

# Appendix 1

## South Somerset Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 – Main Points arising from Issues and Options Consultation October 2017 until January 2018.

During the consultation period, the Council received over 800 representations to the Local Plan Review Issues and Options consultation resulting in 1,424 individual comments, many of which are very detailed and lengthy in nature. 49 late responses were also received. What follows below is a summary of the main points made by respondents, including the late representations. All of the representations received during the consultation period can be found in full on the Council's website at [Homepage - South Somerset District Council Consultations](#)

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	Foreword	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been several questions as to why the Local Plan is being reviewed so soon after adoption of the current Local Plan. It is suggested that as the current Local Plan was only adopted in 2015 the new plan should utilise an evidence base from 2016 and the plan period run up to 2036.</li> <li>• There are also queries as to why so much new housing is required.</li> <li>• It is also felt that the consultation document and Foreword make no mention of Neighbourhood Plans - the Government's main initiative.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council agreed to carry out a full Local Plan Review in the Local Development Scheme, April 2017. The National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018 (NPPF) expects Local Plan to be reviewed with five years of the date of adoption.</p> <p>The Foreword to the Local Plan Review will include a reference to Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
	Sustainability Appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is asked why, when the 2017 HELAA identifies the site (E/MIPO/0003) as having capacity for approx. 68 dwellings and concludes that it is suitable, available, and achievable for development in the next five years, the site was discounted from the Sustainability Appraisal or I&amp;O consultation and there is an objection to what is seen as to lack of reasonable alternatives for Milborne Port.</li> <li>• It is stated that, without site visits and a lack of qualitative analysis of sites, there are a number of inherent flaws in the site appraisal criteria, leading to</li> </ul>	<p>The Council has commissioned consultants AECOM to carry out Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Site options for Milborne Port are discussed later in this Appendix.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
			<p>employment land requirements for the Local Plan Review.</p> <p><b>Brexit:</b> It is acknowledged that Brexit might have an impact and this is relevant to the economic projections which support the predicted jobs and subsequent employment land requirements for the Local Plan Review. However, Brexit is so uncertain that until there is some clarity surrounding the future of the UK in Europe, the projections will not be revised.</p>
5.8	What additional infrastructure would be required to support the provision of the additional new homes and economic development?	<p><u>Roads/ Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is stated that development which would increase traffic on small roads that are severely impacted by HGV lorries and congestion should be suspended until there is funding to protect communities (provision of pavements, lights etc). Many 'B' roads are already overloaded. Housing and particularly employment should be located adjacent to the strategic road network.</li> <li>• Highways England would seek mitigation for any development site which has severe impact on the SRN. It would expect the mitigation to be identified at the Local Plan stage and agreed with HE. This should take the form of an Infrastructure Development Plan. There would be concern relating to potential site allocations along the A303 and the impacts this may have in terms of traffic generation.</li> <li>• It is stated that cross-border working on transport, particularly on bus services and community transport is vital to maintain access to key services,</li> </ul>	<p>Somerset County Council are the Highways Authority and Highways England are responsible for the strategic road network (SRN). Both organisations have been consulted as part of this process and Somerset County Council are providing SSDC on feedback in relation to the proposed preferred options.</p> <p>SSDC and SCC are fully engaged and working together in the Development Consent Order process for the planned improvements to the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>especially in relation to Yeovil. A sustainable transport interchange in Yeovil would be supported and reference to this should be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorset County Council says it has a long term aspiration to improve the links between the A37 and A3088, which provide part of a major regional freight route network for businesses in south and west Dorset. It is disappointed that improvements have not been made to match those to the south within Dorset. There also remain concerns about accessibility of key employment sites in Weymouth and Portland to the national motorway network – funding streams through the Transport Investment Strategy should be fully exploited for improvements. The proposed Yeovil SUE to the south of the town provides an opportunity to deliver a local link road to the A37, which could also reduce traffic on the Quicksilver roundabout and West Coker Road, bringing health, air quality and safety benefits to local residents; the route of the link is not currently identified, but the opportunity should be taken in connection with YEO 6,7 and 8.</li> <li>• Somerset County Council states that full traffic modelling is required to assess infrastructure needs. It strongly agrees with the IDP which states that a District-wide Transport Strategy is developed.</li> <li>• Charging points for electric vehicles.</li> <li>• Specific comments have been received relating to Castle Cary and these are dealt with in that Section.</li> <li>• Curry Rivel is a village with in excess of 2500 residents with over 1000 households and improvements to Parking, Highways, Pavements and the creation of cycle ways needs action now.</li> <li>• The proposed route for the A303 improvements has a detrimental impact on West Camel unless a relief road is built for local traffic in for use in the event of an accident or blockage on the A303.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rail</u></p>	<p><b>Walking and cycling:</b> Walking and cycling infrastructure provision in association with development proposals is addressed through Policy TA1 and in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2015/2016</p> <p><b>Rail:</b> There are currently no feasibility studies which support the re-opening of railway stations in South Somerset. The current priorities regarding Rail are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2015/2016. The extension to Castle Cary train station car park is identified under the Priority 2 schemes.</p> <p>SSDC is fully aware of the need to consult with the relevant rail operator regarding the Preferred Options and will continue to do</p> <p><b>Buses:</b> Improvements to bus services are sought through S106 agreements in associated with development where it is justified and viable to do so.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase access to the railway network – provide new stations near settlements and development sites; link to community transport.</li> <li>• Any developments which would result in a material increase in the character of traffic using rail level crossings should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that safety would not be compromised or mitigation measures are provided. This could be the case with CREW1 and CACA4. The Council has a statutory responsibility to consult the rail undertaker in such circumstances.</li> </ul> <p><u>Buses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better public transport needed.</li> <li>• In Dowlish Wake they do not have a bus service – an increasing concern of the elderly. Recently, the ford has run across the road twice, stopping vehicles from entering. Roads to/from Dowlish Wake are predominantly single-track, so extra traffic would cause a severe strain on the road structure and dynamics of the area, like for many villages.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cycling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of high quality cycling infrastructure in all main settlements, combined with measures to remove through traffic from residential streets, to form a viable and attractive walking and cycling network.</li> <li>• NDDC would like to work with SSDC towards the continuation of the existing North Dorset Trailway to Templecombe via Henstridge, which would offer substantial economic, social and environmental opportunities.</li> </ul> <p><u>Technology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology infrastructure should be improved. High speed broadband must be a priority to facilitate productivity. Continual upgrading of technology,</li> </ul>	<p>There are three Community Transport Schemes in South Somerset providing essential journeys for those who do not have access to a car or public transport. Typical journeys include medical appointments, Day Care Centre visits and shopping.</p> <p>South Somerset Community Transport operates a fleet of wheelchair accessible minibuses in the Yeovil, Chard, Ilminster, Somerton and Langport areas. The scheme also operates South Somerset Community Cars offering bespoke journeys and the pre-bookable Chard &amp; Ilminster Slinky bus.</p> <p>South Somerset Community &amp; Accessible Transport (SSCAT) similarly provides accessible transport to the communities of Wincanton, Bruton, Castle Cary and the surrounding villages including the ring &amp; ride 'CAT' bus and a community car scheme.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>housing delivered in the town, the Education Authority (SCC) should provide an updated position statement for the IDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued existence of sporting and recreational facilities is of great importance and provision of support to enable this is vital. Could be via CIL or from SSDC itself.</li> </ul> <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are constraints in the existing potable supply and waste water networks to serve each of the sites. Further engagement is required with Wessex Water to consider the extent of improvements required.</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many substantial buildings, including listed buildings, in the (Wincanton) High Street have been derelict for more than ten years. They have deteriorated to the extent that they should be demolished in the interests of public safety.</li> <li>Within the current Local Plan, the racecourse is not included within the town's development boundary and there are no specific policies. The wording of Policy EP8 suggests that new and enhanced tourist assets are to be located within a settlement and not in the countryside; they should be easily accessible by sustainable means; and there must be an identified need in the open countryside which is not met by existing facilities. The current wording of the policy therefore fails to meet the needs of the racecourse, which is located in the countryside, in terms of any expansion and development of the site; it needs to be adapted to allow improvement, expansion or development at the site as required, or a specific policy.</li> <li>A new and updated IDP is required.</li> </ul>	<p>have not identified any issues with future demand for places.</p> <p>The requirements for recreational facilities is addressed in the Wincanton Playing Pitch Strategy. Any shortfalls will be identified in the Updated IDP.</p> <p>This is referred to in the Local Plan Review One of the objectives of the District Council's Wincanton Action Plan is to consolidate and rejuvenate the town centre. This is now reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Any development proposal at Wincanton Racecourse will be considered on its merits, including any economic benefits.</p> <p>The IDP is being updated, based on new evidence.</p>
7.21	Due to long-term non-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is general support for this. Additionally, the planning application and subsequent appeal were refused/dismissed between 2008 and 2013 (app</li> </ul>	A further planning application for 27 dwellings has been submitted (Ref.

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	delivery should housing allocation HG/CACA/2 (Land west of Remalard Court) be deleted?	<p>ref 08/00189/OUT and appeal ref. APP/R3325/A/13/200209). The road system that was proposed for the Foxes Run development was at all times hazardous for all established and prospective residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nobody seems to have objected to its deletion.</li> </ul>	16/03447/FUL), which has been refused and, at the time of writing, is the subject of an appeal. Any further decision about whether the site should be included in the Local Plan will need to await the outcome of the appeal.
7.22	<p>Which of the following options should be taken forward in the LPR? Options for growth at Ansford &amp; Castle Cary include: <b>7.22(a)</b> ANSF/CACA 1: Land north-west of Ansford for mixed use <b>7.22(b)</b> ANSF/CACA 2: Land at Higher Ansford for housing</p>	<p>(a) <u>North-west of Ansford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is thought that this is the better site as it includes employment land. It is the preferred option from a landscape perspective; stated to have a safe vehicular access; and also viable and acceptable.</li> <li>One Respondent thinks it should be used for employment only; and there are concerns about possible conflicts with the RoW network.</li> </ul> <p>(b) <u>Higher Ansford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is preferred from a landscape perspective.</li> <li>The landowners and development partners say they are willing to develop this without delay. They consider there to be no issues relating to ecology, contamination and archaeology that cannot be readily addressed. They have control of access and the site is in Flood Zone 1. They support housing, affordable housing and business within the area.</li> <li>It is stated to be a highly sustainable location; it is within walking distance from the town centre, with access via Ansford Road to the High Street where day to day needs can be served. The settlement has facilities commensurate with its role as a Local Market Town, including primary and secondary schools, medical and leisure facilities. The site is just over half a mile from the train station. Its south western edge lies in a Conservation Area and there are several listed buildings nearby. No significant landscape designation.</li> </ul>	<p>(a) The site to the north west of Ansford is being taken forward as a Preferred Option. It is, however, landlocked; and access will need to be obtained from adjoining land.</p> <p>(b) Historic England have objected, but the Conservation Officer's is view that a reduced area defining the southern field only may present a development opportunity where the capacity for substantial harm to heritage assets is avoided, whilst the final extent of built form facing the conservation area should be determined by a heritage impact assessment.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
	<p><b>7.22(c)</b> ANSF/CACA 3: Land east of Station Road for housing</p> <p><b>7.22(d)</b> ANSF/CACA 4: Land north of Ansford Hill for housing</p> <p><b>7.22(e)</b> Another option (please specify)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets.</li> <li>• There are concerns about access, with challenges for pedestrian connectivity due to the pavement width and position. There are also traffic lights to consider.</li> </ul> <p><u>(c) Station Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is stated to be viable and an acceptable area for increased housing with safe vehicular access. It fits in with development already permitted; and Reserved Matters consent has been secured.</li> <li>• There is access to a connected site on Ansford Hill and which would make an ideal extension to this site.</li> <li>• This is preferred from a landscape perspective.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic England consider that development of the site is likely to cause substantial harm to historic assets.</li> <li>• The site is said to have a limited frontage and more details about access would be required.</li> </ul> <p><u>(d) Ansford Hill</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landowners and development partners are willing to develop the site without delay. They consider there to be no issues relating to ecology,</li> </ul>	<p>Access could be from either Cumnock Road or Maggs Lane.</p> <p>However, the site would represent more of an intrusion into open countryside than the Preferred Options to the west of the settlement, which are in the established Direction of Growth. This would not prevent a planning application being submitted and being considered on its merits.</p> <p>(c) This is being taken forward as a Preferred Option, although access should be from Well Farm rather than Station Road.</p> <p>It is the view of the Conservation Officers that, whilst recognising the significance of both the parish church, and the adjacent conservation area, do not consider this to preclude development, particularly as it joins up sites to either side with the benefit of planning consent.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>contamination and archaeology that cannot be readily addressed. They have control of access and the site is in Flood Zone 1. The landowners support housing, affordable housing and business within the area; and the site are considered to be developable and deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site can offer better links between the train station and the settlement, including land to extend the railway station car park. the operators have stated that the car park is operating at capacity which is choking off demand for new passengers. GWR are investigating options to extend the car park and this option could aid in providing land to extend the car park on both sides of the railway.</li> <li>• The site is within walking distance of the town centre with access via Station Road to the High Street. The route is also covered by a regular bus service. The town centre is said to be vibrant and offers retail and leisure services to meet day to day needs.</li> <li>• However, others feel that this would be detrimental to the market town character of the town, as it is in a prominent location and development would change the nature of the northern approach to Castle Cary. It is stated that development north should stop at the A371 on Ansford Hill.</li> <li>• There are concerns about the near vicinity of rail services, poor access and poor pedestrian links; and about impact on the station footpath or Barrow rail crossing.</li> </ul> <p><u>(e) Another Option</u> Specific Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land to the north east of the train station would be good for employment development as access to the A road, immediate rail access and development would be unobtrusive.</li> </ul>	<p>(d) Although suitable, available and achievable, the site is relatively remote from the shops and services in the settlement's centre. Having regard to the amount of development in the pipeline in Castle Cary already, there is no need to take this additional site forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>This is the preferred site for additional car-parking at the railway station. This should not be prejudiced by any employment</p>



Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on the old BMI site is a good proposal and long overdue.</li> </ul> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Neighbourhood Plan should be applied to all housing.</li> <li>• Existing permissions and the BMI site should be built out before additional residential development is allocated elsewhere.</li> <li>• The point is made that Castle Cary already has a high number of commitments in excess of the Local Plan target.</li> </ul>	<p>proposal and this is recognised in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>At the time of writing there is a current planning application for a development of the former BMI site and this will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan is at the Submission stage; and whilst a material consideration it carries little weight at the time of writing.</p> <p>The BMI site is addressed above.</p> <p>It is accepted that Castle Cary and Ansford already has a high number of commitments.</p>
7.23	In addition to the infrastructure described above, are there any other infrastructure requirements for Ansford & Castle Cary?	<p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B3153 and Torbay Road/South Cary Lane are overloaded and dangerous, no more HGV traffic is appropriate. Road improvements are required.</li> <li>• Reduce traffic on the B3153 by having a new link road from Castle Cary Station Road to Torbay Road industrial estate. Enforce speed limits and improve visibility on A371 to accommodate increased HGV traffic.</li> <li>• B Roads - Improvements to Satnav issues. HGVs should be encouraged to keep to 'A' roads to help alleviate 'B' roads i.e. at Lydford instruct traffic along the A37 instead of B3153.</li> </ul>	<p>It is recognised that highway issues are considered by the local community to be important matters to be addressed – and these are outlined in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan - but highways impacts will be considered in relation to any planning application submitted.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land set aside for the road link between Station Road and the Torbay Road Trading Estate needs to be built. This also provides a link to the new employment land in the Direction of Growth.</li> <li>• A footpath should be provided for Clanville residents; this is long overdue.</li> <li>• Provide additional parking the centre of town for those who live between the town centre and Station Road. Free adequate parking need to continue in the town and be expanded at the Railway station. Car park at Castle Cary Station is inadequate. Now have queues backing out to the A371. Could the land used for Glastonbury Festival parking be used as a permanent car park?</li> <li>• Rail connections need to be improved e.g. ability to travel to Taunton from Castle Cary and arrive in time to start work at 9 am.</li> <li>• A new bridge over the railway at Castle Cary.</li> </ul> <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is stated that the primary school needs to stay in the Town Centre, in situ expansion should be explored. The adverse impact on the town centre traders if the school were relocated would be significant.</li> <li>• Adequate free parking is also an important component of the healthy town centre.</li> <li>• Caryford Community Hall is one large community hall in the town, with its own large car park. It is a popular hall but is operating at capacity in terms of hirings and plans are afoot to extend the hall and improve the kitchen, foyer, and toilets so that it can cope with an influx of new people to the town.</li> <li>• Expand the Health Centre to cope with planned development.</li> <li>• Youth, cadet and scout facilities urgently required.</li> </ul>	<p>The potential need for a new primary school is recognised in the Local Plan and a site identified. The Local aspiration for it to remain in the Town Centre is known.</p> <p>No changes to the parking arrangements are currently proposed.</p> <p>Other comments noted – these may emerge as an issue in the Updated IDP.</p>

Question/ Option No	Question / Option / Section of the document	Summary of Main Points	Officer Response
		<p>Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor broadband undermines the economic development of Castle Cary and its rural hinterland.</li> </ul> <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are constraints in the existing potable supply and waste water networks to serve each of the greenfield sites.</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The town centre needs an ATM.</li> <li>The Neighbourhood Plan is clear regarding infrastructure requirements, SSDC should support this.</li> <li>Does the fire station need to be enlarged to cope with growing community.</li> </ul>	<p>The importance of broadband is recognised in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The potential need for a waste water treatment works is recognised in the Local Plan and will be considered in the Updated IDP.</p> <p>Other comments are noted.</p>
	General Langport Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large number of respondents make points along the lines that the level of existing completions and commitments justifies stopping further large developments above those already approved. The rate of building should be slowed to avoid exceeding the housing target 10 years before the Plan period. Otherwise, medical and other local services will be unable to keep up and provide the same level of service. Langport and Huish has already been subject to extensive development, often unsympathetic to the rural nature of the area and Huish's village setting.</li> </ul>	<p>The rate at which developments are built is beyond the control of local authorities.</p> <p>Further housing sites need to be identified to meet Langport's role as a Local Market Town up the end of the new Local Plan period in 2036</p>
7.24	Do you agree that the site within the northern Direction of Growth (Policy LMT2) that	<p>Comments received in agreement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Planning Inspectorate (APP/R3325/W/15/3136302), and the local community both agreed that the original decision to include this sensitive site in the direction of growth was flawed. The appeal decision stated that the harm to the heritage asset was not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development. The Planning Inspectorate found that using the site would "<i>not represent sustainable development</i>". This is primarily due to</li> </ul>	<p>The site within the northern Direction of Growth will not now be taken forward because of the impact on heritage assets.</p>