainability. Pulling the centre of gravity of Wincanton to the west may lead to people living there being more likely to shop at the "A303 supermarkets" and then travel to more specialised shops at Castle Cary and Sherborne. More development to the east (Option 4) balancing some to the west will help the town centre aims. Any housing to the west of Wincanton would best be located primarily to the south of the New Barns Farm development currently being built and proposed in earlier plans in the area then identified.</p>	<p>The edge of Option 4 (Bayford Hill) is approx. 600m from the edge of Wincanton Town Centre Boundary and Option 1 approx. 1,750m from the edge of the boundary. Option 1 is more closely related to the supermarkets, employment opportunities, the secondary school and the sports centre which makes it a more sustainable option in terms to access to facilities. It has been suggested that the growth could be spread between Options 1 and 4 however, given the proposed shift towards increased employment provision and no additional housing growth on top of existing commitments the weight given to the ability to access the A303 effectively becomes a more pressing issue, therefore the western side of Wincanton (Option 1) seems more appropriate given its proximity to the trunk road network.</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Option 4 - Can see no way that the roads could cope with the increased traffic particularly between Wincanton and the entrance to the A303 just east of B3081. All amenities are to the west of Wincanton - so development of option 4 would result in an increase in traffic travelling across the town through the choke point that is the one way system. Once the proposed hotel and pub/restaurant development takes place the situation will get worse. The only other route will be west along the old road through Bayford. This is another choke point and there is extensive on street parking unless other parking options are provided this could be</p>	<p>Noted. Option 4 has not been identified as the preferred option for the direction of growth. The issue of highway access for employment use only has been highlighted as a reason for not locating the strategic growth in that direction.</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 Wincanton accordingly.</p>
	<p>* Concerns regarding infrastructure provision to support the growth proposed.</p>	<p>Infrastructure provision in relation to the level of strategic growth proposed as set out above (an addition 5 ha of employment land) has been considered as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Most of the infrastructure identified in the IDP at Wincanton is related to the Key Site allocation at New Barns Farm.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>* The Council should lower town centre rates for new businesses or give a rate amnesty for a period of time.</p>	<p>This is not a Core Strategy issue.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	*What is being done to attract new businesses to Wincanton?	The Economic Development Team offer advice and guidance to those looking to set up or relocate businesses to South Somerset (including Wincanton). The SSDC web site contains information regarding economic development and provides a link to the Into Somerset web pages from which you can access lists of commercial properties available within your selected location. Whilst it is recognised that it is important to attract new businesses to the District this is a matter for the Economic Development Strategy rather than the Core Strategy which will provide the policies on the scale of growth and facilitate the delivery of employment growth.	No change.
	*There is a lack of jobs in Wincanton - what is being done to attract new businesses to Wincanton?	The Economic Development Team deal with new business enquiries, they keep a property register which links to local estate agents, and have a retained business advisor who can help businesses to find premises in the location most suited to their needs. Planning Policies are designed to facilitate the provision of new and protect existing employment land.	No change.
	* More investment is needed in the town centre - it is dying.	National Planning Policy in the form of PPS4 : Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth encourages the retention of vibrant Town Centres this is also identified as an aim in the Wincanton Peoples Plan. Core Strategy retail policies aim to retain Town Centre facilities, however in the current economic climate all Town Centres are suffering.	No change.
	* The option of going south of the A303 should not be ruled out.	It has been argued that greater consideration should be given to the option of developing land south of the A303. SSDC has recently sought an informal view (in relation to a pre-application inquiry) from the Highways Agency regarding access to employment use south of the A303 and their initial view was that they could not countenance it in terms of highway safety; however they would be willing to comment further if formal plans were submitted. The highway infrastructure costs of delivering the level of employment growth proposed are likely to render the proposal unviable.	No change.

	* Wincanton does not have good rail links.	Wincanton does not have a railway station although it is located reasonably close to Castle Cary (approx 7 miles away), which has a main line railway station.	No change.
	* Town Centre car parking is a problem now - add 400-800 additional cars and it will be a nightmare.	The District Wide Car Parking Strategy Consultation Draft (2006) uses a matrix of possible demand profiles in assessing the likely surplus or deficit in car parking in Yeovil and the Market Towns. The report shows at the worst a potential deficit in car parking for Wincanton Town Centre of 57 spaces by 2016 based upon the base rate, plus planned housing development (at that time), plus national traffic growth at 1.5%. It is expected that this report will be updated in the near future. Given the proposed revised strategic approach to the delivery of growth in Wincanton the population Town Centre car parking should not be such an issue.	No change.
	* There has been a lack of information and consultation. Local people have not been properly informed of what is proposed. Should have been a mail drop to all those affected , people should not have to hear about proposals from unofficial channels. Only heard about the proposals from a neighbour. Leaflet did not provide any detailed info on proposed locations. Have no confidence in the Council - have failed to inform tax payers - would be contacted if rubbish bin was overflowing.	As part of the consultation process on the Draft Core Strategy a number of press releases were sent out, public notices were published in five different newspapers and magazines, the consultation was discussed many times on local radio stations, council staff went out into the community to raise local awareness, focus group events for harder to reach groups were held, town and parish councils were specifically involved at parish cluster meetings last year, copies of the proposals were placed in council offices and local libraries, local community parish magazines and websites were used, a YouTube video was created, and a Facebook page set up to promote the consultation. The District Council went to great lengths to inform the residents of South Somerset of the consultation process particularly by producing the summary leaflet publicising the consultation events that took place at the end of last year, and taking out a contract with Royal Mail to deliver it to every residential household in the District before the areas relevant event.	No change.

		<p>(continued) A number of residents from the Dancing Lane/Verrington area attended the consultation event held on 9 November in Wincanton Town Hall. South Somerset District Council has a population of approximately 158,000 (mid 2008 ONS estimate) within approximately 71,000 households (April 2008, Nomis), the Core Strategy effects the whole population of South Somerset and it would not be cost effective to send a personal letter to every household, however the summary leaflet was considered to be an effective compromise and indeed few other authorities in the south west have been prepared to go to these lengths. In addition to the householder leaflet the Spatial Policy Team have a database consisting of over 1000 consultees this includes individuals (who have asked to be notified of consultations or have been involved in the spatial planning process previously), statutory bodies, local community groups and employers.</p>	No change.
		<p>(continued) Each body or individual on that database was sent an email or letter in the week leading up to 8 October notifying them of the consultation. Somerset Primary Care Trust and the Dorset and Somerset Strategic Health Authority are on that database and will have received notification. Other community groups within Wincanton that are on the database and will also have been notified include: Live at Home (Wincanton), Wincanton Community Venture, Wincanton Business Together, Wincanton Races Company Ltd, King Arthur's Community School, The Balsam Centre.</p>	No change.

	<p>* Great Hatherleigh Farm will be adversely affected by development in Option 2 . Have great concerns over biodiversity. Stream has flashed flooded regularly. Have had several near misses despite installing a flood prevention scheme. Option 2 should be removed.</p>	<p>Option 2 was considered for employment use only and has not been identified as the preferred Option. The Sustainability Appraisal notes that the physical barrier of the trunk road has yet to be breached in any significant way and developing south of the A303 could change the townscape of Wincanton and could result in a Market Town divided by a strategic route. It is accepted that a small part of the shading on the eastern side of Option 2 extends into a section of land designated as Flood Zone 2. The comments regarding the historical and environmental merits of this option are noted however it is not proposed to grow Wincanton south of the A303. The highway infrastructure costs of delivering the level of employment growth proposed are likely to render the proposal unviable.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Supports the aim of para 6.114 and the rejection of Options 2 & 3 as development on the other side of the A303 would be socially and environmentally undesirable leading to the possibility of becoming difficult to access, isolated rather than an integrated settlement.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* North of Dancing Lane and west of West Hill seem to be natural floodplains - water gathers behind King Arthurs School and floods down Verrington Lane with force.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Inset Map 13 shows areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3b extending from the north to the south of Wincanton which pass through the area of Verrington Lane. Proposed revised Option 1 does not include the area around Verrington although it does include a small area within Flood Zones 2 and 3b which follows the river tributary along the edge of the existing Development Area. Despite the inclusion of this area of flood risk it is considered that this option provides the most appropriate location for the proposed employment growth given it's proximity to the A303 and relationship with the existing business park. Locating employment growth only within Option 4 is likely to have a detrimental impact on the internal highway network (HGV traffic through the town centre) and options 2 and 3 are south of the A303. The highway infrastructure costs of delivery of the level of employment growth proposed are likely to render the proposal unviable.</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS5 to deliver a minimum of 5 additional ha of 'B' use employment land in Wincanton to the south west. Amend Inset Map 13 - Wincanton accordingly.</p>

	<p>* Town centre shopping experience needs to be improved following the impact of the out of centre Morrisons store otherwise CO2 emissions will be increased by people travelling to shop.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Draft Core Strategy notes that there is a desire to enhance the environment of the Town Centre and to support and build upon existing retail provision ("Local Issues"). Draft Policy TA1 Low Carbon Travel is aimed at reducing single car occupancy, the need to travel or encouraging the use of more sustainable travel or alternative fuels where travel is necessary. This policy would be applied to any new development which in turn sound reduce the impacts of any additional growth.</p>	<p>See response to Policy TA1.</p>
	<p>* Wincanton sections should prioritise the following: attracting retail development, to regenerate the town centre. This should include provision for a maximum number of free car parking spaces so the increasing population can be encouraged to shop there. Attracting further limited commercial development within the existing town boundaries (if possible the nature would be specifically to help Wincanton residents). Because of existing commitments further housing development should not come forward in the medium term. Inset map should be amended to remove Options 1-4. Additionally planners should acknowledge that in following the strategy they will be seeking to avoid environmental impact on in-town green areas and protect the countryside. Where Greenfield sites are proposed the local community should be consulted on alternatives.</p>	<p>See comments regarding proposed housing and employment growth under paragraphs 6.110-6.115 above. The desire to support and build upon the existing retail provision and enhance the environment of the Town Centre is identified as an issue for Wincanton in paragraph 6.107 of the Draft Core Strategy. Draft Policies EP12: Retail Vitality and Viability and EP13: Protection of Retail Frontages seek to enhance Town Centres and protect retail frontages. Draft Policy EP12 states that new parking should serve the centre as a whole. The Draft Core strictly controls development in the countryside and the community has been consulted on the options for the strategic directions through this document (Draft Core Strategy (incorporating Preferred Options) October 2010).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Priority should be given to Wincanton residents when allocating affordable housing in current developments.</p>	<p>Where affordable housing is secured through a normal planning obligation it contributes towards meeting the District Wide shortfall i.e. meeting the overall need as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Once built the housing is allocated in accordance with the procedure agreed through the Choice Based Lettings scheme. Where affordable housing is provided as part of a Rural Exception Scheme those homes are expected to meet a very local need as they are built in a location where housing would normally be expected.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* Option 1 - it was understood that this land has Green Belt Status. Main concern is provision of sufficient hospital facilities.	Although development in the countryside is strictly controlled no land in South Somerset District has Green Belt status. Given the recommendation above that growth should be directed toward employment opportunities and housing growth remains as currently committed it is considered that any impact on hospital provision would be minimal.	No change.
	* Whilst Wincanton's role as a strategic location for shopping, cultural , education, health , leisure and financial service is recognised there are no specific allocation that would help to improve employment and self containment levels. Suggest amendments to Policy EP12 to allow for new edge of centre and out of centre retail development in Market Towns.	See response to Policy EP12 Retail Vitality and Viability.	See response to Policy EP12.
	Barton Willmore undertook an analysis of the retail capacity on 2008 and identified the the Council's Retail Study was very conservative in it's approach because it does not suggest improving the retention rates. These are currently very low. Barton Willmore study identified that market share of convenience goods share in Wincanton Area: Wincanton 33%, Gillingham 31% and Yeovil 15% in BW experience they would expect Wincanton to retain a higher proportion of the market. Would therefore ask why the studies undertaken do not address this issue and recommend expenditure is 'clawed back'. Comparison goods market share is very poor in Wincanton with 47% going to Yeovil (SSDC Retail Study Update 2009). Needs to be acknowledged that Wincanton Town Centre is constrained, new facilities do not have to be to the detriment of the existing Town Centre, new facilities within walking	The South Somerset Retail Study Update 2010 identifies that there is retail capacity in Wincanton over the plan period but the focus should be on the Town Centre sitting particular opportunities in the Carrington Way area.	No Change.
	* Further suitable land should be allocated at Wincanton to ensure that the strategy remains flexible. Support the aspirations identified in the Wincanton People's Plan. Consider that there is scope to improve retail offer in Out of Centre locations. Consider that the GV Grimley Retail Study Update (2010) does not give the full picture.	See response above.	No Change.

	<p>The suggested Car park sites are unrealistic. Consider that the Council needs to take a sequential approach to selecting a site for new comparison floorspace in Wincanton in accordance with PPS4. Given the dense nature of the core of the town and landscape constraints out of centre sites need to be considered as the only viable option when considering large scale retail development. Optimal location for this development would be within a corridor between the A303 junction and the town centre as this would be accessible to residents and maximise opportunities to create better linkages between existing retail development. Propose that the Tything Commercial Site Centre and the Long Close site should be considered as locations for larger scale retail uses that are too big to be accommodated in the Town Centre (should be subject to the suggested amendments to Policy EP12).</p>	<p>See response to Policy EP12 Retail Vitality and Viability re sequential approach. The South Somerset Retail Study Update (2010) looks at both the Carrington Way and Memorial Hall car parks and recognises that opportunities are limited on the memorial Hall site but Carrington Way and its surrounding uses offer more opportunities although the function of the car park would need to be considered.</p>	<p>No change. See response to Policy EP12.</p>
	<p>* Consider that the Tythings Commercial Centre offers an opportunity for brownfield redevelopment for a mix of uses including housing, retail, employment and potentially community facilities. Considered to be the only opportunity for providing a small scale retail park within walking distance of the Town Centre. Consider that redevelopment will contribute to making Wincanton a more attractive shopping destination. Could provide an improved gateway to Wincanton and could provide a mix of uses supported by PPS4. Proposal has been supported in pre-application letter dated 28/10/08. Site should be allocated.</p>	<p>The Tythings lies within the Development Area of Wincanton, therefore the principle of development is accepted. PPS4 advocates a Town Centre first approach for retail development and saved SSLP Policy ME6 seeks to prevent the loss of employment land. This is a matter that can be dealt with through the Development Management process and is not of a strategic nature that would warrant allocation within the Core Strategy. The South Somerset Retail Study Update (2010) identifies that there are retail opportunities within the existing Town Centre therefore these should be developed first.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>* Land at Long Close should be allocated for mixed uses including retail.</p>	<p>Long Close is in within the Development Area for Wincanton. As noted above PPS4 advocates a Town Centre first approach to retail development. This is a matter that can be dealt with through the Development Management process and is not of a strategic nature that would warrant allocation within the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	* How is retail provision to be improved when most of the appropriate land has been lost to residential development?	The Draft Core Strategy retail Policies seek to retain and encourage retail uses within existing Town Centres and Draft Policy EP3 seeks to retain employment land for commercial use before it is lost to housing. In the past Wincanton has lost employment land to housing however it is hoped that this will happen less in the future due to improved monitoring and evidence gathering systems being in place. The South Somerset Retail Study Update (2010) identifies that there are retail opportunities within the existing Town Centre therefore these should be developed first.	No change.
	* What is SUDS?	SUDS stands for Sustainable Drainage Systems. This can be added to the Glossary.	Add SUDS to Core Strategy Glossary.
	* Wincanton's infrastructure is overloaded, no train service, meagre bus service and routes within the town are congested. There is little scope for improvement.	Given the proposal to reduce the level of housing growth in Wincanton and opt instead for strategic employment growth the impact on local infrastructure should be reduced particularly as the preferred direction for that growth is to the west close to the access to the A303. The IDP does not identify the need for any additional transport infrastructure .	No change.
	* Wincanton has a lack of car parking spaces for residents to park in the town centre. There are not enough car parking spaces in the supermarkets.	The District-Wide Car Parking Strategy (2006) indicates a projected deficit in car Parking in Wincanton Town Centre by 2011and increasing by 2016. This document is likely to be reviewed in the near future. However, the Core Strategy is not the document in which to allocate additional land for car parking. The car parking standards for new development to be set in the Core Strategy (Policy TA4) will be consistent with the Somerset Countywide Parking Strategy and encourage more sustainable travel choices.	No change.
	* Support options 2, 3 & 4 as they have good access to the A303.	Support noted, however Option 1 was the preferred Option. It is now proposed that a much smaller area is identified for Strategic Employment Growth (5 ha) in the south west of Wincanton.	See recommendations above re: strategic housing and employment growth.
	*Support the classification of Wincanton as a Market Town, recognising it serves the needs of the eastern end of the District and its hinter-land.	Support noted.	No change.

	*To support Wincanton's Town centre, free parking should be maintained. LOTS supported if car parking provided.	Consideration of car parking charges is an issue for the District-wide Car Parking Strategy the current document was produced in 2006 and is likely to be reviewed in the near future.	No change.
	*If development were to go ahead, previous history of underprovision of affordable housing should not be repeated.	The revised strategic approach to the delivery of growth makes this comments less relevant however, it is agreed that when growth does take place the provision of affordable housing should be maximised in accordance with Draft Policy HG4.	No change.
	*Wincanton does not need additional retail land, it needs to improve existing quality.	Agreed. The South Somerset Retail Study Update (2009) indicates that there is capacity for convenience retailing in Wincanton Town Centre and recommends focussing on the existing Town Centre.	No change.
	*Wincanton needs employment land, retailing and other services such as a school (promised with Key site, but not delivered) and health centre before any more housing - it will over-stretch the community services.	A new primary school is still expected to be delivered as part of the Wincanton Key Site development and outline planning consent for such a use has been granted. Planning permission has also been granted for a new medical centre in Wincanton. The proposed amended strategic approach to the delivery of growth in Wincanton means that the Core Strategy is proposing no more additional housing on top of existing commitments.	See recommendations above re: strategic housing and employment growth.
	*Wincanton needs more car parking spaces and to tackle issue of on-street parking.	The District-Wide Car Parking Strategy (2006) indicates a projected deficit in car Parking in Wincanton Town Centre by 2011and increasing by 2016. This document is likely to be reviewed in the near future. However, the Core Strategy is not the document in which to allocate additional land for car parking. The car parking standards for new development to be set in the Core Strategy (Policy TA4) will be consistent with the Somerset Countywide Parking Strategy and encourage more sustainable travel choices	No change.
	*Environment Agency note that surface water drainage will need to be considered in the preferred site.	Agreed and noted. This will be done as part of the Development Management process.	No change.

	<p>*Option 2 land includes the northern eastern sector of the Royal Medieval Deer Park of Hatherleigh. Development would destroy the integrity of the deer park. The mature trees and dense vegetation which run down the boundary banks on the eastern side of the option are separately listed. Also Option 2 forms part of the original Wincanton Race Course, which is also listed. A valued veteran oak grows in the north east corner and trees, protected from grazing, have been planted to recreate the original pasture. Pools in landscaped garden of Moonrakers are rich in wildlife. Other reasons for not developing Option 2 - Hatherleigh is farmed efficiently using traditional methods to high environmental standards, positive conservation is implemented, loss of pasture land would damage a well-run productive farm which has been supporting 3</p>	<p>Comments are noted, however Option 2 is not the preferred direction for growth for Wincanton. See response above regarding revised approach to strategic growth.</p>	<p>See recommendations above re: strategic housing and employment growth.</p>
	<p>*The High Street needs to be supported and incentives put in place to encourage the provision of community needs.</p>	<p>Core Strategy policies and national guidance support the retention of vital and vibrant Town Centres. Incentives are not a Core Strategy Issue.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
Rural Centres - Visions and Proposals			
Rural Centres - Visions and Proposals (paras 7.1 - 7.2)	<p>* Support the self containment of settlements but concerned about impact on Strategic Road Network.</p>	<p>Noted. The Highways Agency and Somerset County Council are the bodies responsible for the strategic road network, they would raise concerns regarding impact of development on that network via Development Management consultations.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
Bruton			
Bruton (paras 7.3 - 7.7)	<p>* Support the list of issues identified.</p>	<p>Support Noted.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* The landscape to the south of the town is important and so should be protected from development.</p>	<p>The Peripheral Landscape Study for Bruton (June 2008) identifies that land to the south of the town has very little capacity to accommodate built form, with the majority of land being shaded blue and green (moderate - low, low capacity).</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>*Environment Agency note that development in flood risk areas must be avoided.</p>	<p>Accepted. The Environment Agency are reviewing the Flood Zone in Bruton by doing further modelling.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
	<p>* Agree that a new enlarged surgery is required. Doctor's is short of space, needs a new building with adequate car parking space - needs highlighting. * Hope to see integration of an enlarged surgery with parking provision to ensure the economic welfare of the town.</p>	<p>Noted, the need for a surgery is already highlighted in the Core Strategy in paragraph 7.6.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

	*Para 7.5 - Parking problems need to be addressed - particularly for those visiting the church and when there are events at the four schools. The potential of the church as a location for musical and cultural events is being affected. Parking is the top issue for the town.	This is not a Core Strategy matter. The District-wide Car Parking Strategy (2007) has an action to identify additional car parking capacity in Bruton, and this is an on-going matter, with officers actively seeking additional sites.	No Change.
	*If Sexey's school wish to expand further, they should be asked to compose a Travel Plan.	The requirement to undertake a Travel Plan will depend on the scale of the new development. Policy TA2: Travel Plans identifies development thresholds, but does not currently apply to uses other than A1, B1, B8 & C3. In line with the County Council policy approach, this needs to be revised to apply to all forms of development and Use Classes (above a certain development threshold) other than the ones currently listed in Policy TA2.	Amend Policy TA2 to be applicable to all forms of development and Use Classes above a certain development threshold, other than the ones currently listed.
	* Tourism opportunities are being hampered by the road system.	Noted.	No Change.
	*Bruton and Pitcombe should remain separate entities, their boundaries should not be blurred.	Agree with response, it is not envisaged that development will blur the boundaries between the two settlements.	No Change.
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.8 - 7.10)	* Is 1 ha of employment land sufficient for Bruton, and can this be delivered through the development management process?	The land requirements for B-uses in Rural Centres has been revised, and a minimum viability site size has been identified in consultation with Economic Development Officers. In the Rural Centres the site size is considered to be 2 hectares. It is felt that this will give some scope for development to kick start employment growth. The delivery of employment land is acknowledged as an issue, but this is a matter for the Economic Development Strategy rather than the Core Strategy which will provide the policies on the scale of growth and facilitate the delivery of employment growth. The marketing and development premises and locations will need to be undertaken by the Economic Development department, Into Somerset and Area Development teams.	Amend Policy SS5 to reflect the higher employment provision for Bruton.
	*Concerned about additional residential development given the lack of community infrastructure (education, leisure, banking, youth facilities) - without addressing this, the community will become less sustainable.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has indicated the need for some additional health and leisure infrastructure for Bruton at this stage.	No Change.

	*Further development in Bruton needs to address road, pavement and parking issues firstly.	Somerset County Council, as the Highways Authority is responsible for highways infrastructure and funds transport schemes, they will be consulted on any planning applications for development submitted to the District Council, if there are highways issues, the County Council will require that they be resolved.	No Change.
	* Wish to see Hewden site retained for parking and job creation, as well as surgery space.	Noted, the need for a surgery is already highlighted in the Core Strategy in paragraph 7.6, and car-parking in paragraph 7.7.	No Change.
	* Propose allocation of two fields belonging to County Council, between Frome Road and the Batcombe Road, together with a adjoining field (instead of expansion to the east). Not to cover with housing, but instead allotments, landscaping, flood mitigation, integration of an enlarged surgery with parking provision. This could protect the landscape, quality of life and reduce the impact of traffic on the environment.	The Core Strategy will not be allocating land for development other than Strategic allocations that are vital to the delivery of the Core Strategy. These will be matters for Development Management to consider.	No Change.
	* Implies growth beyond current Development Area but acceptance of growth is not made explicit and no indication as to where - need to extend the town in a sustainable manner.	Noted. The Rural Centres have no direction of growth indicated, the Development Management process will be responsible for delivering sustainable developments which are in the right location.	No Change.
Ilchester			
Ilchester (paras 7.11 - 7.19)	*Agree that Ilchester has a strong employment function and good range of retail and community facilities.	Noted.	No Change.
	*The document's priority appears to be the restriction of development due to noise contours - whilst the noise contours may be reduced, the flood risk will not - there is a significant flood risk to Ilchester from River Yeo and Parrett. Amend document.	Noted, paragraph 7.12 discusses the flood risk in Ilchester and how it is a constraint to growth. Paragraphs 7.21 - 7.23 need to be revised in light of the revised noise contours and this will give a balanced impression of the constraints to development in the settlement.	Amend wording to paragraphs 7.21-7.23 in light of revised noise contours and outcome of Strategic Defence Review. Include Map of revised noise contours.
	*The revised noise contours should allow additional development - Hainbury Farm is appropriate for both residential and employment land.	It appears from the revised noise contour map that Hainbury Farm falls into Noise Category B which would mean that noise mitigation measures may make development acceptable. Any proposals would be a matter for Development Management to consider.	No Change.

	* MOD would like text added to note that they have an anticipated requirement for up to 180 houses to accommodate service personnel and their families within a 10 mile radius of RNAS that will be acquired on the open market (suggested additional text provided).	There is no need to include additional text relating to market housing for MOD families.	No Change.
	* MOD supports statements in paras 7.14-7.18 and would like further text added to refer to the revised noise contours. Their position is that they cannot guarantee the type, number and frequency of aircraft movements now or in the future.	Noted, revise paragraphs 7.21 - 7.23 to illustrate how the new contours (July 2010) will be used to guide planning decisions - aiming to minimise adverse impact of noise without placing unreasonable restrictions on development or adding unduly to the costs and administrative burdens of business. Include text regarding MOD position and also note that new buildings will need to be built to the highest noise insulation standards.	Amend wording to paragraphs 7.21-7.23 in light of revised noise contours and add text to clarify MOD position and noise insulation requirements of new buildings. Include Map of revised noise contours in Appendix.
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.20 - 7.25)	*Support the scale and level of growth for Ilchester , especially located within the urban frame as this will reduce the need to travel and support the existing services and facilities in the town centre.	Support Noted.	No Change.
	*Fully support the level of growth and the location (Tarranto Hill) .	Support Noted.	No Change.
	*The Parish Council does not support this level of growth, yet it is suggested that they do.	At the Town and Parish Council Cluster workshops there was a mixed response to the level of growth. The Parish Council have not formally responded to the Core Strategy, therefore this claim is not substantiated.	No Change.
	*Ilchester needs more car parking spaces, additional development will exacerbate existing problem.	This is not a Core Strategy matter. The District-wide Car Parking Strategy (2007) did not consider car parking issues in Ilchester as it was not designated a rural centre in the Local Plan. The inclusion of Ilchester in any forthcoming review of the DWPS (likely 2012) would be dependent on redesignation of the settlement as a rural centre.	No Change.
	*Suggested a site for development - Car Sales site to the south of Northover House near centre of town (details supplied).	The Core Strategy will not be allocating land for development other than Strategic allocations that are vital to the delivery of the Core Strategy.	No Change.

	*If development does occur, a new road is required linking directly to Podimore roundabout and or the Yeovilton Road, the old Fosseyway will be too congested.	Somerset County Council, as the Highways Authority is responsible for highways infrastructure and funds transport schemes, they have not made any comments suggesting that the proposed scale of growth requires such a road or that the old Fosseyway would be too congested.	No Change.
	*Additional development to the north will split the community further, and concerned that some shops and services would relocate to the north, killing off the existing centre.	There is no indication of the direction of growth in the Core Strategy. The Development Management process will decide whether a development is sustainable and appropriate.	No Change.
Langport/Huish Episcopi			
Langport/Huish Episcopi (paras 7.26- 7.32)	* Environment Agency object to para 7.27 - the flood risk arises from the River Parrett and its tributaries not the Somerset Levels and Moors, they are part of the floodable area not the source of flood risk.	Noted.	Make suggested amendment.
	*The Parish Council does not support this level of growth, yet it is suggested that they do.	The Core Strategy states the Town/Parish Councils indicated a desire for locally needed development, and does not suggest that they supported the level of growth.	No change.
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.33 - 7.36)	* Environment Agency support the displacement of housing numbers to areas in low risk such as Somerton.	Support noted, but there is potential to bring forward development sites at Langport/Huish Episcopi outside areas of high flood risk.	No change.
	* Support - Langport needs the level of housing proposed in order for the Town Centre to continue to provide local facilities - should not lose commercial land to do this. Maybe it would make sense to put the future job needs of Langport and Somerton together and develop a 2.5 hectare high quality business park.	Support for development noted. Although Langport/Huish Episcopi and Somerton are near each other, they are separate settlements with their own need for employment land.	No change.
	* Any development in Langport may be subject to a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment for potential impacts on the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA/Ramsar sites. Text should be amended	Noted.	Amend Core Strategy supporting text to refer to Habitats Regulation Assessment.
	* There is a need to maintain and extend current transport services at Langport, including considering: a railway station; water transport opportunities particularly on the River Parrett and Yeo; use of pool cars/car sharing schemes and affordable community bus service; secure and covered cycle racks; and developing cycle routes in the area.	Sustainable transport modes will be encouraged in general, although it is unlikely that a railway station and water transport will be delivered due to cost.	No change.

	* Need local affordable homes.	Support for affordable homes noted - draft Core Strategy Policy HG4 seeks 35% of new homes to be affordable.	No change.
	* The limited potential for additional development due to flood risk should mean the following are considered: floating house boats on the River Parrett and Yeo; using stilts on the floodplain; renovate existing buildings e.g. Hurds Hill, Downside; co-housing; encourage self-building; modular and extendable homes; no change to shop fronts which would remove separate access to flats above shops; consider impact of new homes on existing sewage works and infrastructure.	The sequential test directs development away from areas of medium-high flood risk. Climate change adaptation measures are encouraged in draft Policy EQ1, including flood resilience measures in the design of new development.	No change.
	* Need to utilise the unique character of the Langport area, in particular: make best use of walking, cycling and rivers; encourage arts and crafts; develop rural skills; develop market gardening opportunities; promote environmental tourism; diversification of land for agriculture, smallholders and allotments, and production of foods, orchards etc; balance types of shops encouraging independents rather than multi-nationals; encourage home working through improved broadband speed and other communications; develop a community hub to promote activities within the town and	These are laudable principles, many of which are supported in the Core Strategy. However, it is not possible for planning decisions to specify shop tenants.	No change.
	* Make grants available for PV and solar panels; lift restrictions on renewable energy installations on listed buildings and buildings on conservation areas; consider feasibility of community scale wind turbines, Anaerobic Digester, bio-gas production, district heating scheme in local area.	Grants are not within the remit of the Core Strategy but reference to Feed in Tariffs may be useful. The restrictions on renewable energy installations are set out nationally in the General Permitted Development Order. Low carbon energy generation is encouraged in Policy EQ1.	Refer to Feed in Tariffs, and expand upon the potential for specific technologies in explanatory text to EQ1.
	* Safe, inclusive, sustainable communities: ensure adequate health services; promote healthy lifestyles; promote community areas for family activities, e.g. within the town garden and on Cockle Moor; consider "low carbon death".	These principles (excluding "low carbon death") are all supported in national and local policy.	No change.

	* Propose a 5 acre site which is ideal for affordable housing for local people on the edge of town adjoining a 1960's development within easy walking distance of Westover Trading Estate and the shops and facilities in town, outside flood plain, not prime agricultural land, and good road access.	Support for this site is noted, but the wider area in this vicinity has several constraints e.g. lack of evidence of further land availability to enable 'strategic' growth, low landscape capacity, historic assets. Location of potential direction of growth put forward and justified in paper presented to Project Management Board in 'Direction of Growth for Langport/Huish Episcopi' paper.	Consider area to the west for Langport/Huish Episcopi's 'strategic' growth, but do not make the preferred direction for growth for the reasons given. Areas to the north east, east and south east are preferred.
	* Don't include any warehousing as part of employment proposals as that would aggravate an already chaotic traffic situation.	The provision of 3 ha of 'B' use employment land is proposed for Langport/Huish Episcopi, but is flexible as to whether this incorporates offices, general industry or warehousing. The impact on the road network will be considered in greater detail as proposals come forward.	Propose 3 ha of 'B' use employment land at Langport/Huish Episcopi.
Martock			
Martock (paras 7.37- 7.41)	* Includes the adjoining settlement of Bower Hinton so amend to Martock/Bower Hinton.	Noted - to be amended	Change to Martock/Bower Hinton
	Martock Business Park should be Martock Industrial Estate	Noted	Correct name to be inserted
	Development Management approach - please explain what this is	All material considerations which are applied when dealing with the planning application process -	Add to glossary
	*Suggested line of communication - please publish other documentation on "Martock on Line".	Additional potential method of consultation is noted.	No change
	*Martock should be referred to as a Rural Centre in line with SS1.	Noted	No change.
	*Martock does not have a good variety of services and facilities, at best it can be described as average to poor. Why should everyone live and work from home or in the village they live in - if they did, no one would need to travel to Yeovil. Disagree that additional houses will generate the services and facilities quoted, it will not.	The vision for Martock aims to allow the opportunity for those people who may wish to live and work in the same place not to have to commute rather than restricting those who wish to travel from doing so. With any development there are additional people who increase the economic viability of an area and could help to support facilities and services. The South Somerset Settlement hierarchy workshop discussion paper March 2011 - Rural Service Provision Paper did not support the provision of new housing retaining services, but this applies largely to smaller villages, not Rural Centres or Market Towns.	No change

	*Self containment is an issue for Martock, but disagree that providing more employment land could potentially reduce out commuting, more needs to be done to utilise fully the existing employment land before identifying new.	Planning policy can aim to encourage and facilitate delivery of development to meet the aims and objectives of the vision. Previous non delivery of allocated sites, highlight that individual sites do not always come forward	No change
	*No evidence that provision of additional housing will help retain existing local facilities and services	discussion paper March 2011 - Rural Service Provision Paper did not support new housing as a means of	No change
	*Environment Agency observe that development in flood risk areas must be avoided.	Noted	No change
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.42 - 7.44)	*Fully support additional growth, have many friends who are unable to afford to buy a house, so more housing should reduce prices. Should have opportunities for people other than large house builders to build houses. Support more homes, brownfield first, Greenfield last resort, higher density as it will drive prices down and more employment land.	Noted	No change
	* Agree with growth proposed but can serious consideration be given to making Stoke Road the 'B' road, and not the road through Bower Hinton.	This is an issue for the Somerset County Highways Department to consider and not in the control of South Somerset District Council.	No change
	* Martock is the largest of the Rural Centres by some distance and distribution of development in SS4 allocates a disproportionately small amount of residential development to the settlement - Martock should accommodate 634 dwellings.	The level of growth proposed is in line with the settlement hierarchy for the patterns of growth for the whole of South Somerset. Promoting a higher level of growth for Martock would be disproportionate to the level of employment.	No change
	*Additional 150 houses are not needed, more should be done to bring forward the saved Local Plan allocation ME/MART/2, Land West of Ringwell Hill.	The level of the proposed growth is to ensure Martock maintains its status within the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan allocation is for employment growth. This land although allocated is in the control of the landowner and although South Somerset aims to enable and facilitate development proposals, it is not able to bring development forward directly.	No change
	*If Ringwell Hill and Sparrows' corner are allocated for development where are the services and facilities for these developments and what road infrastructure will be in place?	These are saved Local Plan allocation sites. The level of infrastructure required by development of these sites will be assessed and provided through the planning application process.	No change
	*Martock only has a small Co-op, the Core Strategy should be supportive of additional food shopping	Noted	No change
	* Site submitted for residential development at Gastons Lane, able to accommodate 14 dwellings. See map, Accessibility Assessment and Tree Survey.	Noted. The Core Strategy is able delivering strategic growth and is not allocating individual sites	No change

	*Object to provision of 1 hectare of employment land, no evidence it is needed.	The level of proposed growth within the Core Strategy is informed by the South Somerset Role and Function Study 2009, and the Employment Land Review which forms part of our evidence base. The need for 2 hectares of employment land has been identified for each Rural Centre as it is anticipated that this is a sustainable and viable amount of land to encourage the developers to invest and bring forward the site.	Update data to refer to latest employment land table in Policy SS5.
	*Agree that there is no specific need for additional employment land in quantitative terms and that the 50 person special care facility will employ staff and so should be considered as employment.	Employment in lines with Government definition has traditionally been viewed with the use classes B1, B2 and B8 (light industrial/office, industrial and storage). However this has more recently been reviewed and it is acknowledged that this does not reflect the wealth of employment provided by other services and facilities.	Noted
	* There is a lack of assisted living/elderly persons care homes within close proximity to the centre of Martock. This is required to enable the elderly to remain in the community - Martock would benefit from a scheme similar to the Archstone project in Sherborne.	It is proposed to introduce a new policy to support the provision of specialist care for older people although this will not be specific to Martock	See new policy on Provision of housing for Older People
	* Would like to see cycling opportunities improved in Martock with a view to linking to Yeovil; several sites could be considered, including the old railway line and Stoke Road.	Policies within the Transport Chapter reflect aspiration for modal shift (alternative forms of transport). It is also hoped that more can be done to promote cycle routes through the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted
	*Concerned that the flexibility will enable Greenfield sites to come forward before brownfield sites and past land that is currently idle - should push land that already has planning permission.	Policy HG3 identifies the aim of South Somerset to provide a minimum of 30% of development on previously developed land, which will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.	No change

	Making the Most of Martock Community Partnership conducted a Local Community Survey, SSDC are invited to analyse these results	The survey looked at a range of issues including housing, facilities, crime/anti social behaviour and employment. Some of the recommendations made were; Younger people need more opportunities to stay in the village; More effort into getting empty trading units into action; Develop a business strategy for Martock to attract shops/facilities. It is noted that many of the objectives are in line with the aims of the Core Strategy. The only variance would be is that over 75% of the people said there should be no more housing, although this is contradicted by the recommendation to provide young people with the opportunity to stay in the village.	No change
	*Need to be clear what will be permitted on the Saved Ringwell Hill allocation and need jargon in the paragraph explained more clearly - main spine road (identity the road), self containment (what is it and how will you achieve it?), Development Management approach (please explain the approach).	The Ringwell Hill allocation was for employment land. There is only one main road that runs through Martock and Bower Hinton, the B3165 (Church Street, Water Street and Hurst). Self containment aims to provide the opportunity to both live and work in the same area with access to facilities and services to meet the needs of the community. A development management approach is where the suitability of development is assessed through the planning application process.	No change but add 'Development Management' to glossary
	* Note that reference to housing on the Ringwell Hill site was deleted during the consultation, with amended text stating site was for employment land only.	Noted	No change
Milborne Port			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?	*Environment Agency note that there are delineated groundwater source protection zones in the vicinity of Milborne Port, and depending on the location and nature of development, these zones may constrain development - add reference to zones in section.	Noted. It is agreed that it might be beneficial to add a sentence making reference to the groundwater protection zone to the north of Milborne Port. Saved SSLP Policy EU7 deals with this issue, as does national guidance.	Amend supporting text to refer to the delineated groundwater source protection zone to the north of Milborne Port.

What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.50 - 7.53)	* Milborne Port Parish Council is happy with the general statements issued and is pleased that comments made during consultation process have been take on board. Would like to draw attention to proposals map which shows land being developed by Belway Homes as a No Development Area.	Noted. It is agreed that for clarity and as a result of planning consent 06/00952/FUL the "No Development Area" at The Tannery and Old Gas works, Higher Kingsbury , Milborne Port should be amended to reflect the boundary of that development.	Amend Inset Map 9 Milborne Port to show a revised "No Development Area" at The Tannery and Old Gas works, Higher Kingsbury reflecting the impact of planning permission 06/00952/FUL.
	* Whilst the Core Strategy refers to more housing, shops and employment there is no reference to the additional problems associated with increased traffic and parking. Already serious problems with parking on footpaths, blocking access to houses - causing great difficulty for access by local residents and emergency	The impact of future development on the highways network in Milborne Port will be assessed as part of the Development Management process when any planning application is received. The Highways Authority (SCC) has not objected to the level of growth proposed for Milborne Port.	No change.
South Petherton			
South Petherton (paras 7.54- 7.57)	* Supportive of the Core Strategy as outlined at the exhibition at the Blake Hall. Measures to support local business and commerce were particularly noteworthy. The consultation was appreciated.	Noted	No change
	* 2006 Parish Plan included a 'Home Delivery Service' to benefit local shops and the need to maintain the health centre. Neither has been fulfilled, seek Core Strategy to support these ambitions.	This is a matter for individual retailers to bring forward and not applicable for inclusion in the Core Strategy.	No change
	*Environment Agency note that risk of surface water flooding is not mentioned, yet it seems to be an issue for the town.	In the consultation document the strategic growth for South Petherton had already been considered and approved in line with the Environment Agencies guidelines. Further consideration of the growth level for South Petherton suggest opportunities for additional growth should be provided. Consideration for surface water mitigation could be considered within proposals for this growth.	No change
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.58 - 7.62)	* Great congestion in village centre which may dissuade people from shopping in the village. Also heavy traffic along Lightgate Road where pavement is lacking in places, and at junction of Lightgate Road/Roundwell Street which is likely to get worse when the new doctor's surgery is built.	Noted	No change

	* Propose a bus route across the northern/Martock side of the village, between Martock and South Petherton centre.	Bus routes are operated by individual bus companies and this is too specific for a strategic document. This may be something the Parish Council may wish to put forward to the local operator.	No change
	* Bus service to Yeovil for work is extremely limited: Nippy bus is unreliable, bus stops too far away from other village I.e. Over Stratton, no service on Sundays or evenings. This makes its difficult to attend further education at Yeovil College, limits young people and forces people to use a car.	Any further development would need to be consistent with our transport policies. See above	No change
	* Parking is insufficient in South Petherton, particularly at weekends.	Provision of off street parking in conjunction with new development will be need to be consistent with our transport policies. On street parking lies outside of the control of the Core Strategy	No Change.
	*Addressing the poor internal road structure should be part of the CS, and it should not be the reason for no development until 2026. Suggest that Bridge Way is opened to South Petherton exiting traffic only. Earth banking either side of the A303 should be removed and a joining road section be put down beside the A303 to allow safe joining (i.e. Ash/A303 joining). This will then permit South Petherton exiting traffic to use Bridge Way and reduce traffic passing right next to alongside the South Petherton, Hayes End School.	Alterations to the A303 would be governed by the Highway Agency and cannot be covered within the context of the Core Strategy. Contributions for road improvements can be secured through legal agreements relating to development, however it is unlikely that the level of growth proposed for South Petherton would be sufficient to enable these suggestions to come forward. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not currently identified that any new road improvements required.	No change

	<p>* Object to no additional housing. Should have additional growth commensurate with its function as a Rural Centre. Paragraph 7.59 refers to the proximity to the Hayes End junction on the A303 and the impact of additional development on that junction. Consider that suitable new housing land exists either side of the existing Local Plan allocation HG/SOPE/1 on the eastern side of Hayes End which has an extant planning permission for 29 houses. This land has been identified as suitable affordable and viable in the SHLAA (N/SOPE/001, 002 & 004) and should be developed. Technical Note by Hydrock Byways and Highways (Nov 2010) supplied in support of additional housing land. Technical Note concludes that there is no impediment to the future development of the land for about 25 dwellings in terms of its impact on the capacity of the A303 roundabout or the surrounding local highway network - this should help sustain South Petherton until</p>	<p>There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher provision is now recommended to better reflect South Petherton's Rural Centre status and by way of acceptance of arguments that potential sites are likely to be available and developable without detriment to the town.</p>	<p>See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.</p>
	<p>* Orchard site , 25 Hayes End should be identified for development (SHLAA ref: SOPE/0004). Land is suitable, available and viable. This land and adjoining sites (SPOE/0001 & SOPE/0002) would provide a development opportunity. Site is within walking distance of village facilities and well located to the school, public transport and main arterial route therefore will appeal to those from all aspects of life. Development will attract new residents to the village. SOPE/0003 is already identified for development so this site will provide an 'infill' area for housing development. The peripheral nature of the land will provide housing well outside village's limiting road network - a unique opportunity.</p>	<p>There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher provision is now recommended to better reflect South Petherton's Rural Centre status and by way of acceptance of arguments that potential sites are likely to be available and developable without detriment to the town.</p>	<p>See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.</p>
	<p>*Support the scale of growth.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>* Much development has taken place over the last 5 years and the local school is oversubscribed.</p>	<p>The IDP does not indicate the need for additional education provision at present time</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>* South Petherton needs more housing, so that local families can buy a reasonably priced house and improve the community.</p>	<p>There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher housing provision is recommended meaning that the town's housing growth levels will be better able to accommodate local housing demands.</p>	<p>See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.</p>

	*There will not be enough open market houses to satisfy the needs of the existing population, yet alone fulfil its role in the future as a Rural Centre.	There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher housing provision is recommended meaning that the town's housing growth levels will be better able to accommodate local housing demands.	See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.
	*The village needs growth to support the existing shops and services.	There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher housing provision is recommended meaning that the town's housing growth levels will be better able to accommodate local housing demands.	See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.
	* Given the recent major population increase with the extension of St Michael's Gardens, any further development should be in small increments to allow assimilation of new residents.	There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher housing provision is recommended meaning that the town's housing growth levels will be better able to accommodate local housing demands.	See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.
	* Current proposals suggest a virtual stagnation of this vibrant village. Any form of sluggish regeneration is not favourable. Should have a degree of growth to ensure the future of South Petherton for residents.	There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher housing provision is recommended meaning that the town's housing growth levels will be better able to accommodate local housing demands.	See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha.
	* Too much info on South Somerset and not enough on South Petherton. Village should not grow any more than existing commitments as infrastructure can only just cope.	The Core Strategy is a strategic document setting the framework for South Somerset until 2028 and what that means for its settlements. Further detailed neighbourhood plans for South Petherton could be proposed and brought forward separately. The level of infrastructure provision and capabilities has been assessed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and identified that, at present, additional leisure and open space provision will be required and a replacement surgery.	No change

	<p>* Have failed to recognise the issue of future development. Not realistic to suggest that South Petherton will have no development to 2026 apart from existing commitments. Not a credible assumption that South Petherton's population will grow by only 300 in a 20 yr period historically population growth has been significantly higher. If projections are credible South Petherton population growth should be almost double what is being suggested. SSDC needs to be honest about things and put forward an estimated figure for 2009-2026. Will have impact on the ability for young people to</p>	<p>There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. A higher housing provision is recommended meaning that the town's housing growth levels will be better able to accommodate local housing demands.</p>	<p>See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha</p>
	<p>Consider that it has been demonstrated that highways issues are not a problem. Core Strategy should allow scope for approx 30 dwellings.</p>	<p>There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres. Credible evidence presented on one prospective site adjacent to the settlement that access issues are not insurmountable.</p>	<p>See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha</p>
	<p>* Details of all 145 dwellings already allocated are needed. All homes should have the car parking that is needed - young people have a desire to travel independently. Need for houses is questionable as employment opportunities are limited, cannot guarantee that people living in South Petherton will work in Lopen. All developers should contribute to amenities before work is commenced. Change of use policy should be more flexible if retail use discontinues more thought should be given to the economics and viability of those premises. Who is going to pay for an integrated</p>	<p>The 145 homes identified are not allocations but are either already completed or have planning permission approved. An additional 2 hectares of employment land provision has been identified for South Petherton. Contributions to transport infrastructure can be negotiated through legal agreement and through CIL contributions. Planning obligations and CIL policies will address contributions to amenities.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>*Paras 7.60-7.62 need to be redrafted as they are not clear that the Lopen Head Nursery is the employment land for South Petherton. Needs to be clear also that Lopen Head will not need an additional 1 hectare of land. Need to clarify term 'main employment centre' in para 7.60 in relation to Lopen Head.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Reference should be made to the existing supply of employment land at Lopen Head contributing to the provision for South Petherton.</p>
	<p>* Areas I and ii on figure 5 of landscape study should be developed, particularly at the back of Pitway. It makes sense to improve access in the area where the new hospital facilities will be to link it to the main village.</p>	<p>There has been further consideration on the proposed level of growth for South Petherton over the next 15 years, however no allocations or directions of growth are being proposed for Rural Centres.</p>	<p>See change in growth section. South Petherton growth to be raised to 245 dwellings to 2028 and employment land to 3.8 ha</p>

	*Environment Agency note that there are delineated groundwater source protection zones in the vicinity of South Petherton, and depending on the location and nature of development, these zones may constrain development - add reference to zones in section.	Noted	make relevant changes to text to cross refer
Stoke sub Hamdon			
Stoke sub Hamdon (paras 7.63 - 7.65)	* Post Office has now closed and is due to re-open in a different location but only on a part-time basis. There are only 2 shops which would class as mini supermarkets. There are 3 pubs and a working men's club. The closure of most of the local shops has resulted in more traffic on the roads - driving to Yeovil or Crewkerne. No regular bus service.	Comments noted. Stoke sub Hamdon has an identified retail and community role with the newly re-opened Post Office, supermarkets, primary and secondary schools and medical/dental surgeries. It is therefore considered appropriate for identification as a Rural Centre and to have housing and employment growth.	No change
What will the Core Strategy Deliver?			
What will the Core Strategy Deliver? (paras 7.66 - 7.69)	* Is it possible that some houses will be built outside the Development Area? When will the proposed location for new homes be identified?	It is unlikely that the current Local Plan development area will accommodate all proposed dwellings so some development may take place outside. Any site put forward will be considered on its' individual merits and against current planning policy and through the Development Management process.	No change
	* There is a need for affordable housing to meet the needs of younger village residents.	Comments noted. The provision of affordable housing is dealt with in Chapter 8, Housing: Policy HG4 and a 35% provision is sought on sites over 5 dwellings. Additionally, Policy HG5 considers the range of housing types, tenures and sizes to be provided.	No change
	* How will you ensure that adequate affordable housing is provided? What will happen if developers seek to bring forward lots of small parcels of land with less than 6 dwellings?	Comments noted. The provision of affordable housing is dealt with in Chapter 8, Housing: Policy HG4. Policy SS7, Planning Obligations, in Chapter 4 seeks to secure a range of house types and community infrastructure from developers. An amendment to Policy HG4 seeks commuted sums on sites of 1-5 dwellings, equivalent to 5% on-site affordable housing provision in Yeovil and 10% in Rural Centres and Rural Settlements in addition to the standard CIL charge. Policy HG4 is also proposed to have a site area alternative threshold of 0.2 ha subject to the outcome of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	See amendments to Policy HG4 in Chapter 8: Housing

	* Seems to be a disjoint between population growth and homes to be built. Only planning for 55 homes over a 20 yr period makes the assumption that Stoke will only grow by 110-120 people. This is not realistic. The policy needs to reflect reality and give a realistic indication in growth in housing even if the exact location is not pin pointed. Housing requirement for Stoke should be increased.	55 additional homes are proposed for Stoke sub Hamdon to enable the settlement to maintain its identified role and support for local services, and to satisfy an identified need for affordable housing. It is considered that landscape, historic and highway constraints restrict the number of new dwellings that can be accommodated within and immediately adjoining the settlement	No change
	* New housing should include electrical charging points and sufficient parking. In the last 10 yrs the village has absorbed round 70 new homes so another 50 in the next 16 years should not be a problem as long as they are sensitively sited and designed and include a significant element of affordable housing.	Comments noted. Parking Standards are dealt with in Policy TA4 and the new SCC Parking Strategy has more reduced parking standards for residential properties which is to be welcomed. Design is dealt with in Policy EQ2, and electrical charging points under Policy SS7 Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing provision in Policy HG4.	No change
	* Has been identified in para 7.65 that one of the residents' concerns is overdevelopment, the proposal for 50 additional dwellings is ignoring those concerns.	Limited growth is needed in Stoke sub Hamdon to satisfy identified local housing need and to support the facilities and services that currently exist. It is felt that this level of provision over a 22 year period can be assimilated.	No change
	* Impressed by the amount of detail in the consultation but only gave part of the village to comment on. East Stoke should have been included. There is land at the rear of the Co-op that could be used for housing. The 1930's house could be demolished to provide access.	Although within the Parish of Stoke sub Hamdon the settlement of East Stoke is not part of the main built-up area of Stoke sub Hamdon. In the adopted Local Plan East Stoke did not have a Development Area and, as such, was regarded as countryside in the determination of Planning Applications. Development in settlements other than Yeovil, Market Towns or Rural Centres is covered by Policy SS2 of the Draft Core Strategy. This allows for some development in these more rural settlements subject to certain criteria.	No change
	* Building more housing without additional employment opportunities will only increase the problem. Stoke is lucky enough to have a more diverse population than many other villages in South Somerset, and has significant cultural and heritage assets that are not yet fully exploited (e.g. The Priory). Suggest consideration is given to developing Stoke's tourist potential as a means of increasing local employment this should then determine the amount of housing to meet the needs of the indigenous population.	It is proposed to deliver additional employment land in Stoke sub Hamdon over the period of the Core Strategy. Policies EP7 and EP8 aim to facilitate new tourism proposals.	No change

	* Part of the Southcombe complex in Langlands are not being used - could these be developed for employment use?	As an existing employment site this land is covered by Policy EP3 which seeks to safeguard existing employment land subject to a number of criteria.	No change
	* No agricultural land should be lost to housing as the UK will have to become more self sufficient in terms of food production because of the effects of climate change. Once lost, agricultural land is irreplaceable.	Planning Policy Statement 7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) promotes the use of previously developed land in preference to agricultural land and lower grade agricultural land in preference to higher grade agricultural land. However, it also states: "It is for local planning authorities to decide whether best and most versatile agricultural land can be developed, having carefully weighed the options in the light of competent advice." South Somerset District Council seeks to maximise the use of previously developed land for development but the rural nature of the District means that there is insufficient PDL for the development required to 2026.	No change
	* Need for small bungalows for elderly residents who wish to downsize and vacate their family homes, whilst remaining in the village.	Comments noted. The provision of affordable housing is dealt with in Chapter 8, Housing: Policy HG4. Policy HG5 considers the range of housing types, tenures and sizes to be provided.	No change
	* Stoke-sub-Hamdon has lost many of its village facilities over the past 20 years, with the recent demise of the post office a particularly harsh blow. Therefore make it a condition when granting planning permission that any developer should subsidise the running of a post office (an important facility) for say 10 years.	It is unlawful for a planning condition to be imposed unless it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The subsidising of a Post Office would not satisfy these criteria.	No change
	* There is a shortage of parking spaces in the centre of Stoke-sub-Hamdon, so any new housing here would require sufficient provision of car parking spaces.	Policy TA4 of the Draft Core Strategy deals with Parking Standards and advises that provision should be based on site characteristics, location and accessibility. The new SCC Car Parking Strategy proposes more relaxed standards for residential properties and is recommended to be applied in South Somerset.	No change

	* Suggest building some new homes at the allotments in East Stoke as these are not used to full capacity - this would help integrate East Stoke with the rest of the village.	Allotments and their tenants are protected by national policies and a number of conditions must be met before the owner authority can dispose of them. Should the allotments in East Stoke be proposed for housing the application would be dealt with on its own merits and under the prevailing planning policies.	No change
	* Stoke is increasingly becoming a dormitory village, the fact that many households have more than 1 car and the character of the village means off-street parking is limited this means there are increasing traffic problems.	Policy TA4 of the Draft Core Strategy deals with Parking Standards and advises that provision should be based on site characteristics, location and accessibility. Somerset County Council as Highway Authority would be consulted on any proposals for new development and would address traffic concerns. The new SCC Car Parking Strategy proposes more relaxed standards for residential properties and is recommended to be applied in South Somerset.	No change
	* Any future development should bring with them improvements to traffic flow around rather than through the village centre.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified any specific road improvements but such would be required alongside any development proposals if these necessitated them and can be achieved through planning obligations	No change
	* Suggest a smaller bus that runs more frequently.	Noted, but this is outside the remit of the Core Strategy.	No change
	* More classrooms would be needed for the junior school as it is so full that many people have to send their children to Norton.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified the need for new school provision but this would be covered by planning obligations should development take place which places pressure on school places.	No change
	* A lot of money has been invested in the hall and playground so money should be spent elsewhere on other amenities.	Comments noted, but this is outside the remit of the Core Strategy. However, the provision of new amenities can be facilitated through the Core Strategy alongside growth.	No change
	* Have you consulted the village plan yet?	The Stoke sub Hamdon Village Plan is included within the Evidence Base for the South Somerset Local Development Framework and has informed the Draft Core Strategy.	No change