



## Contents

	Page
Summary of Responses & Representations	
1. Mendip wide responses	3
2. Frome	6
3. Glastonbury	10
4. Shepton Mallet	13
5. Street	15
6. Wells	17
7. Villages	20

This document summarises responses from the Local Plan Part II Issues and Options Consultation. The main issues raised and the Council's response are included on the statement of consultation.

## Summary of Responses and Representations

### **1. Mendip wide**

71 individuals and organisations have made comments, including a number of Parish Councils, special interest groups and 23 developers.

#### **1.1 Housing**

- 1.1.1 A number of developers have commented that policies should be clear that no special justification is needed to exceed minimum numbers as Government policy is to meet OAN in full and boost the supply of housing. It is also suggested that the overall scale of housing is a significant under assessment and there will be a lack of supply in the later years of the plan period.
- 1.1.2 One developer comments that large urban extensions have a long lead time and that smaller greenfield sites should be allocated which are immediately developable to maintain a 5 year land supply.
- 1.1.3 Several developers suggest that a 10% buffer should be allowed for non-implementation of sites. Inclusion of land that is not deliverable may result in the plan being found unsound. Planning for minimum requirements may result in under delivery and as many sites as possible that are suitable and deliverable should be allocated.
- 1.1.4 Several developers suggest that the Part 1 plan and the Part 2 plan should be amalgamated and that this will allow an early review of the plan in the light of the West of England Joint Spatial Strategy.
- 1.1.5 A number of developers have commented that additional sustainable development should be supported including in locations in open countryside outside development limits and where the Council can demonstrate a 5 year land supply.
- 1.1.6 Several developers comment that the Part 1 approach to allocating a proportionate 15% increase in villages is flawed and should be treated with caution. Adverse impacts are a better determinant of the appropriate level of growth and allocating minimum numbers is likely to result in delivery below minimum. Where the residual requirement has been exceeded, this amounts to a moratorium on development, which is not consistent with responding to need over the plan period.
- 1.1.7 One developer comments that numbers have been included for villages that are not plausible. Several respondents consider that land should be allocated across the rural area and sites allocated in villages that are less constrained. It is suggested that there is a need for small scale development in open

countryside, hamlets and smaller villages outside development limits and that a more flexible approach should be taken to primary and secondary villages. One developer suggests that development in open countryside should not be restricted and that this amounts to a presumption against development. It is also suggested that a more flexible approach to infilling in villages is needed, that would allow “rounding off” to foster growth above minimum.

- 1.1.8 Northern part of Mendip is influenced by BANES and West Wiltshire housing market areas. LPAs have a duty to co-operate to meet the housing needs of all areas.
- 1.1.9 Future Growth Areas should be brought forward by Local Plan part 2.
- 1.1.10 A policy on self-build and custom build housing is required which allows these forms of development as an exception site. It is also suggested that self-build and custom build should not impact on the delivery of market housing. Viability, financial considerations and relationship to affordable housing should be carefully considered. Self-build and custom build are not the same and should be clearly defined.
- 1.1.11 There are comments both that the level of affordable housing required is too high, and 30-40% can make even greenfield sites unviable, and that there is a chronic undersupply of affordable housing and minimum levels required in the plan are not being met. One developer comments that the best way to deliver affordable housing is as part of a market development and without further market housing there will be no affordable housing. Starter homes are identified a form of development that could have more prominence in the policies.
- 1.1.12 Several respondents consider that brownfield land should be prioritised. There are also comments that other land within the built up areas should be prioritised.
- 1.1.13 A need to provide for housing for older people and extra care housing in identified.
- 1.1.14 Local plan should emphasis social housing rather than affordable housing
- 1.1.15 One respondent comments that MDCs previous policy on LGSs is only to allocate inside development limits. This policy is wrong and is an open space is worthy of protection and important to local people it is not relevant where it is in relation to the settlement boundary.

## **1.2 Employment**

- 1.2.1 One respondent commented that the plan may need to factor in provision for employment land which will be lost to housing

### **1.3 Development Limits**

- 1.3.1 One respondent is concerned about the removal of development limits from settlements not defined as towns, primary or secondary villages.
- 1.3.2 One developer suggests that development limits should be extended to include Future Growth Areas defined in Part 1.
- 1.3.3 There is some feeling that extending development limits to incorporate development that has permission but is considered inappropriate would exacerbate problems.
- 1.3.4 It is suggested that development limits should not be used to restrict sustainable development from coming forward and fails to plan positively for current and projected OAN.

### **1.4 Infrastructure and facilities**

- 1.4.1 It is suggested that the Council needs to be more proactive in providing infrastructure. Parking is also mentioned as need to be provided.
- 1.4.2 Sport England consider that a robust and up to date assessment of need for sport is required and recommend undertaking a playing pitch strategy and a needs and opportunities assessment.
- 1.4.3 One organisation suggest that a policy to protect cultural facilities should be included.

### **1.5 Environment**

- 1.5.1 Comments include a need for zero carbon development, protection of agricultural land to safeguard food security and policy to reduce car usage and promote food growing, water efficiency and grey water harvesting.

### **1.6 Other matters**

- 1.6.1 One respondent considers there is a need for policy on building standards and 2 respondents consider that a technical standards policy is not required.

## 2. Frome

### 2.1 Town Council comments

2.1.1 Frome Town Council consider that additional housing could be provided through a well designed strategic extension, comprehensively planned with all the necessary infrastructure. The majority of the suitable sites are to the south of Frome and a masterplan for this area would redraw the development limits. Sites within the town's development boundary and closer to the town centre would be best suited to custom build or housing for older people. All housing sites should be considered for at least an element of custom build.

2.1.2 Frome Town Council has carried out an employment study which identifies sites to be retained in employment use. It also identifies that there is a need for workspace allocations. The most suitable sites for employment development would be those adjoining existing employment sites, in particular Marston and Commerce Park.

2.1.3 Frome Town Council has identified a need for additional sports facilities including football pitches, netball courts, running track, rifle and archery range, larger swimming pool, outdoor exercise equipment and cycle paths. FTC is undertaking further work on this issue.

2.1.4 The Town Council consider that all the current OALS warrant designation and none should have the designation removed. They request that new sites are designated at Packsaddle, North Parade, Water's edge, Low Water, Gibbet Hill, Rodden Lake Stream Meadow, Marston Road, Broadway allotments, Millennium Green, Selwood Lodge, The Leys, Feltham Hill, Bath Road and Birchill Lane (assessments have been carried out for these sites). Some smaller green spaces have been put forward for designation for informal recreation and play. A wildlife rich corridor could be created between Adderwell and The Retreat, linked to the footpath network.

### 2.2 Other Responses

2.2.1 112 individuals and organisations have made comments, in addition to the Parish Council.

#### **Housing**

2.2.2 A number of respondents suggested general areas that were inappropriate for housing development. These included;

- Areas beyond the escarpment
- Areas upstream of the town centre which could give rise to flooding
- Sites near any flood zones
- Previous employment sites
- Greenfield sites

- 2.2.3 A number of respondents put forward general areas that they felt were good areas for development. These included;
- North of Gypsy Lane at Highfield
  - Sites near the A361
  - Saxonvale, in preference to using this site for retail
  - Land at Gibbet Hill
  - Land south west of The Mount
  - Land to the south of Frome
  - Brownfield land
- 2.2.4 Several respondents commented that development should be elsewhere in the District, or in BANES and that overall numbers in Frome should not be increased.
- 2.2.5 Several developers considered that additional sites should be allocated in Frome and that the plan should accommodate above minimum housing numbers. One commented that Frome was falling behind in housing delivery and that the 5 year land supply may be questionable.
- 2.2.6 One respondent considered that higher end houses were needed to balance the community, whilst other considered that smaller and higher density houses were needed.
- 2.2.7 Some respondents felt there is a shortage of affordable housing and that the proportion of new housing that is affordable is decreasing to the detriment of the community.
- 2.2.8 The Civic Society felt that co-housing, custom and self build should be considered, and the Frome Co-housing group considered that higher density housing forms may be needed, and supported self build. Another respondent felt that self-build housing should be restricted to appropriate areas and not near listed buildings.
- 2.2.9 One respondent felt that a comprehensive development brief was needed for the town.
- 2.2.10 One respondent commented that too many consents had been granted in villages where people commute to Bath and West Wilts, and that this was affecting Frome's role as an integrated centre.

### **Employment**

- 2.2.11 The Civic Society comment that employment land should be retained within the town and not used for housing.
- 2.2.12 The Civic Society identify a need for small scale workspace for the creative community

- 2.2.13 The Civic Society also suggest a large scale employment site east of Commerce Park, but comment that this should only be used for development of a scale and type that cannot be accommodated in the town.
- 2.2.14 A developer comments that there is a need for flexible and affordable workspace and a that allocations are needed to reflect this
- 2.2.15 A developer comments that employment could be included in a masterplan for the south of Frome
- 2.2.16 A developer identifies Vallis Trading Estate as outdated and underused and considers it should be allocated for mixed use
- 2.2.17 One respondent considers that more studio space and office space is needed
- 2.2.18 One respondent considers that too much employment land is lost to housing
- 2.2.19 One respondent considers there is a need to increase the availability and quality of employment land.
- 2.2.20 One respondent considers that there is a need to increase employment to balance housing growth.
- 2.2.21 A respondent identifies an opportunity for low density tourism development in Marston park
- 2.2.22 A developer comments that employment land should be identified in locations accessible to the strategic road network.

### **Development Limits**

- 2.2.23 Frome Civic Society consider that the development limit should be constrained by the railway, the by-pass and the escarpment. Land to the north west of the town has outstanding landscape value, gateway approaches should be protected and land east of the A361 is too remote. Land to the south is the only remaining developable land.
- 2.2.24 One respondents considers that development limits should remain unchanged to the south of Frome and development should be focussed on the centre
- 2.2.25 One respondent considers that development limits should be extended to include the Future Growth Area at The Mount.
- 2.2.26 Vision for Frome comment that a master planned approach is needed outside development limits
- 2.2.27 A need to review residential uses at the edge of the development limits is identified at Highfield, north of Gypsy Lane
- 2.2.28 A need to extend development limits to include a potential site at Marston Gate is identified
- 2.2.29 Several respondents consider that development limits should be extended to include allocated sites.

### **Infrastructure and Facilities**

- 2.2.30 Better access to the river corridor, walking and cycling routes are needed
- 2.2.31 Improvements to the Market Place and more parking are needed
- 2.2.32 Civic Society consider that pedestrian and cycle links to BT and D and Southfields Farm are needed
- 2.2.33 Vision For Frome and other respondents consider that Saxon Vale needs cycle and pedestrian routes and open space, making the most of the riverside and a town square
- 2.2.34 FROGS consider that more cycle and pedestrian routes are needed and that desire lines need to be taken into account when planning routes.
- 2.2.35 A need for more sports facilities is identified by one respondent
- 2.2.36 One respondent considers that further education provision will be needed if the town expands any further.

### **Environmental Issues**

- 2.2.37 Retain designation of all current OALs
- 2.2.38 Protect the route for a cycle way from Adderwell to The Retreat
- 2.2.39 Designate all pocket parks and small spaces for informal recreation
- 2.2.40 Provide additional sites in large developments

### **Other Matters**

- 2.2.41 Additional retail space is needed. If sites can deliver without impacting the town centre it will improve the towns self containment
- 2.2.42 Civic Society consider that housing calculation needs to be clarified
- 2.2.43 Make clear that the impact of planning applications on heritage will be assessed
- 2.2.44 Bus stop interchange and railway station should be shown on the map
- 2.2.45 FROGS question whether policy DP16 has been correctly applied at Mountsfield
- 2.2.46 Housing sites need to be linked to sustainable public transport

## 3. Glastonbury

### 3.1 Town Council Comments

The Town Council's Response is summarised as follows:

- 3.1.1 The Town Council are against provision of housing above LPPI allocation as Glastonbury is the most environmentally constrained town in the district and highlight that the character of the town is considered to be under threat from overdevelopment.
- 3.1.2 No further sites identified for development as Glastonbury Town Council fully endorses the Local Plan's statement that:  
"Any development above minimum levels is considered to be harmful on the wider landscape and environment of the town."
- 3.1.3 Any development should include social or at least affordable housing as many residents struggling to pay for rented accommodation and/or enter the housing market.
- 3.1.4 Part of the site adjoining Dyehouse Lane is potentially suitable for light industry, although it lies in flood zone 2 and 3 and there is potential for a landscape impact.
- 3.1.5 Support GLAS084b for employment development (subject to consideration of flooding as it is in flood zone 3 and it is separated from town by the bypass).
- 3.1.6 Support the development of the Children's centre in Abbotts court for employment.
- 3.1.7 North east of sewage works could be redeveloped for employment, or for the depot relocated from GLAS001 if the traveller site were relocated.
- 3.1.8 Land North-east of the Sewerage Works, adjacent to the Baily's Buildings (locally known as "the Baily's dump") – once a suitable alternative site has been found for the occupants of the currently tolerated travellers' site – could either provide a potential relocation site for the Glastonbury Highway Depot, currently located at GLAS001, or be suitable for some other employment use.
- 3.1.9 Draw attention to the potential of the old car-park area adjacent to Tovey Coal; to the West of the Bauhaus (Zig-Zag) building on the Morland's Enterprise Park, as land for employment/commercial development. This is part of the area marked as a **Committed Employment Site**. Town Council trusts that developers will maximise the potential of redevelopment of the Enterprise Park.
- 3.1.10 Given the lack of unconstrained land around Glastonbury, the Town Council feel that **all** the existing employment or commercial sites in or around the town are important, and need to be retained in their current use – with the exception of the following sites, which could accommodate housing:

**GLAS001 – Glastonbury Highway Depot**

**GLAS001a – Avalon Motors, Wells Rd**

**GLAS027 – Frogmore Garage**

### **GLAS055 – Lintells Garage**

- 3.1.11 Support the existing development limit which has been carefully planned. Current development limit should not be changed, except at GLAS114E which may be suitable for employment development.
- 3.1.12 A cycleway along Old Beckery, a cycle and footway alongside the Brue, and an improved community centre at St Edmunds hall are all needed.
- 3.1.13 Concerned that when the Drapers site is fully developed, car parking used for the Tor and Chalice Well will be lost.
- 3.1.14 All the OALS still warrant protection and more open space is needed.
- 3.1.15 OALSGLAS001 should be extended to the west as far as the development limit, to include the green burial ground.
- 3.1.16 OALSGLAS005 should include land to the north, including the tennis courts, sea cadets building and scouts building in the OALS as far as Benedict Street.
- 3.1.17 Puts 8 further sites forward for designation as open spaces.
- 3.1.18 Any development within the conservation area will need to be sympathetic.
- 3.1.19 Would like to see development that has low environmental impact, reduces carbon emissions, is carbon neutral and supports sustainable new builds and retrofitting of existing buildings.
- 3.1.20 Update description of deprivation in Glastonbury to read Glastonbury St Benedicts lies within the 10% most deprived areas in the country... Glastonbury St Johns being just outside the 30% most deprived areas.

### **3.2 Public Comments**

- 3.2.1 20 individuals and organisations submitted formal consultation responses on the issues and options put forward in Glastonbury and over 80 people attended a consultation event in Glastonbury.
- 3.2.2 In broad terms there was strong feeling that that Glastonbury is constrained and development limits should not be expanded.
- 3.2.3 Some feeling that Glastonbury needs more starter homes, affordable housing and homes for those on low incomes.
- 3.2.4 Several respondents support development of the area around the Red Brick building (as opposed to Greenfield sites).
- 3.2.5 Support for cycle network is needed, in particular connections with Street and Butleigh.
- 3.2.6 Strong feeling that OALS sites should continue to be designated as open land within the town is very limited.
- 3.2.7 Further LGS sites proposed at the junction of Mutton Road/Hamlyn Road and Leg of Mutton Road/Rowley Road Glastonbury.
- 3.2.8 Attendees at the consultation event requested protection of the following:

- The field that the fair goes on.
  - Potential play park for all Windmill Hill, Thorndell Estate and the new housing at Avalon
  - Allotments (Common Moor Drove)
  - Play park at bottom of Lowerside Road
  - Edmund Hill as it is part of the beauty approaching Glastonbury with the Tor in background
  - Community garden at back of Manor House Road/Bowyers Close
  - Playing field west of Feversham Lane
  - Birdies Round heritage site
  - Cinnamon Lane Park
  - Wearyall Hill including lower level areas
  - Protect Tor Leisure as Open Space
- 3.2.9 Connect Glastonbury to the canal system and make residential berths available in the vicinity of the Tannery.
- 3.2.10 A361 re-routing of heavy goods vehicles and /or imposition of freight weight limits on this road is vital for the health and safety of residents.
- 3.2.11 Plan includes details of cycleway and footpaths but not important transport corridors. Bus stop interchanges and bus links to town centres and other towns such as Yeovil should be shown on the plan.
- 3.2.12 All planning applications need to be assessed on renewable energy criteria
- 3.2.13 Could consider research and development on community land trusts, housing, co-ops
- 3.2.14 Climate change – all new builds should be integral systems to mitigate/reduce harm from climate change and highest code of sustainability
- 3.2.15 Connect waterways to Bridgewater canal and invite canal boat community around.

## 4. Shepton Mallet

### **4.1 Town Council comments**

- 4.1.1 Shepton Mallet Town Council consider that site SHEP037 should be protected from development. They consider that the only potentially suitable site is the future development area on Ridge Lane. They also consider that all the OALS / LGSs should be retained.

### **4.2 Public Responses**

- 4.2.1 48 individuals and organisations have made comments, in addition to the Parish Council. Site specific comments are recorded on the appropriate site assessments. These comments are non-site specific.

#### **Housing**

- 4.2.2 A number of respondents put forward general areas that they felt were good areas for development. These included;

Land to the south of Shepton

Land to the east and west of Shepton

Site adjoining SHEP013

Brownfield sites

- 4.2.3 Several developers considered that additional housing is needed in Shepton, that housing numbers above those set out in Local Plan Part 1 will be required and that additional development will prevent an imbalance developing between employment and housing availability.
- 4.2.4 One respondent considered that quality houses were need to balance the community,
- 4.2.5 Some respondents felt that there is a sizeable need for affordable housing, and that affordability is worsening. One respondent suggested that terraced housing would be more affordable. Another respondent suggested that a mixture of housing types and tenures was needed to meet a range of needs.
- 4.2.6 One respondent commented that new development would provide the opportunity to improve additional facilities and infrastructure and another respondent considered that additional development would help to improve the image of the town and its prosperity.
- 4.2.7 One respondent suggested that buildings should be limited in height to match older houses.
- 4.2.8 One respondent suggested that custom build should be encouraged.

#### **Employment**

- 4.2.9 Several respondents raised issues about employment sites, including the need to allocate specific large sites in Shepton, and land is suggested east of Fosse Lane, concern that sites at the Bath and West will not meet business

demand, need for a technology park, and support for high end employment provision to encourage higher paid, higher skill jobs.

- 4.2.10 Lack of good transport links is identified by one respondent as a concern.
- 4.2.11 One respondent felt that work is needed on the towns continuing poor image and that this is the most significant factor for the town. Heritage is the most important factor in attracting people to the town.
- 4.2.12 A number of respondents identify opportunities to improve tourism, including further scope for retail development at Kilver Court, bringing empty units in the High Street into use, re-using the old sorting office and redevelopment of the prison.
- 4.2.13 One respondent supports farm diversification.

#### **Development Limits**

- 4.2.14 One respondents considers that development limits should remain unchanged
- 4.2.15 One respondent considers that development limits should be extended to allow for increased demand for housing.
- 4.2.16 One respondent suggests that Kilver Court should be included in development limits.
- 4.2.17 One respondent suggests that development limits should be extended to include West Shepton playing fields.

#### **Infrastructure and Facilities**

- 4.2.18 Extension of the Strawberry Line cycle way and footpath towards Wells is suggested by several respondents.
- 4.2.19 A need for a new primary school in central Shepton is identified.
- 4.2.20 A need for more car parking is identified by several respondents. Comments include a need for free car parking for the town centre.
- 4.2.21 A request that any CIL money is spent on community enrichment was received from one respondent.
- 4.2.22 One respondent suggests that land east of Fosse Lane could include open space and leisure provision.

#### **Environmental Issues**

- 4.2.23 Retain designation of all current OALSs
- 4.2.24 Protect the railway line to Cranmore
- 4.2.25 The designation of land at the swimming pool and east of the playing field as recreation land under policy DP16 is questioned by one respondent.

#### **Other Matters**

- 4.2.26 Concerns regarding quality of development and materials

## 5. Street

### 5.1 Parish Council Comments

5.1.1 No comments were submitted during the Issues and Options Consultation.

### 5.2 Public Comments

#### **Summary of issues raised in the consultation:**

- 5.2.1 13 individuals and organisations submitted formal consultation responses on the issues and options put forward in Street and a number of people attended a drop in consultation event in Street.
- 5.2.2 Street has one of the most beautiful views in Somerset.
- 5.2.3 More affordable housing needed especially shared ownership and affordable rent.
- 5.2.4 More smaller properties needed that cater to the need of the younger adult population attempting to get on housing ladder as well as older people wishing to downsize.
- 5.2.5 Housing requirement for Street is stated as minimum. Council should actively explore opportunities to deliver housing above minimum. Additional sites should be allocated in street.
- 5.2.6 Housing supply in Street relies heavily on the delivery of the strategic site to the West of the town and the associated Future Growth Area. Since the Part 1 inspectors report was published no tangible progress has been made on delivering this site and it is unlikely that housing will be delivered from 2018 in accordance with the housing trajectory. Whilst the strategic site may ultimately be delivered it can only be later in the plan period. An alternative site should be allocated to come forward earlier in the plan period.
- 5.2.7 Need for individual houses as well as big housing estates.
- 5.2.8 Should be more consideration for self-build enterprises.
- 5.2.9 A grocery shop is needed in the old Tesco store or in the High Street.
- 5.2.10 Development limit should be flexible. Development limit should be extended from south side of street and restricted in low lying ground on north side of Street.
- 5.2.11 A multi-user path linking Walton, Street and Glastonbury should be a priority and must be an improvement on the existing path along the A39 which is poor and potentially dangerous.
- 5.2.12 All of the green spaces in Street need to be preserved to provide “gaps” in otherwise residential areas where people can walk dogs, exercise and be in touch with nature and sunlight.

- 5.2.13 All the designated OALS are a vital component in the unique character of Street which boasts fields, public footpaths, extensive views and even farmed areas within the village itself. Each one is precious, highly valued and none must be lost or eroded.
- 5.2.14 Object to the lack of reference to sustainable public transport links in the town centre for improvements for bus passengers visiting Clark's Village etc.

## 6. Wells

### **6.1 City Council comments**

- 6.1.1 Wells City Council consider that additional infrastructure including improved broadband, health and school facilities, future burial land, cycle track, signage, car parks and a bus station are needed in the City. Additional housing will mean additional jobs are required. A focus on the south side of the City is suggested, where offices have already been built.
- 6.1.2 It is suggested that the City Centre must remain commercial in nature and that redevelopment of the High Street and the old Co-op are needed. A need for additional City centre car parking is identified and the preferred site would be at Palace Fields.
- 6.1.3 The City council supports the policy requiring a percentage of housing to be affordable. More houses for first time buyers are needed. The old Cold Store and land adjacent to Lovers Walk are suggested for housing development.
- 6.1.4 The designation of the existing OALS is supported and some additional sites are put forward. It is also suggested that school playgrounds and play areas should be protected.

### **6.2 Other Responses**

- 6.2.1 53 individuals and organisations have made comments, in addition to the City Council.

#### **Housing**

- 6.2.2 Several developers considered that additional housing is needed in Wells and that housing numbers above those set out in Local Plan Part 1 will be required. There were also comments that housing is not being delivered at the rate envisaged in Local Plan Part 1, affordability is declining as there is an imbalance between housing numbers and jobs, and Wells is one of the most sustainable locations for housing.
- 6.2.3 Several respondents considered that no more than the minimum required housing numbers should be built and that greenfield sites should not be built on. Some commented that development on brownfield sites would be acceptable.
- 6.2.4 Several respondents identified needs for particular types of housing, including housing for older people, affordable housing and homes for first time buyers.

- 6.2.5 Some respondents commented that homes should be of reasonable size and have parking
- 6.2.6 Several respondents commented that the character of Wells is defined by the juxtaposition of medieval buildings and farmland and that this should be protected.
- 6.2.7 One respondent suggested that custom and self build should be supported.

### **Employment**

- 6.2.8 Several respondents identified the value of Wells role as a visitor destination, and suggested that this should be encouraged. Regeneration of the High Street's empty shops was identified as important, as was redevelopment of the Princes Road area.
- 6.2.9 Several respondents prioritised developing employment in the knowledge sector and identified a need for superfast broadband.

### **Development Limits**

- 6.2.10 Several respondents consider that development limits should be changed to reflect current development.
- 6.2.11 Several respondent consider that development limits should ensure that Wells does not merge with surrounding small settlements such as Haybridge and South Horrington.
- 6.2.12 Several respondent commented that the Development Limits should not expand, as the character of Wells was dependant on its context, with medieval buildings adjoining farmland.
- 6.2.13 One respondent suggests that development limits should be extended to include land at Haybridge for sport and recreation.

### **Infrastructure and Facilities**

- 6.2.14 Several respondents commented that land at Haybridge should be allocated for sport and recreation
- 6.2.15 Several respondents considered that land should be allocated for a cemetery extension
- 6.2.16 Several respondents commented that infrastructure such as schools and doctors are overstretched and new facilities should be provided to cater for development. There were also comments that there is not enough playing field provision and allotments are needed.
- 6.2.17 Several respondents considered that more parking was needed, both for residents and for visitors. A park and walk facility was suggested south of the

recreation ground. There were also comments that bus infrastructure at Princes road should be protected and that coach parking was not mentioned.

### **Environmental Issues**

- 6.2.18** A number of comments were made designation of current OALSs and suggesting new ones. One comment suggested that OALSWELLS014 should be removed.
- 6.2.19** One comment identified a number of views into and out of the City that are important to its character. The surrounding countryside was identified as important to the character of Wells by a number of respondents.
- 6.2.20** The character of Wells was highly valued and several respondents commented that it should be protected.

## 7.Villages

### 7.1 Baltonsborough

#### Parish Council Comments

7.1.1 Baltonsborough Parish Council did not make any comments as part of the Issues & Options Consultation.

#### Public comments

7.1.2 Six individuals and organisations made comments.

7.1.3 Respondents commented that no or very limited further housing is needed in the village and that the road network and general infrastructure is inadequate to support more housing. If housing must be built there were conflicting views on whether it should be by infilling, or whether the character of the village would be affected by infilling of the gaps between groups of houses. One respondent felt there is no need for additional employment land and if there was the road infrastructure would need to be improved.

### 7.2 Beckington

#### Parish Council Comments

7.2.1 Beckington Parish Council identifies the distinctive character of Beckington as being an old woollen village, with well treed approaches and historic architecture. Any development that is necessary should be on the eastern side of the village and not extend beyond the bypass. Development on the west side would adversely affect views. However, they do not believe that further development is required. They could support small parts of BECK005 a and b if development were absolutely necessary.

7.2.2 It is felt any development should be small scale and phased and built from natural stone. Eco and self build might be preferred.

7.2.3 All existing employment opportunities should be maintained. There is no need for additional employment land.

7.2.4 Development limits reflect the historic core of the village. Extending development to include sites with planning permission would encourage unwarranted development. They would like to see a commitment to restricting further development to inside development limits.

- 7.2.5 The Parish Council would like to see some infrastructure improvements, to include safe walking routes to school, cycle routes, upgrade of drainage system, speed calming, pavement repairs and a new sewerage system is needed.
- 7.2.6 The PC supports the designation of all the OALS suggested, and puts forward a further 5 sites.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.2.7 27 individuals and organisations have made comments, in addition to the Parish Council.
- 7.2.8 The historic character, rural setting and strong community spirit are amongst the most valued aspect of the village.
- 7.2.9 Many people feel there has been sufficient development in the village and there is no need for further housing and if there is to be development, then it should be in small groups built incrementally over the plan period and not one large estate.
- 7.2.10 Many respondents do not support any extension to the Redrow Homes or David Wilson sites.
- 7.2.11 A need for affordable housing and housing for the elderly was identified
- 7.2.12 It was felt that all sites for existing businesses should be retained in employment use and none redeveloped for housing. There were also a small number of comments that there is no need for further employment land.
- 7.2.13 Many people feel that the development limits should not be changed, but also many that thought they should be changed only to incorporate the building that had already taken place. A few people thought that the development limits should not be altered to take in the new development as this would encourage further expansion.
- 7.2.14 There were a small number of comments that any expansion of the village should be to the west to avoid traffic and sewerage passing through the main part of the village.
- 7.2.15 Surface water drainage and sewerage were identified as significant problems for the village by numerous respondents. There were also many comments that village infrastructure is at capacity, with issues at the school, the surgery and with traffic and parking.

### **7.3 Binegar and Gurney Slade**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.3.1 The Parish Council hosted two public events which attracted more than 80 residents from the three parishes of Binegar, Ashwick and Emborough. The Parish Council have based their response on those consultation events
- 7.3.2 The villages are rural in character and have developed along the network of local lanes. There is no reason to plan for more homes than the 40 allocated in Part 1 of the Plan. High density housing estates should be avoided and new homes should be built using stone to reflect the village's quarrying history. Sewage disposal, drainage and traffic on the narrow lanes affect both Binegar and Gurney Slade. Open areas of Local Significance are supported and new sites suggested at Binegar Fair Field. Flooding is a serious issue in the Parish and should be resolved before further development can take place. Village infrastructure such as parking, school public transport and faster broadband are all issues in the Parish.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.3.3 10 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Binegar and Gurney Slade.
- 7.3.4 Comments received included the need to consider mineral operations, and the potential for noise and vibration, the need to tackle surface water flooding, sewerage and traffic.
- 7.3.5 Residents strongly support redevelopment of the Volvo Trucks site.
- 7.3.6 One respondent felt that Gurney Slade is the more suitable location for development as is a more sustainable location, having road access, facilities, and is not a sensitive location environmentally. Binegar has surface water flooding issues, ground water source protection zone and historic interest. They promote a site on Tellis lane is unconstrained, available and deliverable.
- 7.3.7 It was also argued by a site promoter that the 40 dwelling requirement for the village(s) is arbitrary. This is a sustainable location with capacity for more growth. It is socially sustainable, with facilities and road access, economically sustainable, with employment in the village(s) and environmentally sustainable, being mostly free of constraints.

## **7.4 Butleigh**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.4.1 Butleigh Parish Council provided detailed comments to the issues & options put forward in the consultation paper. They consider that Butleigh should not extend beyond its natural settlement limits i.e. restrict development south of

Barton Road and east of Henley Lane/Back Town. The demand is for smaller houses either on shared ownership or for outright purchase – housing that would help the village demographic or age profile achieve something closer to the Mendip average.

- 7.4.2 The existing development limit is tightly drawn around the village, but does not allow for future development. A limited expansion to include some of the closest sites would be sufficient for the village to grow sustainably without adversely affecting the Conservation Area.
- 7.4.3 A proportion of villagers would like to develop a Village Hall. This could be achieved by extending the existing Pavilion on the Playing Field (off Back Town). Linked to this an extension of the Playing Field is envisaged to allow for realignment of the existing pitches and extra car parking. In the Parish Plan adopted in 2013 a majority of villagers wanted to have a safe pedestrian link between Chapel Lane along Sub Road to the junction with Barton Road.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.4.4 Seventeen individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Butleigh. The main points raised were that Butleigh is a compact rural village and should not be allowed to expand into the open countryside or merge with nearby settlements. Traffic on Sub Road means that development on its western side should be discouraged. Traditional orchards, the conservation area and listed buildings should be protected. An excessive amount of development in the village is not supported, as there is no employment and more housing would generate commuting. Wildlife sites and the aesthetic value of the countryside should be protected. Parkland to the north and east of the village is important to the historic and visual appeal of the place – especially ‘Cedar Walk’ and ‘Park Wood’.
- 7.4.5 It was suggested that small scale housing development of traditional design, close to facilities would be preferable. Potential for flooding to be increased by run off from development was identified at Wash Brook.
- 7.4.6 The recent development at Adam’s Orchard was identified as a welcome and sympathetic development of socially affordable housing that demonstrated it was possible to build new housing stock that was in keeping with the rest of the village. The use of natural stone and pantile roofs meant that this development sits well with the surrounding houses; when it has weathered down in a few years, will be nearly indistinguishable.
- 7.4.7 It was suggested that homes built at Butleigh Hospital should be included in the total for Butleigh
- 7.4.8 The development of small businesses suitable for a rural area, people working from home and the re-use of farm buildings for light industries

should be encouraged, on grounds of sustainability. No further solar farms are wanted.

- 7.4.9 It was suggested that the Development Limit should be extended to encompass the 15 houses at Grenville Court. The development limit could also include other appropriate sites on the east side of Sub Road, with Sub Road and Kingweston Road being boundaries to the south and west. This would keep development to the east of Sub Road which is where the main part of the village is located. Others felt that the current Development limit is still appropriate and should not be increased.
- 7.4.10 Mobile telephone communication links should be improved as signal within the village is extremely poor.

## **7.5 Chewton Mendip**

### **Parish Council**

- 7.5.1 There were no Parish Council comments for Chewton Mendip

### **Public Comments**

- 7.5.2 11 local residents and other organisations made comments.
- 7.5.3 Local residents consider that the village is special because of its historic buildings and open spaces, and views into the village are particularly important. The AONB is also considered important.
- 7.5.4 A need for affordable housing, housing to rent and family homes with outside space is identified.
- 7.5.5 Some people feel that Bathway should be considered part of the village and could provide some space for housing development.
- 7.5.6 A need for recreation space and a childrens play area is identified and there is a feeling that the car park should be protected, particularly as it is important to village facilities such as the shop.
- 7.5.7 It is also felt that it is important to protect and enhance the setting of heritage assets such as listed buildings and the scheduled ancient monument and that the AONB is of great significance and the plan should be based on an assessment of the village's character and history. Chew Head springs and the water course through the village are also considered important.

## **7.6 Chilcompton**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.6.1 The Parish Council did not make any comments on specific sites as they see no need for further development. They highlight concern at the past level of development and argue that further housing development is neither needed nor desired.

### **Public Comments**

7.6.2 16 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Chilcompton.

7.6.3 Key issues raised included the need to maintain the village identity of Chilcompton and the need to maintain separation from Midsomer Norton, strain on infrastructure such as roads, doctors, schools, drains etc, concern about the limited Broadband.

7.6.4 It was also felt that pavements are lacking in large parts of the village but in particular in the lower part of the village where the lanes are narrow and the traffic fast moving.

## **7.7 Coleford**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.7.1 Coleford Parish Council is concerned about large scale or ribbon development. It considers that no further housing is needed and has reservations about development due to the poor and dangerous road access. There is no case for further housing due to the impact on roads and sewers. The housing allocation can easily be fitted into the existing footprint of the village through infill and use of brownfield sites.

### **Public Comments**

7.7.2 62 individuals and organisations made comments.

7.7.3 People value the rural setting of Coleford, with many pointing the relationship between the village and the countryside, with attractive buildings in a rural landscape. In Lower Coleford the historic buildings are particularly valued, whilst in Highbury the extensive views and groups of old cottages are mentioned. Some people value the relative isolation of the village, which is served only by small rural roads. Others consider the road network to be a problem. Many responses mention the mining history of the settlement and features such as the Somerset and Dorset Canal bed and aqueduct which reflect this heritage. All of the existing OALS are supported. Many responses also mention the distinct character and identity of the 2 parts of the village, at Lower Coleford and Highbury, and the need to

maintain separation between them. Highbury is considered to have a little more potential for development, although linear and ribbon development is mentioned as a concern.

- 7.7.4 There was a feeling that no further housing is needed in the village or that the road network is inadequate to support more housing. Others supported only affordable housing or small groups of quality housing. Several comments support the existing development limits and consider that any development needed could be fitted into the existing built up area. Car parking is identified as a problem, particularly in Lower Coleford.
- 7.7.5 Employment in the village is limited, but the sites that exist should be retained. Poor broadband is identified as a limitation.

## **7.8 Coxley**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.8.1 No comments were received by the Parish Council. However, a response was received by the Coxley Community Land Trust who argue that the site put forward offers a unique opportunity for the community to have a purpose built village hub to replace the demolished Pound Inn. They feel that the site is well located, lying at the crossroads of the three communities of Coxley, Upper Coxley and Coxley Wick (geographically at the centre of the community) and would go some way in addressing social exclusion which is of particular concern following the loss of Coxley's only pub – the former Pound Inn. They note that although Coxley Memorial Hall has two rooms for hire, it cannot be regarded as a 'drop-in' centre for social interaction. Sketch plans for the hub which includes a shop, café, bar, restaurant, function room and staff accommodation, have been drawn up and included with their response.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.8.2 5 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Coxley.
- 7.8.3 Key issues raised included the current development limits, which separate the 3 parts of the village and don't allow for development, pedestrian and cycle access to Wells and the special landscape features at Hay Hill and Ben Knowle.

## **7.9 Croscombe**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.9.1 The Parish Council did not make any comments on specific sites, but submitted a detailed application for the Playing Field and Fayrefield to be designated as an LGS, including letters of support from a number of individuals and organisations.

### **Public Comments**

7.9.2 8 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Croscombe.

7.9.3 Key issues raised included the value of green spaces (in particular Griffins Green, Pound, allotments, playing field and play area, The Green, and Fayre Way Field), the importance of protecting views into village from the valley sides, the need to protect the character of the area and the building style. Car parking along the main road and narrow side streets is also identified as an issue.

## **7.10 Ditcheat**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.10.1 The Parish Council is concerned to protect the character of Ditcheat, with green spaces and traditional orchards within the village contributing to views. Mature trees and tree lines around the larger listed houses are also a particular of the village. They consider that no additional housing is needed as the allocated figure is large compared to the size of the village. Starter homes and homes to rent are needed. Existing businesses and commercial enterprises should be retained for local employment and the racing stables is a unique feature of the village. There is no need to extend the development limit other than to accommodate the allocated housing figure. Car parking is an issue for the village and road access is inadequate for the volume of traffic. Superfast broadband and enhanced mobile telephone reception is required.

7.10.2 The church, churchyard and the village recreation ground, which is used extensively by children, are important open spaces which contribute to the special character of the village and should remain as designated. The area of land to the north of Linterns Close should be designated as open space. This space forms a natural break between the modern Linterns Close development and the older part of the village. It also allows a view from the village green away from the village towards Ansford and Castle Cary to the south.

7.10.3 Protection of formal and informal Recreational Spaces designation should be removed from the field immediately south of Smiths Lane.

### **Public Comments**

7.10.4 17 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Ditchheat. Respondents felt that main features of the villages are its orchards, wildlife and countryside/green spaces. There was strong feeling that large scale development would be harmful to the character of the village and several respondents highlighted this desire for small scale development was clearly expressed in the Parish Plan (2012) and at the village consultation day held by the Parish Council on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2015.

7.10.5 Most respondents recognised the need for small scale development, including the building of some affordable housing but consider that smaller individual sites would be more suitable to deliver housing rather than one large site.

7.10.6 Other issues raised included the importance of local businesses, no need to amend development limits, need for car parking, the bus service would not be usable to work in Yeovil, need to protect OALSs and 2 further sites for open space designation were put forward.

7.10.7 Removal of the recreation designation at Maryland farm is suggested as this has not been in use for some time. The designation arose when Barbers facilitated a football pitch for a Sunday Team.

7.10.8 Removal of the designation of land to north of Manor Farm as Traditional Orchard is suggested. The orchard was new planting in pasture land in 1974, and was subsequently removed because it was very difficult to mechanically harvest on the sloping land. The orchard designation no longer displays on the DEFRA mapping system.

## **7.11 Doulting**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.11.1 The Parish Council did not make any comments on specific sites, but requested that the "Glebeland Community Area" (owned and managed by the Parish Council) should be designated as an LGS. It is described as an area of managed parkland with a central area for ball games, woodland walks and an area incorporating a skate park.

### **Public Comments**

7.11.2 9 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Doulting. Key issues raised included the value of the Conservation

Area and historic environment, lack of facilities particularly sewerage, broadband, gas supply, over subscription of the school, journey to work bus service and traffic management. The impact of mineral operations was raised.

7.11.3 Some felt that more housing is needed, whilst others felt that no further housing needed.

7.11.4 A site for designation as open space was put forward at Glebelands.

## **7.12 Draycott**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.12.1 Parish Council supports site DRAY004a, but it would only provide about 25 houses and would require infrastructure. Traffic would be a problem. The PC support retaining the green area designation at the church, burial ground and adjoining field. Designation of the new playing fields is also suggested, although part of this is in Sedgemoor. Amended development limits should include site DRAY004a and any other agreed sites. The PC questions the exclusion of smaller villages from consideration for housing just because they are considered rural.

### **Responses**

7.12.2 59 individuals and organisations made comments in addition to the Parish Council.

7.12.3 The green areas of the village are valued. Draycott is seen as a tranquil village set in agricultural land. The steep slopes and setting on the hills is also seen as locally distinctive.

7.12.4 There is a feeling that any housing development should include affordable homes and homes for young people to rent. A need for 3 bed semis, homes for elderly people and social housing is also identified. There are also a number of comments that none of the sites put forward are suitable, than none of the sites access from Westfield Lane are suitable and that land could be put forward in Rodney Stoke instead of Draycott, as all the facilities are shared between the 2 settlements. There were a significant number of comments about site DRAY004a raising concerns about traffic and access to the site. There were also a number of comments suggesting land of Eastville Lane as a suitable alternative site.

7.12.5 Potential for a small employment site is suggested between Station Road, The Street and Back Lane. There are comments that both no more commercial land is needed as the village is not suitable for commercial traffic, and that more is needed as there are few employment opportunities in the

village. The village pub and shop are recognised as valued commercial facilities. One person suggests that there are brownfield sites for redevelopment in Rodney Stoke.

7.12.6 There is a feeling that development limits should not be expanded to include ribbon development along the A371, although there is little scope for development within the development limits. There are comments both that the west side of the village, off Westfield Lane, should be included in development limits, and that it should not. There is also a comment that any expansion of the development should be on the east side not the west side.

7.12.7 The following facilities are identified as in need of improvement;

- Gas supply
- Broadband
- Parking
- Shop lacks parking
- Zebra crossing for the school
- Poor road infrastructure
- Poor pedestrian access
- Sewerage capacity

7.12.8 There is significant support for retaining the OALS at the church and adjoining field for its wildlife and landscape value. It is felt to be special to the village.

7.12.9 It is also suggested that the recreation ground is designated as green space.

### **7.13 Evercreech**

#### **Parish Council Comments**

7.13.1 No comments received from the Parish Council.

#### **Public Comments**

##### **Summary of issues raised in the consultation:**

7.13.2 16 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Evercreech. Issues raised included concern at recent levels of development, need for affordable housing, lack of infrastructure such as sewerage and healthcare, lack of parking, traffic concerns, need for more footpaths. It was suggested that the Weston Town sports field and land to the east of the village should be protected green areas.

7.13.3 It was also suggested that Newts are present in the pond behind the Bell Inn.

## **7.14 Faulkland**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.14.1 The Parish Council agree with the designation s a secondary village in Part 1 of the plan and do not wish further development to come forward. The Part 1 Local Plan allocation of 20 has already been exceeded by a further 12. The PC consider it is difficult to justify further development given the limited infrastructure and that there is no case for allocating additional sites. Affordable housing would be welcome, as would individual applications to upgrade, extend or redevelop within the built up area of the village. Any local business that provides local employment should be given sympathetic consideration and a local shop would be welcome. Somerset Lavender, Faulkland Inn and the old village shop (now a hairdressers) are identified as important local businesses. The existing development limit is considered to be correct and should not be changed. Infrastructure in the village is considered to be limited and the village hall is appropriately located. The 2 OALS are supported. The shop has closed. There are 2 footpaths and a network of bridleways north of the village.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.14.2 4 individuals and organisations made comments in addition to the Parish Council.
- 7.14.3 1 person comments that sites are needed in the village as allowing minimum numbers only is not in accordance with NPPF and growth will safeguard village facilities.
- 7.14.4 Somerset Lavender is a tourist attraction and should be allowed to expand. The old village shop is now a hairdressers.
- 7.14.5 One respondent suggests extending the development limits to allow a development site to come forward. Other respondents consider the development limits to be correct
- 7.14.6 The 2 green space designations are supported

## **7.15 Holcombe**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.15.1 Parish Council responded with factual corrections, namely that the document says Holcombe is a secondary village but later refers to it as a primary village. They also point out that there is no school, the bus service is infrequent and the post office and shop has recently closed.

### **Public Comments**

7.15.2 8 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Holcombe. The majority of respondents felt further development in the village was not appropriate. Reasons included the loss of open fields and views as well as impact on services and traffic.

7.15.3 Respondents also highlighted updates to village facilities and services, specifically that there is no longer a post office and shop.

### **7.16 Kilmersdon**

#### **Parish Council Comments**

7.16.1 Kilmersdon Parish council consider that the area around the Church, pub and Jack and Jill Hill make the village distinctive, as do the undeveloped fields surrounding the village boundary. The PC consider that no further housing is needed and are against development of all sites put forward. There are no further sites put forward for development and there are no suitable sites for redevelopment. The lawnmower shop and pub should be retained as commercial premises. The development limits are correctly defined and do not need to be changed. There is a need for additional car parking in the village. The OALS in the current plan are supported. The PC consider that Kilmersdon should remain a secondary village.

#### **Public Comments**

7.16.2 7 individuals and organisations have commented in addition to the Parish Council.

7.16.3 The church, the area around the pub and Jack and Jill Hill surrounded by open fields were identified by several respondents as making the village special.

7.16.4 Several respondents felt that there is no need for housing allocations. It was felt that the village should remain a secondary rather than a primary village as defined by part 1 of the plan.

7.16.5 Respondents wanted the lawnmower shop and pub to remain in commercial use.

7.16.6 A need for car parking was identified, but the comment made that there are no suitable sites.

7.16.7 There is support for the designation of all the currently designated open spaces.

7.16.8 One person commented that no strategic flood survey has been done, and the village suffers problems in heavy rain

## **7.17 The Lydfords**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.17.1 The Parish Council commented that the Parish is made up of 4 distinct settlements, but Fairplace is not shown on the map. The settlements are linear in form and this should be replicated in any development. The recent development at Toy Farm does not follow this pattern. There is no need for any further housing as there is no identified need. In principle preferred locations for the development identified in Local Plan Part 1 would include LOF005 with ribbon development along the front, directly adjacent to the B3153, LOF008, with a similar option, LOF012 & WLYD002. Alternatively consideration might be given to WLYD005 & WLYD009 which involve building behind existing houses. This would not however accord with a linear development/'in-fill' approach to new housing. Low cost or family homes were referred to in the Lydford on Fosse 2006 Parish Plan and more recently one villager at a Parish Council meeting has mentioned accommodation for the elderly to facilitate downsizing.

7.17.2 To enable further ribbon development the development limits may need to be extended. There may be a need for a development limit at Lydford on Fosse although current land proposals at Lydford on Fosse should be taken into account first. The whole area around the Lydfords is open countryside and this is significant and matters a lot to the people who have homes here. This should continue.

### **Public Comments**

7.17.3 One organisation or member of the public made representations to the I&O Consultation. They made comments on an alternative site to Toy Farm, which is at Church Lane, extending to 0.37ha opposite Home Farm, adjacent to the development limit and site LOF005 and has good access for the development of 5 houses.

## **7.18 Meare and Westhay**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.18.1 The Parish Council did not make any representations to the LP Part II Issues & Options Consultation

### **Public Comments**

- 7.18.2 Eight organisations or members of the public made representations to the I&O Consultation. They made comments on the potential for sites within the existing development limits of Westhay to come forward for residential development.
- 7.18.3 Although Meare has met its housing requirement some sites have had planning permission for a considerable number of years and still have not delivered.
- 7.18.4 It was suggested that the current Development Limits do not reflect the existing and likely future built up areas of Meare as new development (outside of the current development boundary) now meets the land adjoining Ashcott Road (site ME009). Sites WEST006 and WEST008 should be included within development limits as they are located in the centre of the village and could provide useful infill development without encroaching on the open countryside.

## **7.19 Mells**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.19.1 The Parish Council did not make comments.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.19.1 5 individuals and organisations comments on the issues and options put forward in Mells.
- 7.19.2 1 respondent considers that the local quarries are important in defining the local distinctiveness of the village and they need robust protection from development that might encroach.
- 7.19.3 The design of any new development should be in the context of the village setting and 1 response considers that more than 2 houses could be built in Mells as it has bus links to Frome and MSN
- 7.19.4 The importance of the quarries to the local economy is pointed out by 1 respondent who also considers that development should be restricted to within development limits to protect the local quarries and land south of Top Lane should be designated LGS to provide a buffer between the village and the quarries

## **7.20 Norton St Philip**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.20.1 Norton St Philip Parish Council consider that the village Conservation Area Appraisal sets out what is special about Norton St Philip, which includes its historic buildings, green areas and setting on a hill top. It has been a village of about 300 houses for 100 years and the infrastructure has evolved for this size of community. Since 2007 it has increased to 400 houses but the infrastructure has not changed. It is in danger of losing its special character due to the level of development. There is no identified need for further housing and no broad areas for development need to be identified. The green spaces inside the village contribute to its special character.
- 7.20.2 There is no reason to identify additional sites for development and no further housing is needed. None of the sites put forward are supported. The target set out in Part 1 of the plan has already been exceeded. No sites for redevelopment are suggested and 3 commercial units were built at Fortescue Fields, but there have been no takers and they are now being converted to houses. The shop at Fortescue Fields should be retained in this use. (note; the shop has now re-opened)
- 7.20.3 The development limit does not reflect recent developments but should not be amended to include these as they were not supported locally. Several suggestions for Local Green Space designations are put forward.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.20.4 There was a strong feeling that Norton St Philip is special because of its historic character and that it is a “classic English village”. The rural setting with close knit development interspersed with green spaces and high walls are particularly valued. The strong village community is also valued by local people.
- 7.20.5 There is a strong feeling that no additional housing is needed in the village. The Local Plan Part 1 housing requirement has already been exceeded and none of the sites put forward are suitable. Many feel that Shepherds Mead is not suitable for housing development and should be a LGS.
- 7.20.6 There is a feeling that existing commercial premises should be retained, but no additional employment space is needed, and none of the sites is suitable for redevelopment.
- 7.20.7 Many felt that the existing development limits should be retained. Many also felt that the currently designated OALS should be retained. There were several suggestions for new open space designations. There were many comments about the closure of the shop at Fortescue Fields. (note; the shop has now re-opened)

## **7.21 Nunney**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.21.1 No comments were received from the Parish Council.

### **Public Comments**

7.21.2 11 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Nunney.

7.21.3 Key issues raised included the need to attract young people to live in the village, a maximum of 50 houses should be permitted on the site at Green Pitts Lane, there is potential for development at Ridgeway/Berry Hill and consideration needs to be given to mineral operations. Several respondents did not support site NUNN001a at Green Pitts Lane due to the density of the site and concerns about drainage and traffic. Respondents from the Mendip Society and CPRE Somerset supported this site (in part) as they felt that some development was needed and this site was the clear candidate. The promoter of the site argued that the site is suitable, accessible, well contained and would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. They also highlight that this is the only available site to meet Nunney's housing requirement.

## **7.22 Oakhill**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.22.1 The Parish Council considers that the landscape to the south of the village, as approached via the A367 should be protected or preserved, with no development that would be detrimental to that objective. The land adjacent to the A367 stone wall up to the junction with the A37 south to Long Wood should be included in this landscape preservation. Limited development of low-cost housing for first-time families should be considered, in addition to 'affordable homes', particularly where there is evidence of local employment opportunities.

7.22.2 The Parish Council would support Site OAK003 and any future plans submitted should include, as a minimum, the required percentage of social/affordable housing and off-road parking spaces.

7.22.3 Car parking is needed, particularly in High Street. Telephone exchange site could potentially be used. Heavy vehicle restrictions are needed.

7.22.4 There are potential flooding problems at the Brewery site due to culverts.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.22.5 13 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Oakhill.
- 7.22.6 Many respondents felt there was no need for any further development in Oakhill and that local facilities (especially the school and preschool) were stretched.
- 7.22.7 It was also considered that any future housing should be in-keeping with current cottages rather than large scale high density new build and should have parking available. Traffic management is identified as something that is needed, particularly for HGVs. The current development limit does reflect the existing and likely future built up area of the village and should not be changed.
- 7.22.8 Drainage/local flooding is identified as an issue that needs to be dealt with.
- 7.22.9 It is suggested that the area to the south of the doctor's surgery which formed the original gardens of Pondsmead house and consists of two artificial lakes, grottos, caves systems and other features should be designated. The grottos have scheduled ancient monument status.

### **7.23 Rode**

#### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.23.1 Rode Parish Council point out that the things that make Rode special are documented in the Rode Neighbourhood Plan. They do not feel that there are any reasons that further sites for housing development should be identified and no additional sites are put forward. Housing for elderly people is identified at Merfield House in the Neighbourhood Plan. No sites for redevelopment are put forward as Church Farm already has planning permission for 44 houses. The PC consider that the shop, cafe and post office on High Street should be retained. The current development limit does not reflect planning permissions and should be altered to include these areas. The remaining development limits should remain unchanged and this recognises the importance of open space at the heart of the village. Rode Neighbourhood Plan will recognise open spaces at The Mead, allotments at Barrow Farm, Pux Well, Temperance Hall, Rode Chapel and the proposed Church Farm recreation area. OALS should include the areas set out in the Neighbourhood Plan at the Recreation Ground, Browns Ground, village green and the pathway to Rockabella. The journey to work bus service is under threat and some services have been withdrawn.
- 7.23.2 A representation has also been received from the Rode Neighbourhood Plan Group.**

The Neighbourhood Plan Group support the general principles underpinning the development limits, which have been drawn tightly around the several distinct areas of the village. They consider this approach is supported by evidence from the various Conservation Area Appraisals. However, the Neighbourhood Plan group suggest revisions to the development limits, which include planning permissions which have been granted outside the current limits. A map is submitted detailing the suggested revisions at Church Farm, the Millers House and Clay Lane. The group do not consider it sustainable for the village to accommodate further development in the light of the scale of growth over the last 10 years.

### **Public Comments**

7.23.3 Comments were made by 8 individuals and organisations.

7.23.4 The conservation area is valued and it is considered that it should be preserved. It is felt that there is no additional need for housing and that Rode has met its “target” set out in Part 1 of the plan already. Starter homes or homes for the elderly were felt to be useful.

7.23.5 No sites for redevelopment were identified, and a need for some employment was identified, but not ribbon development along the A361 joining up with Beckington

7.23.6 It is not felt there is a need to extend the development limits.

7.23.7 It was felt that trees at Langham House should be protected

### **7.24 Stoke st Michael**

#### **Parish Council Comments**

7.24.1 The Parish Council has severe reservations about developments which would significantly increase traffic on the north and east routes into the village. As such the Parish Council strongly objects to SSM007 which would exacerbate existing problems which result as a consequence of heavy traffic including a large number of HGVs. It is the west side of the village which is served by the wider road network and although this is not an ideal solution it is the option with the least practical limitations for the village. Further sites may not be required because the 45 identified in Local Plan Part 1 is likely to be significantly reduced as a result of subsequent planning consents granted

7.24.2 The Parish Council is unclear whether additional affordable housing needed, previous surveys indicated need for 6 homes.

7.24.3 The Parish Council suggest that improvements needed to the Playing Field, including: new and larger multi-functional pavilion, extended car park,

installation of adequate drainage, improvement works to the football fields and tennis courts and expansion works to skateboard park. Pavements and enhancements to road network needed to improve safety for pedestrians.

7.24.4 They also consider that the centre of the village has limited open space which makes that which is available more precious and The Millennium Wood should be designated as an LGS.

### **Public Comments**

7.24.5 9 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Stoke St Michael.

7.24.6 A number of respondents called for the residual housing requirement to be updated. It was suggested that once the residual requirement has been verified it is likely that the number will fall to below 30 and therefore could be accommodated within the development limit.

7.24.7 Other key issues raised included a suggestion that the only housing need is for affordable housing, flood data needs to be reviewed as southern corner of SSM007 regularly floods, surface water drainage throughout the village needs to be reviewed as further housing, driveways and roads will significantly alter the ability for rainwater to drain away. It was also suggested that the pavilion at the Playing Field is no longer fit for purpose and should be replaced with a multi-purpose facility.

7.24.8 It was also suggested that traffic and parking issues need to be managed more effectively.

### **7.25 Walton**

#### **Parish Council Comments**

7.25.1 The Parish Council did not make any representations to the LP Part II Issues & Options Consultation

#### **Public Comments**

7.25.2 Nine organisations or members of the public made representations. Issues raised included only allowing limited further development as infill within development limits, the traffic impacts on the A39, which carries a significant volume of traffic, highway safety, the potential for a by-pass in the long term which should direct development to the north of the village, need for a cycle path and improved pedestrian facilities, and a request to refer to development off Brooks Road as Walton, not Street

## **7.26 West Pennard**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.26.1 The Parish Council did not make comments.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.26.2 Eight individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in West Pennard. The main points raised included pedestrian safety issues associated with A361, which is very fast through the village, benefits of attracting younger people to the village and need for more affordable housing, need for housing for older people, benefits of eco housing, need to extend the development limit to cater for new development, spectacular views towards Glastonbury Tor, dark night skies, heritage of the village, need for development to avoid sites alongside the A361 with Newtown Lane being preferable
- 7.26.3 A site is suggested at Laurel Street – there is land which is directly behind the houses on the A361 up to the Red Lion. .
- 7.26.4 WPEN004 is supported because there is plenty of space for bungalows and small houses with gardens, garages and off road parking, with potential to create a mixed community.
- 7.26.5 It is also suggested that West Pennard’s bus service is poor for commuting to work and that the village lacks infrastructure including an “outdoor heart” – no village green or recreation area, poor crossing points on the A361, lack of parking and no shop. This limits the opportunities for casual social interaction. A village green type open space with play equipment, benches etc is needed. It is suggested that these could be provided in association with development of WPEN004.

## **7.27 Westbury Sub Mendip**

### **Parish Council Comments**

7.27.1 Westbury is developing a Neighbourhood Plan. All questions will be answered by the NP and we understand that the NP will be taken into account in developing the plan.

### **Public Comments**

7.27.2 19 individuals and organisations have made comments, in addition to the Parish Council.

- 7.27.3 People value the village's community spirit and the community has grown slowly and organically over the years. The school and open spaces are important for young people. The land east of the village, the Conservation Area and the AONB have visual value.
- 7.27.4 A need for smaller houses is identified, for young people, first time buyers and older people who want to downsize. There is a feeling that housing needs to be accessible to village facilities and that village facilities need to be improved before development can be accepted. There are comments that larger sites are less acceptable than smaller sites. Self build and custom build were also supported.
- 7.27.5 Comments were received suggesting that the industrial estate should be retained, and possibly expanded slightly. A new access should be considered alongside site WSM006 as large lorries access the industrial estate.
- 7.27.6 Comments were received that the development limits should not be expanded to the east of the village, and opportunities to the south and west are limited. One person suggests that land just within or just outside development limits should be considered for development. A site is suggested for inclusion in development limits at Upper Yard, Old Ditch Farm.
- 7.27.7 Several respondents comment that the village hall is small and difficult to access and needs replacing, that the shop is too small and needs to be replaced, and that the school is at capacity and needs to be replaced. The village playing fields and adjacent land is suggested as a suitable site. Other suggestions include a need for pedestrian access to the Strawberry Line. One person commented that improved infrastructure is key to absorbing additional housing.
- 7.27.8 respondents think that all the current OALS should continue to be protected. There are several suggestions for additional sites, including land between Top Road and Perch Hill, land between Lybcombe Road and Top Road, Broadway Hill and Windy Ridge.
- 7.27.9 One person commented that a dark skies initiative is needed. There is also a comment that the key facilities section needs to be updated as the pub has re-opened and a community shop opened. One person also commented that a cycle path from Wells to Cheddar is needed.

## **7.28 Wookey**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.28.1 A response was received from the Wookey Neighbourhood Plan Group, who made a comprehensive representation which they feel reflects the view of

the community as a result of consultation undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process.

- 7.28.2 The main issues identified were the heritage value of the village, support for the current development limit, too much housing being proposed (none of the sites put forward were supported), potential for small affordable live work units, potential for a community shop, need to maintain employment and provide for small industrial and office units. The open space designation was supported for the currently identified sites and further sites were put forward.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.28.3 5 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Wookey. Apart from the Neighbourhood Plan Group's comments summarised above, most of the comments received related to specific sites. The promoter of site WOOK010 argues the case for its allocation for housing and Highways England raise concern about the access for WOOK002.
- 7.28.4 Other issues raised include some support for affordable housing in the village with footpath links to Wells.

## **7.29 Wookey Hole**

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.29.1 St Cuthbert Out Parish Council responded only to highlight that Wookey Hole has no post office, no shop and no school.

### **Public Comments**

- 7.29.2 6 individuals and organisations commented on the issues and options put forward in Wookey Hole. They pointed out that that Wookey Hole has no post office, no shop and no school. They also considered that the commercial leisure facility brings no benefit to the village and that future commercial development should respect the character of the village and demonstrate benefit for the community. It was also suggested that car parking, a recreation area and a village hall are needed. Concern was expressed about potential loss of wildlife at OALSWOOKH005. Concern was also expressed about loss of views towards The Mill, brightness of street lighting, loss of bats and the need to slow traffic.