

Queen Camel Neighbourhood Plan Submission
South Somerset District Council Comments - March 2020

Section/ Policy	District Council Comments
General	<p>It would be helpful for the paragraphs in the Plan to be numbered for referencing purposes, this will be particularly important when the Plan is being used for decision making on planning applications..</p> <p>There are a few typing errors and document layout issues that can be addressed when compiling the final version of the Plan.</p> <p>Section 4 of the document includes a couple of projects which are proposed to be actioned in 2019, these need to be updated.</p>
Figure 2	The map and reference to the “3-tier cascade” of parishes seems out of context in this location in the Plan and may be more appropriately located in Appendix 1 itself.
Figures 5A, 5B and 7	As reference is made elsewhere in the Plan to flood risk, it would be helpful to have the Flood Risk Zones annotated as constraints in the key to the maps. The Zones should also be amended to reflect the most recently updated Environment Agency Zones at: Flood map for planning - GOV.UK
Page 24; final paragraph	The Plan states that “the South Somerset Local Plan (2015) sets a target of 35% affordable housing on sites of 6 or more dwellings (although at the time of writing this plan, this threshold was only being applied to sites of 11 houses or more, and is expected to be reviewed through an update to the Local Plan)”. This is now incorrect as the requirement has only been applied to proposals for 10 or more dwellings (i.e. ‘major’ developments) since the NPPF policy was revised; and the Neighbourhood Plan now needs to be updated accordingly. The requirement in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options document is for 29% in major schemes.
Policy QC1 Housing	The Policy advocates about 30 new homes to be provided in the settlement, but the Local Plan Review Preferred Options document proposes about 60 up to 2036. However, given that the lifetime of the

	Neighbourhood Plan has now been shortened to end in the year 2030 (from 2034 previously), this may be acceptable. There is also an acknowledgement that the Neighbourhood Plan should be reviewed when the new Local Plan is adopted.
Policy QC2 Infill development within the settlement boundary	It is not currently clear in this Policy how “d) sufficient off-road parking” is defined. It is suggested that the Policy cross-refers to NP Policy QC9 - Parking.
Policy QC3 Land to the north side of West Camel Road	There are no objections in principle to the proposal to allocate this area for housing, subject to the potential constraints identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site could probably be extended further to accommodate more dwellings in accordance with the proposals in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options document without significant harm.
Policy QC5 Business and Employment	<p>The requirement that buildings for a business that has not been established for at least three years be located and designed to enable its re-use for alternative businesses, without the need for major rebuild, may provide an onerous constraint on such a business. Particularly if it has specific operational requirements in the design of the building that may make it unsuitable for an alternative use.</p> <p>Policy EP4 of the current adopted Local Plan requires that a business will need to demonstrate that it has operated successfully for a minimum of 3 years to ensure that it has an established presence in the particular area. The business will also need to demonstrate that it is viable and has reasonable prospects of remaining so. However, this stipulation no longer applies in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options Document, in accordance with the policy guidance in the NPPF. Indeed, a new Policy EP4 referring to the ‘Delivery of Employment Land in the Villages, Rural Settlements and the Countryside’ has been introduced as part of Local Plan Review.</p>
Policy QC11 The Rural Setting of the village and Key Views	This Policy would be improved if it were more specific about the principal features in each of the views that required such protection. As it is, there is no detailed explanation of the scope and extent of the views and it may be difficult to actually apply the Policy in the determination of planning applications.
Policy QC12 Local Green Spaces	The designation of the Churchyard and the ‘Iron Box’ as Local Green Space may not be necessary because of the protection already afforded to them by their location within the Conservation Area. The Playing Field is also already safeguarded by the advice in the NPPF.
Policy QC13 Conserving and enhancing local heritage assets	The Plan states that Local Listing and any potential changes to the Conservation Area boundary are a matter for the Local Planning Authority to consider and cannot be carried out through the Plan. This is indeed the case, so the designation of these features in the Plan will carry little weight at the present. If their designation

	<p>as Locally Listed features is going to be sought in conjunction with the Local Authority as a 'Project', this should be detailed in Section 4 – Projects, with acknowledgement that the District Council should lead on this – and moved from the main body of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Policy QC14 Archaeology	<p>This Section presently makes no reference to the Area of High Archaeological Potential designated within the Local Plan. (Policy EQ3). The designated area does not extend to the whole Parish and archaeological investigations may not be necessary in all instances. Advice should be sought from the Local Authority on a case-by-case basis.</p>