

This document was exported from Numbers. Each table was converted to an Excel worksheet. All other objects on each Numbers sheet were placed on separate worksheets. Please be aware that formula calculations may differ in Excel.

Numbers Sheet Name	Numbers Table Name	Excel Worksheet Name
Sheet1		
	Table 1	<a href="#">Sheet1 - Table 1</a>
	Table 2	<a href="#">Sheet1 - Table 2</a>
	"All Drawings from the Sheet"	<a href="#">Sheet1 - Drawings</a>

Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
		6	I would like to make a comment regarding Section 6 (Housing In East Coker) and the recommendations with regard to housing numbers within the Parish of East Coker during the planned period. It is my belief that the figure of 65 dwellings to be constructed within the planned period within the parish is to high and contrary to South Somerset District Council's own agreed and confirmed policy on housing numbers in Rural Settlements. The Local Plan states that at least 2,242 dwellings would be built in Rural Settlements between 2006 and 2028. This equates to 14% of the District's housing requirement. The March 2013 SSDC's Annual Monitoring Report indicated that a residual 750 dwellings remained to satisfy the Rural Settlement requirement. Housing growth in Rural Settlements has outstripped growth in other areas of the District and as such it is important to ensure future applications do not undermine the Strategic Housing and Settlement policies that underpin the Local Plan.	John Snelling		There are a number of response on the housing issues associated with the EC Neighbourhood Plan which require a detailed response. This is included within the appendix to this report rather than within these tables to enable the responses to be read and understood more easily and is a comprehensive manner.	See Housing Appendix
Gen			Plan has identified a policy exception housing sites for affordable housing. <u>Has this been recorded properly... doesn't make sense? Mr Lewis exact words! GM</u>	K. Lewis, Westfield Cottage		The plan supports affordable housing provision but the plan does not seek to allocate sites for housing. No changes proposed to the NP.	
46		U9	Description of match photo/visa versa.. Cannot see 'glimpse' of stone, so suggest moved closer to get in and misleading.	K. Lewis, Westfield Cottage		Acknowledged. Considered Photo captures essence of Local Green	LGS need to be considered see note 14 below
24	ECH1		I am concerned that with 65 proposed additional houses, 43 approved and thus 22 more needed, that not all of these should be in the North Coker part of the village. North Coker will have 5 areas of modern housing development. Further housing should be more evenly shared across East Coker	J. Leyton, Burcott, Burton Lane		See 1 above. The NP does not allocate specific sites for housing.	The NP requires a range of housing in line with South Somerset District Local Plan. As planning application
25 & 18	ECH 4 & EC1		I very much support the presumption in favour of affordable housing, and in ECH4 that only small scale sites will be accepted for 100% affordable housing. I would not like to see any developments of 100% affordable housing. If possible a social mix should be required by all proposals.	J. Leyshon, Burcott, Burton Lane		Exception sites should work from a base position of 100% affordable	Housing Needs Assessment to investigate the level of affordable housing need at a local level, the type of affordable housing local people need and what they can afford. Check Policy wording and amend accordingly
23			Planning application 15/05325. Why has the Broadacres proposed development of 14 dwelling (out of 40 to the ECP to be approved) not been finished as yet? Delay in agreeing the section 106 and final design is causing a 'blight' on potential property sales in the immediate area. One specific case so far, that potentially more are likely.	J. Kenneth F McIver - Broadacres residents Group - Higher Burton		Not within the remit of the NP. Noted and thank you for your comment	
53/52	Road Safety		Speed issues and need for 20 mph speed limited required for Higher Burton and the Holywell - White Post roads already identified. By the additional powers and the above mentioned development at Broadacres. Can there not be additional passing places not be Holywell/White Post road, especially as there may be large lorries buses regularly using that route, some cars have to reverse upto 100/150 yards.	J. Kenneith F McIver - Broadacres residents Group - Higher Burton		The NP does not provide detailed solutions for improving routes, these may come forward from the Highway Authority and /or improvements related to specific developme	
24	ECH1		I am concerned that with 65 proposed additional houses, 43 approved and thus 22 more needed, that not all of these should be in the North Coker part of the village. North Coker will have 5 areas of modern housing development. Further housing should be more evenly shared across East Coker	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		See 1 above. The NP does not allocate specific sites for housing.	Check Policy wording and amend accordingly.
25 /18	ECH 4/ EC1		I very much support the presumption in favour of affordable housing, and in ECH4 that only small scale sites will be accepted for 100% affordable housing. I would not like to see any developments of 100% affordable housing. If possible a social mix should be required by all proposals.	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		See 6 above. Check Policy wording.	Check Policy wording and amend accordingly.
27/28	ECEM 1/ ECEM 2 / ECEM3 / ECEM4		Fully support these policies of support and promotion of existing and further business development.	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		Thank you for your supportive comments	
31	ECT1		Support this policy for walking, cycling and bridleway routes. Wish the 'car free' requirement to be emphasised - those paths are a very important facility.	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		Thank you for your supportive comments	
32	ECT2		Agreed with speed restrictions in the village, and the proposals for the virtual pavement between Tellis Cross and the School.	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		Thank you for your supportive comments	
43 / 44	ECCN6 / ECCN7						Comments noted - additional views and vistas to be added
			Comment noted ECNP aims to maintain separation between Yeovil and the village	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		The National Planning Policy Framework para 76 and 77 provide g	
42	ECCN4		Suggest the final phase of paragraph might read '.... as well as maintaining the gap between the villages and the Southern edge of the Yeovil urban area, including at the Keyford development'. I am concerned that the separation of the villages (especially North Coker) from the urban edge of Yeovil is very significant over a wider extent than just at Keyford. <u>Not sure what is meant by this...check original transcript. Checked and the first word should have been 'suggest' but the rest is as written. GM</u>	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		Check Policy wording	Comment noted ECNP aims to maintain separation between Yeovil and the village
31	8.15		I am very opposed to any alteration to the sunken lanes. They are a key and significant feature of the village landscape and character. Though driving on them is difficult there are other easier access routes to the village which should be preferred routes used.	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		The NP does not provide detailed solutions for improving routes, these may come forward from the Highway Authority and /or improvements related to specific developme	
	Whole Plan		I am in agreement with the plan as a whole, apart from the comments above. I am aware of the time, afford and commitment of those involved in the production of this plan and I am very appreciative of their work. I think the whole document is well produced, detailed, well thought through and readable. Impressive! Thank you.	Janet Leyshon - Burcott, Burton Lane		Thank you for your supportive comments	
			River Od - only has one 'd' and is not River Odd	S. Lewis - East Coker Mill		Noted. Check text.	Amend text accordingly
36			Protection of community assets. The village store still existing's in the NDR ratings list - so perhaps should be protected or alternative uses sought. <u>Check spelling/ transcript. Sought was typed as South, I have changed and the rest of the text is as the parishioner wrote it gm</u>	S. Lewis - East Coker Mill		Noted. Not within the remit of the NP to seek a use for a property	Update on village store?
		ECTT2	village signage was always kept to the barest minimum to protect the rural views village so I have concerns over speed signage impairing this.	S. Lewis - East Coker Mill		Noted. The NP promotes highway safety and the protection and e	What say does PC have in signage... this needs to be elaborated re careful consideration of Highway Authority proposals, a number of comments have been made relating to the need of additional signage. Implications on EC2 project list? Not land use? Check Policy wording and amend accordingly.
		ECT1	Footpaths are missing on your maps and some that are there are not accurately drawn.	S. Lewis - East Coker Mill		Noted. Check plan.	This needs to be checked and amended accordingly
		V&V9	Photo does not show the Millennium Stone	S. Lewis - East Coker Mill		Noted. Check photograph	New Photos agreed with SW/JS
56			Difference between households and dwellings. Can any of these be identified to be free up for homes?	S. Lewis - East Coker Mill		Noted. Check text.	Look at plan terminology
21	6.6		Why exclude Keyford -it is in the Parish and there are proposal to integrate it with footpaths etc.	Mrs O Neil - BA20 2JU number 17		Noted. Check text.	Currently the ECNP does not address Keyford in detail because at the time of publishing the draft the SSDC had not approved planning permission even in outline form.
21	6.8		So should we be planning extra houses in the village at all?	Mrs O Neil - BA20 2JU number 18		See 1 above.	The need for additional houses is evidence based following consultation with the community
22	6.11		Bearing in mind policy SS2 and the above I think this number far too high.	Mrs O Neil - BA20 2JU number 19		See 1 above.	Comment noted. Based upon new evidence the numbers are being reviewed.
31/ 41		ECT1	I have found no specific reference to dark skies, which were a much appreciated feature according to the Parish Plan - 'appropriately lit' should at least say 'no upward light spillage' and preferably have no street / path lighting at all	Mrs O Neil - BA20 2JU number 20		Check Policy wording.	Comment noted. Will look at ECNP to include reference to dark skies being maintained as far as possible.
45			Should Wraxall be Wraxhill?	Mrs O Neil - BA20 2JU number 21		Noted. Check text	Amend to Wraxhill
47	10.13		No mention of endangered and protected species eg. Sandy skill (puffball) ??? Or water voles in the stream.	Mrs O Neil - BA20 2JU number 22		Noted. Check text	Comment noted will review text
41	10.5		Is chapel now part of the conservation area as it reads as though it should be? Is the mill in Mill Lane part of the conservation area, on the map it appears not.	Gill Evans - 1 Garden Row, Burton		Noted. Check text and map	ECNP does not seek at this time to change the existing conservation area. We are unclear what is meant by "Chapel" For information the Mill in Mill Close is not included in the conservation area.
31	8.11		This seems like a strong viable alternative to creating large car parking areas	Gill Evans - 1 Garden Row, Burton		Noted. The PC have chosen not to allocate sites for parking.	Comment noted.
32	8.17		Car parking on the roads creates a problem as houses were not built in a car era. Will the council support applications for off road parking areas to be created?	Gill Evans - 1 Garden Row, Burton		The NP seeks to encourage off street parking. Planning applications will	Reference needs to be made to any changes in Policy ECT1
52			Speed restriction signs - are they necessary? They will not be enforced at 2am when infringements usually occur. Traffic calming measures on the road would be preferable.	Gill Evans - 1 Garden Row, Burton		See 20 above	
7			On the display sheet - just opt note that any mention of West Wells Cottage garden as a protected 'greenpace' should not be included in final report.	Pauline Dognall - West Wells Cottage		Noted. Check designation	Comment noted. Review is underway
			I am concerned re the traffic congestion with more houses esp in E. Coker Rd and by the school, also past the Heylar Arms with parked cars.	Monica Whipp - 2 Mill Lane		The NP seeks to encourage off street parking. Planning applications will be considered in reference to Somerset County Council Parking Strategy.	
7			....compatible with EU and convention on human rights - add - or Up superseding legislation	L R Harwood - Newhouse, Burton Lane		Noted. Check text	Interesting point re outcomes post Brexit? Requirement to amend?
24	Housing		The 860 figure is too high. East Coker has been targeted by SSDC for its urban expansion therefore future projections to 2028 should be lower. 850 would be more reasonable. 43 already planning meaning 7 over next 11 years.	L R Harwood - Newhouse, Burton Lane		See 1 above.	
			General Comment. Many thanks to all on the Parish Council for their time and effort for producing an excellent plan.	L R Harwood - Newhouse, Burton Lane		Thank you for your supportive comments	
			No comment to make	Odcombe Parish Council		Noted	

30	8.3		This section seems factually incorrect regarding bus services to Chard and Bridport. These were cut in early 2016, so that the Chard service is about every two hours (the gap varies through the day) and the Bridport service is two hourly in the morning, with a 3 hour 45 minute gap in the afternoon. Of course, there are fewer on Saturdays and none at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Perhaps even more important is that these services are the local link for the north of the Parish into Yeovil. When combine, these services still leave gaps of 2 - 2 1/2 hours into Yeovil, and 1 1/2 to 2 3/4 hours for the return journey, making it difficult to plan, for instance, hospital or doctor appointments by public transport compared to the previous level of service. This recent reduction in services will increase car journeys in and out of the parish whereas the aims should be to reduce these as much as possible.	Terry Rowell, 13 Nash Lane	Noted. Check text.	Amend text accordingly
47	10.13		Hardington Moor is a National Nature Reserve, as well as being a SSSI as stated.	Terry Rowell, 13 Nash Lane	Noted.	Amend text accordingly
10	2.15		Refurther development - must be for meeting local needs - affordable housing vital	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	See 1 above.	
18		EC1	Reassuring that any contrary plans need to demonstrate engagement and consultation with ecpc	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	Whilst the NPPF (paras 188-195) refer to pre-application engagement and	Re-word EC1 to reflect SSDC comments
22	6.10 / 11		this does seem a realistic and positive scenario. Reassured generally by the depth of detail regarding housing development. Need recognised but rural settlement must be maintained.	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	See 1 above.	Check if removing housing number policy will require re-consultation given the number of representations in support and against this policy.
30	8.6		Would welcome 'coloured footpath' from Tellis Cross to the School, as someone who uses that route.	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	Noted. Not within the remit of the NP.	Process for doing this...is this a community project?
31	8.12		Provision of car park at halves Lane - positive idea but.... Hall car park is not fully utilised currently, so would this be used if provided.	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	Noted. The NP does not allocate sites for a carpark. The PC are	Amend text accordingly
34	9.5		An observation - Clossworth and Sutton Bingham do have their own Parish Churches. Should any mention be made of Coker Ridge Benefice. Just an observation.	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	Noted	Amend text accordingly
52-54			Very impressed with the range of issues, projects and actions. It shows deep consideration for all aspects areas and villagers. Well done all.	Judith Shaw - St Michael and All Angels Church	Thank you for your supportive comments	
			The Plan is extremely well laid out and it is obvious a lot of work and consultation has gone into its production. It covers all the issues and sets out the village and its ethos extremely. Well done to all who have been involved. I do have a couple of comments though. If anything the Plan concentrates overly on housing and perhaps not quite enough on the community facility aspects of the village. Perhaps the reference to the absence of a village shop could have been more positive, as I believe this is achievable with the will of the community behind it to make it happen. Other villages and communities have made this happen. Secondly I was a bit disappointed that the only photograph of the outside of the village hall on page 34 was so small. This is such a brilliant facility and one which many villages would give their eye teeth for, as the saying goes, that I would have liked to see it being given more prominence. These comments apart your plan is brilliant. This is a Plan your village and community can be proud of and I look forward to hearing the results of the consultation.	Cathy Bakewell	Noted. Thank you for your supportive comments.	
			Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A303 to the north west of the plan area. It is in the context of these responsibilities that our comments are made. We note that the Plan area includes the proposed Southern Yeovil Urban Extension site at Keyford which has been allocated in the adopted South Somerset Local Plan for mixed use development, including up to 800 dwellings. We therefore understand that as this site is covered by Local Plan policies, it has not been considered specifically within the Neighbourhood Plan. This scale of development has the potential to impact on the operation of the SRN and we therefore look forward to working with the District Council and potential developers in the assessment of traffic impact and the mitigation measures which may be necessary to support these proposals as they come forward. In terms of the proposed policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, we are satisfied that these are unlikely to impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. This response does not however prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the appropriate policy at the time.	Steve Heltier - Highways England	NOTED NO COMMENT	
COMMENTS NEED TO BE INCLUDED HERE AS TH			Letter ...can we link this and we need to do something about sub headings. PROCESS - the ECDNP, it is clear that its primary focus is on the villages themselves, with less attention given to wider issues about the Parish or its relationship with Yeovil (or its other neighbours). This is emphasised by the reference to policy. The NP could cover a small area. The ECDNP . acknowledges, there has been substantial discussion about the SUE and its overall planning status is firmly established. The ECDNP also recognises that the Keyford site accommodates growth for the whole of Yeovil (and is in the form it is to meet the town's requirements and not East Coker's or North Coker's). The development will be subject to national and local planning policy and the development management process – which have the same quality objectives and requirements that the ECDNP plan repeats. POLICY ECH1: excludes the SUE but provides no other guidance on where the additional development it refers to may take place. That process will presumably come from the application of policies in the SSSLP. The policy also fails to make provision for a review of the SSSLP (between now and 2028 when both plans will expire). If this policy needs to be in the ECDNP (and we are not sure it does – Policy ECH1 of the Plan makes no distinction between settlement and parish. It should just apply to East Coker and North Coker, although ECH1 probably doesn't need to be in the ECDNP at all given that it is effectively already in the Local Plan (or other planning guidance), and we recommend that such a reference is added to the end. POLICIES ECCN1, ECCN2, ECCN3, ECCN4, ECCN5, ECCN8, and ECCN9 -the need for these, they do not add value to SSDCLP or national policy. PROPOSAL MAP - inaccuracies and in need of further explanation. A number of suggestions could be made in this light. However, because of the ECDNP's focus (and function) and because the Keyford site is already subject to quality control (that is at least equivalent to that proposed now), as a starting point we recommend that the Plan Area is reconsidered generally and/or that the Keyford site is removed from it.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust	Comments noted LETTER OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE SENTousing Appendix	
			We would like to congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and the Parish Council on reaching this milestone in the Neighbourhood Planning timeline, and producing a very good plan. We support the plan. However, we would like to see the addition of three key areas which we believe are important for the Parish and the Community living and working within it. These are:	Matthorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.	Thank you for your supportive comments	
			1. An additional policy should be added which details the flood management plan within the Parish, ensures that development complies with this, and ensures that developers take all actions necessary to minimise the risk of increased flooding as a result of that development.	Matthorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.	Noted. The PC has looked into the inclusion of a separate flood risk policy. The NP seeks to avoid overlap. NPPF provides strict tests to protect people and property from flooding. SSDCLP POLICY EQ1: ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE IN SOUTH SOMERSET directs development away from medium and high flood risk areas through using South Somerset's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as the basis for applying the Sequential Test, in addition this policy outlines measures which should be included in development ( where appropriate) to reduce and manage the impact of flood risk by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems, through appropriate layout, design, choice of materials and incorporation of methods of flood resilience.	
			2. The ECCN policies should be reviewed to ensure that sufficient wording is included to ensure the protection of the natural environment (terrestrial and water) and biodiversity of flora and fauna throughout the Parish. Currently, ECCN 4 covers this in a very generalised manner, while ECCN 9 covers a specific wildlife designation only.	Matthorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.	Noted. The NP seeks to avoid overlap. NPPF provides protection for biodiversity. SSDCLP POLICY EQ4: BIODIVERSITY promotes conservation, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity and geology by sustaining and where possible improving the quality and extent of natural habitat and the populations of naturally occurring species. POLICY EQ5: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE and associated Green Infrastructure Strategy encourages development proposals to provide and/or maintain existing areas including public open space, accessible woodland, and river corridors, and by ensuring that development provides open spaces and green corridor links between new and existing green spaces. Policy ECCN4 and ECCN9 considered below.	Green Infrastructure Strategy is looking at YSE...check progress should have been adopted October 2016... linkages to LGS and potential policies? Natural England 'Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard' (ANGSt) relevant to LGS designations re standards?

N/A

N/A

			3. Policies throughout the plan should be reviewed so that health and well-being of residents within the Parish is maintained or enhanced as a result of development. Specific comments on this are included as separate responses to the draft plan....where are these. I do not have these and can only assume they were previous responses??-> GM			Noted. The NP seeks to contribute towards health and well being. Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) for significant major developments are a means of assessing the potential health impacts of a development and can help the LPA to make choices about alternative and improvements to actively promote health. HIAs are submitted as part of the planning application for specific development schemes considered likely to have a significant impact on health and wellbeing. For example, major development sites which fall into areas of highest health deprivation. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gave local authorities new duties and responsibilities for health improvement and health protection. The Act requires every local authority to use all the levers at its disposal to improve health and wellbeing. The promotion and protection of health and wellbeing being embedded throughout all directorates and functions of the Council, including spatial planning and development management  The NPPF sets out the purpose of the planning system as being "to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society is recognised by the NPPF and Securing the Future (UK Sustainable Development Strategy) as one of the guiding principles' of sustainable development.	
			The priority of our responses to the draft plan have been marked in two ways. First, responses linked to the three points above have been marked as "Priority". Other responses, which we hope could be considered by the working group and may provide benefit to the Plan and/or the Parish, have been marked as "Observation".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.			
5	Para 1.8		Observation: no mention of the history of the production of flax within the Parish. Should this be considered?	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted.	Amend text accordingly
8	Para 2.8		Observation: This paragraph is disjointed, and the point trying to be made does not come across clearly. Consider rewording or adding clarification.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text.	Amend text accordingly
8	Para 2.8		Observation: The Policy SS2 box, which has been lifted from the SSDC Local Plan, should carry an appropriate reference.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text .	Amend text accordingly
8	Para 2.8		Observation: Fourth paragraph - "... described in section 2.14 below". Section 2.14 is on page 10. not on page 8. Remove the word "below", and replace with "on page 10".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
8	Para 2.8		Observation: Fifth paragraph - "East Coker is a Rural Settlement". It is not made clear in this plan how East Coker has been classified as such, and by whom. It is mentioned in Para 6.14 that the SSDC Local Plan states this. However, we cannot find where there this is stated in the the local plan. Consider providing a reference to back up the statement. We know that the classification is correct, but we should be seeking to back up statements like these where possible.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
10	Para 2.15		Observation: Believe that there is a missing word (or words) in the first sentence. This sentence is also very long - consider splitting into two to make the message clearer.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
16	Objectives Box		Priority: The plan requires a single objective and associated policy regarding flood management within the Parish, and ensuring that development does not contribute to increased flood risk.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		See 53 above	
18	Policy EC2		Observation: Surprised to see mention of speed restriction signs at entrances to village only. It was previously understood that any speed restriction within the village would require repeater signs throughout the village. As a result of this the proposed speed restriction was rejected by the Parish Council. Has this now changed? Further details clarifying this would be useful. If the policy regarding repeater signs has not changed, will the speed restriction be enforceable if signs are only present at the entrances to the village?	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		See 20 above	Needs further clarity re the highway authority and signage. Policy amended accordingly
20	Table		Observation: Missing brackets in 2 cells - East Coker % column, Children 0-15 year old row & Older People (aged 65+) row.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted	Amend text accordingly
22	Para 6.9		Observation: Incorrect word in final sentence. Should be "will grow to 1807" not "will grow by 1807".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted	Amend text accordingly
24	Para 6.14		Observation: As per previous comment on Para 2.8, consider including a reference to the SSDC Local Plan which states that East Coker is a rural settlement.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted	Amend text accordingly
24	Policy ECH2		Priority: This policy should be amended to include affordable housing for young families. The parish needs young families, however the homes should be suitable for them. Homes suited to the elderly are not necessarily suitable.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. The NP recognises that the community needs housing that meets the local housing need. The SG are considering the option: to conduct a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) which would identify the mix of housing required. Affordable homes are negotiated through the planning process. See amendments to policies below.	HNS would help to identify types and mix of housing required, to address this point.
27	Para 7.4		Observation: Second bullet - remove duplicated slash (/)	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted	Amend text accordingly
27	Para 7.5		Observation: Third bullet - remove the word "is"	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted	Amend text accordingly
28	Policy ECEM2		Priority: First bullet should be appended with the words "including residential dwellings". This clarifies that business activities should not impact of the health and well being of residents within the Parish.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check Policy wording.	Amend ECEM2 to be clearer re impacts upon amenity.
28	Policy ECEM3		Priority: The 3 bullets from Policy ECEM3 are equally applicable to policy ECEM2 and should be included. Alternatively, the linkage between the two policies should be clarified - currently the introduction text to each policy suggest that the are independent and relate to different business applications.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted . Check Policy wording	Amend ECEM 2 and 3 and associated wording for clarity
28	Policy ECEM4		Observation: Final bullet is not a bullet but a paragraph in its own right. Remove bullet point.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted . Check Policy Wording	Amend ECEM 2 and 3 and associated wording for clarity
28	Policy ECEM4		Observation: The final bullet appears to be promoting the creation of additional farm shops within the village. Can the village support another farm shop, and how does Goose Slade Farm feel about the plan encouraging competition? Suggest rewording, possibly changing "farm shops" to "amenities". Holiday cottages, for example, would contribute to the rural economy.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted . Opposition to business competition is not a material planning consideration. See policy amendments.	Amend ECEM4 accordingly
30	Para 8.1		Observation: Should say "community have been", not "has been".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
30	Para 8.2		Observation: As the local bus service is predominantly used by Bus Pass holders, is the service viable going forward? Does the amount of money which the Government reimburses the service provider for concessionary travel cover all costs? Do we need to do more in order to protect the service for those who need it?	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Not within the remit of the NP. Noted and thank you for your comment	
30	Para 8.6		Observation: The route from the school to Tellis Cross should be regularly swept in Autumn/Winter to remove mud and leaf litter (which reduces the width of the walk way), particularly opposite Coker House entrance where the path passes under large trees. This could be a standing arrangement with the SSDC Lengthsman, or with County Highways.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Not within the remit of the NP. Noted and thank you for your comment	
31	Policy ECT1		Observation: Fourth bullet. Is inclusion of appropriately lit route in conflict with policy ECH2 - "compatible with character"? Much of the Parish is not lit.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check Policy wording	Check Policy wording and amend accordingly, refer tp 27 above
31	Policy ECT1		Observation: Fifth bullet should be amended to include "dog waste bins".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check Policy wording	Check Policy wording and amend accordingly
31	Para 8.9		Observation: Can more detail be provided on the second bullet please? - "active participation in relieving congestion".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text.	Check text and amend accordingly
31	Para 8.9		Observation: Third bullet suggests that there is already a speed limit covering the whole Parish. As per our comment on policy EC2, further details are required on how the proposed speed limit would be implemented and enforced. Clarification on the current situation would be useful.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text.	Clarification required as per 20
31	Para 8.11		Observation: Can it be clarified why the Village Hall is not being used fully for parent parking? Should we be considering making provision for a walkway from the Village Hall past the Sawmills, noting that currently many of the businesses park on the road outside their premises?	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text.	Check text and amend accordingly
31	Para 8.13		Observation: Same comments as previously given on Policy EC2 and Para 8.9 also applicable here - further details are required on how the proposed speed limit would be implemented and enforced. Clarification on the current situation would be useful.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	See 20 above
32	Policy ECT2		Observation: Bullet 1. Same comments as previously given on Policy EC2 and Para 8.9 also applicable here - further details are required on how the proposed speed limit would be implemented and enforced. Clarification on the current situation would be useful.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted . Check Policy wording	See 20 above
32	Para 8.16		Observation: This paragraph appears misplaced, appearing between paragraphs which are talking about traffic. Suggest moving into own sub-section.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
32	Infrastructure		Priority: There is no discussion regarding road drainage. Highways drains, and the maintenance and unblocking of these, are extremely relevant to traffic and road infrastructure. This infrastructure is important in preventing surface flooding, a problem which the Parish currently suffers with (e.g. at Sawmills). This should be considered further.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted . Not within the remit of the NP.	
32	Para 8.18		Observation: Should read "mains drainage" and not " main drainage".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
34	Para 9.2		Observation: Final sentence - comma missing between cinema and health.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
34	Para 9.4		Observation: Believe that this should be under the title "The Pavilion". The paragraph currently follows on from one under the title "Village Hall".	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
34	Para 9.7		Observation: It should be made clear that the Sandhurst Road convenience store is also the closest Post Office to the Parish.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
34	Para 9.7		Observation: It should be made clear that all the alternative retail provision, including Goose Slade Farm are not accessible by foot for most Parishioners.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
34	Para 9.8		Observation: This paragraph is out of date and needs revising.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
36	Policy ECCF1		Observation: Missing "(" between "protected" and "as". Also, bullets 2, 3 & 4 appear to have a space in front of each statement - makes the bullets out of alignment with the first and last.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend Policy accordingly
36	Policy ECCF2		Observation: Red House and Yeovil Court Hotel are not included despite being mentioned in paragraph 9.9. These should be included.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text	Amend Policy accordingly
36	Social & Health		Observation: No mention is made on the number of clubs and meetings which are regularly held in the Parish and are well supported. It is vital that these are maintained and continue to be supported.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text. The PC have endeavoured to consult and engage with established clubs/groups and this is discussed in detail in the Consultation Statement.	Amend text accordingly
38	Section 10		Priority: This section should take into account the protection of applicable biodiversity designations and the Waterframe Work Directive designation of the River Odd.	MattHorsley & Becky Griffing - 10 Drakes Meadow.		Noted. Check text. See 54 above	Amend text accordingly



21-22	6.6-6.11		Paragraph 6.7 uses 2011 Census data and a Household Occupancy figure of 2.1. Previous comments from the District Council (email from Jo Wilkins dated 6th December 2016) have raised the issue of using up-to-date data such as the 2014 based Household Projections and 2014 Subnational Population Projections. The ECNP group have acknowledged this and will revise at Regulation 15 stage. A revision of the baseline from 2011 to 2014 as suggested by the Council will undoubtedly amend the figures.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above & housing appendix
				Jo anne Manley - SSDC			
			<a href="#">Paragraph 6.8 suggests an 8.5% increase in population and dwellings in East Coker between 2011 and 2028. What is the evidence for this growth? The methodology as set out in the plan does not reflect the PAS Guidance "Housing Needs Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans" http://www.pas.gov.uk/documents/332612/0/PASNP/5cd2a9da-dc5e-4c5c-a982-e2f4a23d3fcc nor is there any evidence supporting the figure of 65 dwellings over the plan period.</a>	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above. & Housing appendix
24	Policy ECH1: Housing Provision		This Policy seeks to inhibit further large-scale growth of the south western edge of Yeovil. The Neighbourhood Planning Group should recognise that as the District's principal settlement, it is highly likely that Yeovil will need to grow in the future and accommodate additional residential and economic development. The Early Review of the Local Plan is underway and evidence already demonstrates that additional housing will be required across the district to support population growth to 2034. The Spatial Planning team will begin to work on options to accommodate this additional housing and 360 degree searches of appropriate settlements will be undertaken to establish potential sites/locations for development. The Neighbourhood Planning Group should not be seeking to constrain parts of the town from future development through this Neighbourhood Planning process as it is not in the spirit of sustainable development advocated in the NPPF. This could also result in community expectations not being met.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
			It has previously been stated by the Council (email 6/12/16) that Policy ECH1 should refer to a minimum requirement rather than an absolute as this is in line with the Local Plan approach to housing requirements. The minimum requirement relates to the application of Local Plan Policy SS2 and recognition of issues surrounding the national requirement for local authorities to demonstrate a 5 year land supply.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
24	Policy ECH3: Provision of Amenity Space		The Policy seeks to tackle an issue that has been wrestled with nationally for some time. The Local Plan has no standards of this type so it would be inconsistent to include them here. Additionally no standards are offered in the policy, the use of words such as 'suitably' and 'reflects' still leave the determination open to assessment which is where we are now.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC			The Basic Conditions requires general conformity to the strategic Policies of the development plan for the area. National guidance contained in the 'Technical housing standards-nationally described space standards' (March 2015) refers to space inside dwellings. There is no strategic policy in the LP relating to internal and external space standards. The NPPF sets out the need to seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings as one of the core planning principles in paragraph 17. Consultation results have highlighted the need to provide appropriate housing for the community. Suggest alternative policy: All new development will be expected to achieve the provision of the following: 1. Sufficient internal space in housing for everyday activities and to enable flexibility and adaptability by meeting nationally described space standards; and 2. External amenity space should be: a) functional and safe; and b) easily accessible from living areas; and c) orientated to maximise sunlight; and d) of a sufficient size and functional shape to meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers; and (e) designed to take account of the context of the development, including the character of the surrounding area.
24	6.17		Although the 2016 Act defines Starter Homes as an affordable housing product, and the White Paper further supports their contribution to meeting affordable needs, they have yet to be formally included in the definition. The current NPPF definition still applies as stated in previous Council email (6/12/16).	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	
24	6.17		Suggest including the words 'up to' before '80%' when describing starter homes.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
24	6.17		Housing Associations are not the only provider of rented affordable accommodation; suggest the inclusion of Almshouses or Community Land Trust.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
24	6.17		The provision of 'warden-assisted' homes is subject to the County Council agreeing the revenue subsidy to provide a warden, therefore these can be difficult to achieve unless provider is private developer.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
24	6.18		Housing Associations are not the only provider of rented affordable accommodation; suggest the inclusion of Almshouses or Community Land Trust.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
			Policy ECH4 requires 67% of affordable housing for rent or shared ownership 'with the balance for 'starter homes' that will be required in line with national policy'.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		As part of the early review Local Plan a number of pieces of evidence base have been produced. The Council published a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in October 2016 which identifies an Objectively Assessed Housing Need to 2034: <a href="https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/862544/somerset_final_shma_oct2016_revised.pdf">https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/862544/somerset_final_shma_oct2016_revised.pdf</a>	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
			This includes the need for affordable housing. The need for affordable housing identified in the SHMA for South Somerset is:	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
			• 11% intermediate housing	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
			• 10% affordable rented, and	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
			• 79% social rented.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
			Does the neighbourhood planning group have any local evidence to support the mix of affordable housing required by Policy ECH4 as opposed to that identified in the current SHMA?	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. <b>Amend text and Policy accordingly.</b>
			As stated above the Council can have regard to 'starter homes' as part of the intermediate element of affordable housing once Government have finished legislating for them – but it should be noted that even the Government have reigned back and suggested a mix of ownership options rather than just starter homes in the White Paper.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
	100% affordable housing schemes should not be ruled out, especially on small sites.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.		
	Policy ECH4 refers to Appendix 2 which details the definitions and criteria of local need and connection and cascade arrangements. The local connections criteria differ from the Council's criteria. The Council does not use the first bullet point as criteria. The Council would not stipulate 15 years in the third bullet point. The Council would not include armed forces/ex service personnel with no connection. Suggest revising criteria in line with Council's own policy.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording.	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly. Check local connection criteria.		
25			Additionally, landlords apply their own local connections criteria. Given this, the ability of the Neighbourhood Plan to enforce their criteria is limited.				See alternative Policy
Appendix 2				Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording.	
			The SHMA highlights that local connection criteria cannot be applied to starter homes how does this link to the application of Policy ECH4?	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording	See suggested Policy amendment above 158
			The cascade arrangement proposed (4 weeks advertising at various intervals) is not normal practice and can result in void periods for the landlord of up to 12 weeks. The Council can effectively undertake the cascade filtering in a single advert cycle with no need for delay – priority is given to those with connection with the target village and only when there are none would the landlord then look at bids from those from doughnut ring – but all those bids can be made simultaneously.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted	See suggested Policy amendment above 158
			This is unlikely to work in practice due to the potential financial burden placed on the landlord. Suggest revising cascade.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted	See suggested Policy amendment above 158

25	Policy ECH5: Conversion of Rural Buildings		Policy ECH5 attempts to positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of the area. The 'rural areas' referred to in the policy are not defined, suggest adding clarity to the policy by defining what is the rural area i.e. outside built form of settlement.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	National policy supports the sustainable re-use of rural buildings for economic and residential uses (no sequential test required), requiring development to be sustainable and recognise the intrinsic beauty of the countryside. Development must be well designed and achieve a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Specifically in relation to residential conversions national policy states that they should lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting. <b>Alternative single Policy on Conversions may require re jig of text but more reflective of NPPF POLICY: Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside - The conversion of redundant or disused rural buildings of substantial and permanent construction which positively contribute to an area's rural character for residential, tourism or employment uses will be supported where:</b> (a)A suitable access to the building is in place or can be created without damaging the surrounding area's rural character and the road network can support the proposed use; and (b)The building can be converted without significant alteration, extension or rebuilding; and (c)The design will retain the original character of the building and its surroundings; and (d)The development will retain any nature conservation interest associated with the site or building, and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible. Text needs to include the open countryside is defined as outside the physical boundaries of existing settlements
			In light of Policy ECEM4: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Business, should the policy seek a business reuse first?	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	NPPF does not suggest this sequential approach. See suggested policy above -164
27	Policy ECEM1: Retention of Local Employment at Halves Lane		The policy is poorly worded - what does no longer appropriate mean? Suggest rewording the policy to refer to a vacant site where there is no demonstrable reuse (following marketing) which is a more robust approach.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Is this Policy needed. When considering LP POLICY EP3: SAFEGUARDING EMPLOYMENT LAND Employment land and premises* will be safeguarded and planning permission will not be granted for development to alternative uses unless it can be demonstrated that the loss would not demonstrably harm the settlement's supply of employment land/premises and/or job opportunities. Applicants will be expected to submit a marketing statement with the planning application, which demonstrates that the site/premises has been actively marketed for a maximum of 18 months or a period agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to application submission. Changes of use will not be permitted unless: - The proposed use is compatible with existing surrounding uses and not detrimental to the operation of existing businesses in the area; - Adequate access exists or can be achieved to serve the proposed development; - The proposal would result in significant environmental improvements or enhancements to the character of the area; and - The site is not in an unsustainable location for the land use proposed. *Class B1 Business Use, Class B2 General Industrial Use, and Class B8 Storage or Distribution Use of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended. NPPF discourages the long-term protection of allocated employment sites where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose, and requires local planning authorities to have regard to market signals. If there is no interest in the site as a result of marketing, the potential of the site for mixed use development including employment must be considered in preference to the total loss of employment. SUGGESTED POLICY: Proposals that would result in the loss of business space at Halves Lane, East Coker must: i) demonstrate there is no market demand through active and continued marketing for a maximum of 18 months or a period agreed by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Parish Council, prior to application submission; or ii) demonstrate that there is no loss of economic performance of the site or location through the provision of better quality employment space allowing for mixed use of the site that incorporates an employment generating use; or iii) The land / premises is / are no longer suitable to continue as business use when taking into account access / highway issues, site infrastructure, physical constraints, environmental considerations and amenity issues.
28	Policy ECEM3: Promotion of Diverse Businesses		Although in line with national guidance, Local Plan Policy EP7 does not support new build live/work units where new residential development would not normally be permitted. This is based on local evidence that illustrates that live/work practices do not work in reality. ECNP policy appears in line with Local Plan as refers to units within established built form of villages/settlements.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted .	SSDC do not appear to be making comment on this POLICY. However, given there reference to local evidence,
28	Policy ECEM4: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Business		Question the ability to secure employment uses when Policy ECH5 supports residential conversion.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	See P25 for related Policy suggestion and commentary.
30	8.2		Please reference the evidence base used.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check text.	Amend text accordingly
31	8.9		Need to qualify that travel planning relates to new developments of a certain size.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check text.	Amend text accordingly
32	Policy ECT2: Highway Safety		These highways matters are for discussion with the County Council. There are however, little projects that developers may be encouraged to fund as part of complying with the spirit of Local Plan Policy SS2.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	This policy is confusing. The reference to potential projects is arguably non -land use and there are issues raised as part of REG14 re necessity for additional signage e.g. see 20 above. This needs further exploration/explanation by the PC. Suggested POLICY - remove reference to projects and re-word POLICY - When considering proposals to improve access and car parking as part of any redevelopment of the existing Primary School and Village Hall site , will be supported where they accord with other development plan policies.
32	Policy ECT3: Car Parking in New Development		Policy ECT3 has implications for parking standards by reducing the ability to park on street. How practical is this policy? Where do visitors park, or do all schemes require visitor parking? We cannot have any policy that is inconsistent with the Somerset County Council Parking Strategy. You cannot stop people parking in the highway even if they have on-plot parking. Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in particular hotspots could be encouraged.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) are legal documents to allow the police or local authorities to enforce road restrictions.  They are used to:  help traffic flow control or direct traffic improve the safety of road users preserve or improve the character or amenity of an area prevent serious damage to roads and bridges Examples include speed limits, parking restrictions (single and double yellow lines), weight restrictions, one way streets, no right or left turns and loading bays. Para 8.17 highlights the need to work in partnership, which is fundamental to success, have the PC looked at these and can cross reference be made to projects (no longer identified in ECT2)within the text? <b>SUGGESTED POLICY: All development should provide safe and suitable access to the site for all people and not cause a significantly adverse impact on the local road network that cannot be managed or mitigated. Development proposals that minimise car parking other than in designated parking areas and discourage on street-parking will be supported.</b>

36	Policy ECCF2: Protection of Community Assets		Suggest inclusion of the following wording after "18 month period", to make policy less onerous and more in line with Local Plan Policy EP15 - "or a period agreed by the Local Planning authority in conjunction with the Neighbourhood Planning group".				See new Policy
38	Policy ECCN1: Listed Buildings		The policy needs to refer to the harm to the "significance" of a heritage asset as the test as to whether a proposal should receive support. Where there is harm the proposal can be approved if the harm is outweighed by public benefit. This will accord with the policy language of the NPPF.	Jo anne Manley - SDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	
41	Policy ECCN2: Design in the Conservation Area		The policy should refer to local colours / hues and the contribution they make to local distinctiveness. It should avoid referring to Ham stone specifically, as the local rubble building stone is not Ham and is the more prevalent material. The last part of the policy suggests that a scheme will be successful if a few token local materials are used. A more general reference to the use of a palette of high quality materials that respond to the local distinctiveness of the area has the potential to achieve the same result, but is less restrictive.	Jo anne Manley - SDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	I would suggest omitting the finer design detail and refer to the Conservation Area appraisals which identify the special characters of an area. Suggested Policy: Development proposal will be expected to maintain the special character and appearance of East and North Coker Conservation Area, especially positive elements in any Conservation Area Appraisal.
42	Policy ECCN3: General Design		Bullet Point 2 – will benefit from rewording; layout, scale etc. are not 'qualities'.	Jo anne Manley - SDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	To address clarity and refer back to principles of EC1 Suggested POLICY: Development must maintain and enhance East Coker Parish's distinctive natural and historic character. Development should demonstrate a design process that has clearly considered the existing context, and how the development contributes to the social, economic and environmental elements of sustainability through fundamental design principles of: i) being of an appropriate scale, density, layout, height and mass; and ii) provide continuity with the existing built form and respect and work with the natural and historic environment; and iii) provide building structures that can be easily altered, particularly internally, to respond to both climate change and changing social and economic conditions; and iv) does not contribute to or suffer from adverse impacts arising from noise, light or air pollution, land instability or cause ground water pollution; and v) utilise unsustainable construction methods, minimises the use of non-renewable resources and maximises the use of recycled and sustainably sourced materials; and vi) incorporate the principles of Secured by Design (SBD); and vii) undertake community engagement, involvement and consultation in the design process proportionate to the scheme; and viii) protect individuals and property from: a) overlooking and unreasonable loss of privacy; and b) overshadowing and overbearing impacts; and c) unreasonable noise and disturbance.
			Bullet Point 3 – the intent is not clear.	Jo anne Manley - SDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	See above
43	Policy ECCN4: General Landscape Character		Amend wording at end of 1st paragraph to read "...maintaining a legible gap...". Current wording is open to challenge, and has no Local Plan policy into which it keys.	Jo anne Manley - SDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	In addition reference to comment 15. Amend policy and insert: maintaining a legible gap between the villages, Yeovil and Keyford and their separate identities. - last sentence of para 1.
43	Policy ECCN5: Heritage Assets		This policy needs clarifying. It looks like an attempt to cover other designations such as scheduled monuments, and undesignated assets like the sunken lanes. This needs to be clearer. The NPPF is clear about the various designations and undesignated assets. The policy should refer to the harm to the "significance" of a heritage asset as the test as to whether a proposal should receive support.	Jo anne Manley - SDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	The PPG states that "Local lists incorporated into Local Plans can be a positive way for the local planning authority to identify non-designated heritage assets against consistent criteria so as to improve the predictability of the potential for sustainable development". (Reference ID: 18a-041-20140306) "Local Heritage Listing Historic England Advice Note 7" (2016) sets out Historic England's guidance on local listing of heritage assets. This advises that communities can play a key role as a Neighbourhood Plan may indicate buildings and sites which merit inclusion on the local list. However the guidance explains that identifying potential properties is only the first stage of the process of preparing the local list. Identified sites then have to be assessed and ratified by the local authority following consultation with property owners and the local community before the list is published. What evidence is there to support the list of non-designated heritage assets in this Policy and are the PC going to follow through and get these ratified by the LPA? Suggested POLICY and TEXT amendments: Text to clarify - Non listed heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets, these can include non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. What status do the Roman Villas have...are they a scheduled monument as referred to by SDC, in which case POLICY ECCN1 would apply. New TITLE - NON LISTED HERITAGE ASSETS - Proposals affecting buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets should ensure they are conserved, having regard to their significance and degree of any harm of loss of significance. Append and refer to potential non-statutory heritage assets in East Coker Parish – this list is not exhaustive...It would be advisable to review the revised guidance from Historic England on the subject to ensure consistency and amend text and list accordingly and confirm in text .The generation of a formal Local Heritage List will be pursued with South Somerset District Council as per guidance in the English Heritage Advice Note 7.

44	Policy ECCN6: Local Greenspace		The aspiration loosely ties with elements of Local Plan Policy EQ2, but it would be better if the wording states ... and the areas <u>managed</u> for their landscape ... as 'protection' cannot be assured.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	See 14 above. There is no single national definition of green space; it can include a wide range of land including public parks, sports and recreational areas, allotments, cemeteries and areas with nature conservation importance. National guidance and Local Plan policies seek to protect and enhance green infrastructure to support healthy lifestyles and to enhance the local environment. The NPPF provides local communities the opportunity to designate areas that are locally important as Local Green Space. 3.55 NPPF paragraph 76 enables local communities to designate Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans for special protection which will rule out new development on them other than in very special circumstances. Paragraph 78 states that the local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. An example of a made policy <b>The areas shown in x on the following page and listed in schedule x – Local Green Spaces on p x are designated as Local Green Spaces. Development on these areas will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances. Where development on designated green space is permitted, any harm to the site's character, accessibility, appearance or general quality will be compensated by the community benefiting from an equivalent or superior replacement green space or funding of an alternative community facility. . Another example of a made policy: The following areas are designated as Local Green Space....list...Development on land designated as Local Green Space will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where it can be clearly demonstrated that the development will not conflict with the purpose of designation.</b>
45	Policy ECCN7: Views & Vistas within the Parish and Local Landscape		Policy ECCN7 has not been amended despite the Councils comments suggesting that the policy needed revising to be clearer regarding the extent of the area being protected and the evidence base supporting their identification (email 6/12/16).	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Have to highlight that the policy would not amount to a blanket restriction on development, which would not accord with development plan policies. The views and vista would benefit with defining between long and short distance views on the map e.g. The short range views are along the roads in the older part of the village which is designated a conservation area and the main entrance roads into village. The long range views are of historic assets from points outside the village. This approach has been adopted in other made plans and supported by evidence from Conservation Area Appraisals. Suggest evidence, map, schedule and text amendments to amplify justification of views and general conformity with development plan, this can be addressed with suggested POLICY : <b>Development should consider the visual impact of proposals on key views (see proposals map on page x and described in the following schedule) and minimise adverse impact on these views through the careful consideration of the design, siting and layout of proposals. This policy has been re-worded as a result of Examination and is in a made plan.</b>
			Additionally, this policy is open to challenge – most are general views, some quite arbitrary. The 'protection' of views has no explicit Local Plan or NPPF basis, nor is there an evidence base that makes a reasoned case for its inclusion. A general policy that states support for the conservation of 'designed' views relative to heritage assets; and open land where integral to the setting of Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, would have greater credibility.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	See 182 above
47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land		As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Para 112 of NPPF states Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. Suggested POLICY example: <b>Development on High Quality Agricultural Land</b> The best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will be protected from development not associated with agriculture or forestry. Planning permission for development affecting such land will only be granted exceptionally if there is an overriding need for the development and either: 1. Sufficient land of a lower grade (Grades 3b, 4 and 5) is unavailable or available lower grade land has an environmental value recognised by a statutory wildlife, historic, landscape or archaeological designation and outweighs the agricultural considerations. Or 2. The benefits of the development justify the loss of high quality agricultural land. If best and most versatile land needs to be developed and there is a choice between sites in different grades, land of the lowest grade available must be used except where other sustainability considerations, including intrinsic nature conservation value of a site, outweigh land quality issues. E.g. Planning permission will be refused for development on Grade 1 agricultural land unless it:- a) involves the development of land for the purposes of agriculture and forestry; or it b) involves the development of local community facilities, and informal open space where this meets an exceptional and identified community need. For criterion b) it must additionally be proven that lower grade agricultural land is not available (Grades 2, 3, 4, 5). A sequential approach should be taken whereby land of lower quality is developed in preference to higher grade agricultural land. For example Grades 3b, 4, and 5 to be developed in preference to Grades 1, 2, 3a and then Grades 2 and 3a in preference to Grade 1.
47	Policy ECCN9: Wildlife Habitats		Policy appears to be onerous and not in accordance with paragraph 118 of the NPPF which allows development to occur with suitable mitigation or compensation measures. Suggest revising policy.	Jo anne Manley - SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Suggest omitting Policy in reference to SSDC POLICY EQ4: BIODIVERSITY All proposals for development, including those which would affect sites of regional and local biodiversity, nationally and internationally protected sites and sites of geological interest, will: · Protect the biodiversity value of land and buildings and minimise fragmentation of habitats and promote coherent ecological networks; · Maximise opportunities for restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats; · Incorporate beneficial biodiversity conservation features where appropriate; · Protect and assist recovery of identified priority species; and · Ensure that Habitat Features, Priority Habitats and Geological Features that are used by bats and other wildlife are protected and that the design including proposals for lighting does not cause severance or is a barrier to movement. Where there is a reasonable likelihood of the presence of protected and priority species development design should be informed by, and applications should be accompanied by, a survey and impact assessment assessing their presence. If present, a sequential approach to the design of the proposal should be taken that aims first to avoid harm, then to lessen the impact, and lastly makes compensatory provision for their needs. Development will not be allowed to proceed unless it can be demonstrated that it will not result in any adverse impact on the integrity of national and international wildlife and landscape designations, including features outside the site boundaries that ecologically support the conservation of the designated site.
			Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A303 to the north west of the plan area. It is in the context of these responsibilities that our comments are made.	Steve Heltier - Highways England			
			We note that the Plan area includes the proposed Southern Yeovil Urban Extension site at Keyford which has been allocated in the adopted South Somerset Local Plan for mixed use development, including up to 800 dwellings. We therefore understand that as this site is covered by Local Plan policies, it has not been considered specifically within the Neighbourhood Plan. This scale of development has the potential to impact on the operation of the SRN and we therefore look forward to working with the District Council and potential developers in the assessment of traffic impact and the mitigation measures which may be necessary to support these proposals as they come forward.	Steve Heltier - Highways England			
			In terms of the proposed policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, we are satisfied that these are unlikely to impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. This response does not however prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the appropriate policy at the time	Steve Heltier - Highways England			
			Having inspected the draft plan they confirm that they have no comments to make.	Terry Sneller, Local Plan Team Leader, Dorset Councils Partnership			
			We are impressed by the Plans vision to address local needs while protecting and enhancing the areas unique history and heritage. We note this is a general underpinning theme, and reflected explicitly in the policies f Section 10 on the Built and Natural Environment. In that the plan is not specifically allocating identified ties for development there are no detailed comments that we wish to offer. We would therefore only want to congratulate your community on its progress to date and wish it well in the making of the plan.	David Stuart - Historic Places Advisor			

			The Plan is extremely well laid out and it is obvious a lot of work and consultation has gone into its production. It covers all the issues and sets out the village and its ethos extremely. Well done to all who have been involved. I do have a couple of comments though. If anything the Plan concentrates overly on housing and perhaps not quite enough on the community facility aspects of the village. Perhaps the reference to the absence of a village shop could have been more positive, as I believe this is achievable with the will of the community behind it to make it happen. Other villages and communities have made this happen. Secondly I was a bit disappointed that the only photograph of the outside of the village hall on page 34 was so small. This is such a brilliant facility and one which many villages would give their eye teeth for, as the saying goes, that I would have liked to see it being given more prominence. These comments apart your plan is brilliant. This is a Plan your village and community can be proud of and I look forward to hearing the results of the consultation.	Cathy Bakewell		
5,7,8,18,32,52,53		1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 5.4, 8.18 and Appendix 2	In Sections 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5 & 2.8 are many good words that include consideration of the health of the local society, using sound science responsibly and respecting human rights as well as the principles localism, SS2 putting it nearly that 'proposal' should generally have the support of the local community following robust engagement and consultation. If the plan is to mean anything then its primary objectives and purpose are clearly paramount and the parts of the plan need to be consistent with those (i.e. well-being, compatible with Human Rights, ensuring a strong, healthy and just society, using sound science responsibly...) However, mentioned in 3 other areas of the plan (p18, para 5.4, p32, para 8.18 and Appendix 1 'improve comms across parish) is the concept of extending mobile reception or coverage. They way this is typically achieved is by adding more mobile masts in the community either as 'telegraph pole, lookalikes or atop buildings such as churches. There does not seem to be a strong DEMAND conveyed in the Plan for such a direction which is a very good thing, but if increased mobile coverage is followed up as able, this would be inconsistent with the plan purpose and objectives and will assuredly result in the death - knell of the community. The reasons for this are set out as follows. Refer to appendix	Neil Boxall	1	
5	1.4		Not included into his draft but to be included in the final plan will be a 'basic conditions' statement. I understand from discussions with your consultant at the last open session (11/3/17) that this will include statements to verify compliance with various national and local policies that have precedence. Considering, for example, the current pressure on the Government to free up more green belt land for development it is assumed that the robustness and durability of this plan could still be subject to amendment permitted into he flow down from the scope permitted within the legislative order of precedence.	Dr Peter Burrows		
7	2.2		I was informed by your consultant that consideration of the eur obligations had little or no material impact on the development of the neighbourhood plan. Thus Brexit would not appear to have material impact either.	Dr Peter Burrows		
16	4.2		Conservation Objective - To support the retention and enhancement of the existing Conservation Areas in East and North Coker' This key statement noted for reference with respect to comments below.	Dr Peter Burrows		
18	EC2		"Footpaths and signage, including linking the villages and the new community at Keyford". It is not clear what benefits this would bring to the objective stated in Sect. 4.2 (reference above). Linking urban and rural areas can bring readily visible benefits to the inhabitants of the urban area. Considerations against the Conservation Objective would be the possibility of: Increased vandalism, greater dog mess, increased littering, inappropriate usage (trailbikes on footpaths)	Dr Peter Burrows		
18	EC		"Speed restriction signs at the entrances to the Villages". Again, at the last open session I was informed that speed limit restriction signs could be placed at the entrances to the village and these would remind drivers of the need for speed control in our residential area. These would be beneficial but would not be legally enforceable. An enforceable limit would require legal institution and would most likely require a greater increase in street furniture (repeated signs, lighting, etc.) The latter would be unwelcome and contrary to the Section 4.3 objective.	Dr Peter Burrows		
21	6.4 to 6.6 and 6.10		"The District Council's Local Plan Housing Strategy limits housing growth in Rural Settlements to approximately 14% of the district wide requirement... Development in the Parish... Should be in broad conformity". Clearly there is a non-conformity or major disconnect here caused by the distortion of the Keyford development to the parish of East Coker. In consideration of the practicalities, the policy to plan for a lower percentage growth in the parish, excluding the Keyford numbers as expressed in 6.6, would seem to be entirely logical, further, this should be limited to appropriate small developments that demonstrate sufficient benefits both to the rural community/environment and meeting the objective of Section 4.2 in conservation areas. The contradiction now appears in 6.10 which refers to the aspiration being "higher than would be expected in many Rural Settlements". Vibrant Rural Settlement - Yes.... Creeping urbanisation - No thank you.	Dr Peter Burrows		
30	8.7		Disabled access is vital and important consideration which should be given good support. Careful implementation will be required to ensure that it is done in a sensitive manner to avoid possible detriment to the rural environment as reference in comments w.r.t. EC2, above.	Dr Peter Burrows		
31	ECT1		Great care needs to be taken over the lighting of routes with respect to the potential loss of "dark skies" in the rural area in general and the effect on the conservation area in particular.	Dr Peter Burrows		
31	8.9 and 8.13		There are currently no speed limits/signs in the village (except national regulation and in local areas such as 20 mph near the school, etc). Signs at entry and exit might improve safety. Has the Parish Council evaluated the successfulness of alternatives such as speed limited chicanes at entry and exit? An advantage might also be the reduction in 'rat run' usage through the village. A disadvantage might be the problems posed to large delivery vehicles and farm tractors/trailers.	Dr Peter Burrows		
			Footnote: Whilst the plan will never please all the people all the time, I would like to complement the team for the obvious effort put into it by them and many others (not mentioned). It is a quite comprehensive but a few apparent conflicts need to be resolved.	Dr Peter Burrows		
2	Foreword		Congratulations - at last the signs of a document nearing the final version. Whilst it may be difficult to identify all the individuals and organisations (other than the Parish Council) who have contributed over many years to this document, I believe it deserves a stronger statement of recognition and thanks to all those who have done so! To quote Isaac Newton 'if I have seen further than others, it is by standing upon the shoulder of giants'.	Sarah Owen		
8	2.6		..... In which East Coker Parish Council and other East Coker organisation and individuals fully participated.	Sarah Owen		
10	2.14		East Coker Parish Council and other East Coker organisation and individuals participated...	Sarah Owen		
10	2.15		East Coker Preservation Trust	Sarah Owen		
10	2.17		This statement gives the impression that the nature of the footpaths between the village and the Keyford area may be changed in the future. It has already been suggested in the development proposal for Keyford that part of the Monarch's Way will be pave. This approach is not conducive to the conservation and landscape objectives of the Neighbourhood plan.	Sarah Owen		
13	3.5		Parish Newsletter - Do you mean the East Coker Society Newsletter? If you do, then please say so.	Sarah Owen		
18	5.4		Potential Future Projects. Footpaths and signage, including linking the villages and the new community at Keyford, see comment for 2.17. Speed restriction signs at the entrances to the village, is there evidence that this will make any difference and have other approaches been considered, bearing in mind that too much signage detracts from the nature of the rural settlement?	Sarah Owen		
22	6.1		Why express a projected populating growth that is higher than other rural settlements? This just sets an unrealistic need for housing, which is already catered for in the Keyford Urban Extension. Has sufficient consideration been given to the increase of older people in the projections?	Sarah Owen		
30	8.7		It is commendable to consider the provision of footpaths for people with disabilities, but this needs opt be done in accordance with the conservation and landscape objectives, i.e., not introducing paving inappropriately.	Sarah Owen		
31	ECT1		This policy contradicts Objectives in Section 10 and policies such as ECCN4, ECCN5. There seems to be too much focus on establishing links between Keyford and East Coker Village, which seems to indicate inappropriate increased urbanisation.	Sarah Owen		
31	8.9		Speed limit signs will merely indicate the permissible speed, which is inappropriately high for most of the roads in the village and will not be enforceable.	Sarah Owen		
31	8.1		Have school staff been asked to use car parking spaces within the school or at the Village Hall rather than occupying space on the road? This would at least set an example to parents.	Sarah Owen		
31	8.11		The use of the Village Hall car park for school use needs to be encourage much more by the School and the parents Teachers Association.	Sarah Owen		
31	8.12		If the village Hall Car Park is not being utilised, then it is not appropriate to tarmac further green fields for School parking purposes.	Sarah Owen		
31	8.13		See comment for 8.9	Sarah Owen		
32	ECT2		See comment for 8.9	Sarah Owen		
39	Section 10 map		The map of the parish needs a title and reference. There are numerous omissions not his map, including existing footpaths and location of approved planning applications. The Monarch's Way needs to be labelled and marked distinctly (as on OS maps) from other footpaths as this is of major historical significance. it is an important asset and therefore needs opt be mentioned in the text.	Sarah Owen		
41	10.6		The statement relating to 'statutory responsibilities for the District Council...' gives the impression that the Parish Council are not interested in pursuing any extensions to the 2 conservation areas. In 2015 the neighbourhood plan sub committee were invited and authorised by the Parish Council to work with the District Council in reviewing the Conservation Areas. It should not be left for the Distract Council to progress alone!	Sarah Owen		
45-46			Include a further proposed view and vista from Patchlake Cottages towards pavoyotts and Darvole.	Sarah Owen		
47	ECCN8		It is outrageous that SSDC have agreed to development of Grade 1 agricultural land. Future generations will suffer from the loss of such a vital resource. With this in mind, remove ' unless there is no practicable alternative and the importance of the development outweighs the need to protect the best and most versatile land'	Sarah Owen		
			Dark Skies - There is no reference anywhere to the importance of retaining our existing dark skies. This is one of the key attributes of our rural are and provides the distinction from urban areas. A policy is required about light pollution.	Sarah Owen		
54			Regular Newsletters - these are published and distributed by East Coker Society. ECPC contribute content.	Sarah Owen		
54			Monthly film nights have been set up and run by East Coker Hall Charitable Trust since 2016.	Sarah Owen		
			Typos and omissions - I have marked up a copy of the document. It would make sense to identify further proof reading of the final plan by a team who have not been involved in the document preparation.	Sarah Owen		
			20 Housing Objective It is noted that the housing objective set out the in the Neighbourhood Plan aims 'to encourage the delivery of appropriate housing, including affordable housing, to meet the whole life needs of the local community of East Coker'. It is of course key that the the housing needs of the East Coker community area met and that the Neighbourhood Plan provides for such current and future accommodation. This specifically relates to the need for housing in rural settlements. However, as detailed in comments made below in response to draft Policy ECH1, it is considered that the East Coker Parish area should actually have a wider housing role. Due to its geographical proximity to the defined Yeovil Development Area, the very northern reaches of the Parish Boundary have a role to play in accommodating growth associated with the Strategically Significant Town of Yeovil, which is the prime focus for new development, according to the adopted Local Plan (Policy S51). In light of this its is recommended that the stated Housing Objective of the Neighbourhood Plan be revised to reflect the dual roles of the Parish area in relation to new housing. 24.6.13 It is noted that reference is made to proposals in the area which are at the pre-application stage. For clarity we set out below a summary of the latest position in relation to our client's site, which is currently the subject of pre-application discussions with Council officers. Current Pre-Application Discussion for Land to the East of Holywell The site being promoted by our client, land to the East of Holywell, is at the pre-application stage (ref. 17/00941/PREAPP) and is currently being considered by South Somerset officers.	Brooke Smih Planning		The complete form is Appendix 2 as the drawings are within text but would not copy over



		On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.	Gladman Developments Team		
		On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the ECNP's ability to meet basic condition (a) and (d) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Relationship to Local Plan	Gladman Developments Team		
		The current development plan that covers the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan area and the development plan which the ECNP will be tested against is the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 to 2028, adopted in March 2015. Within this plan both East Coker and North Coker are classed as Rural Settlements which are considered as part of the countryside to which national countryside protection policies apply.	Gladman Developments Team		
		However, due to the proximity of the Neighbourhood Area to Yeovil, the largest settlement in South Somerset, the plan should not be presented in a way that may have the effect of restricting development coming forward on the edge of Yeovil.	Gladman Developments Team		
		East Coker Neighbourhood Plan	Gladman Developments Team		
		Gladman raises concerns with several policies currently contained within the plan and submits that as written these policies do not meet the basic conditions. These concerns will be detailed below.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Policy ECH1: Housing Provision	Gladman Developments Team		
		This policy sets a target for 65 additional new dwellings for the Parish within the plan period without specifying whether this is a minimum or maximum figure. The wording of this policy should be modified to state this will be regarded as a minimum or at least, in order to have regard to the flexible approach of the Framework in significantly boosting the supply of housing.	Gladman Developments Team		
		If it were to be a maximum it is considered that the plan would not meet basic condition (a) as the examiner of the plan should not find it appropriate to make the plan having regard to the Framework and its objectives of significantly boosting the supply of housing.	Gladman Developments Team		
		It is also not considered appropriate to set a level of growth for the Parish which is adjacent to Yeovil, the largest town in South Somerset. Suggesting a level of growth could result in restricting development coming forward on the edge of Yeovil that would otherwise be perfectly sustainable. PPG states:	Gladman Developments Team		
		'All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas - and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.'	Gladman Developments Team		
		Therefore, Gladman recommends deleting the dwelling target to comply with basic conditions (a) and (d).	Gladman Developments Team		
		Policy ECH4: Affordable and Social Housing	Gladman Developments Team		
		This policy seeks for affordable housing on all sites more than 10 dwellings and only in exceptional circumstances will off site provision or a commuted sum in lieu of onsite provision be acceptable. This does not accord with the Framework; the only exceptional circumstances test refers to Local Green Space. In terms of affordable housing the Framework is clear that affordable housing needs should be met on site unless offsite provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified, this is not as restrictive as an exceptional circumstances test.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Policy ECCN 6 Local Green Space	Gladman Developments Team		
		This policy designates areas as Local Green Space however Gladman contends that this policy is not appropriately worded to accord with the Framework. The policy fails to mention that development of LGS can be considered appropriate in very special circumstances. Gladman suggests this policy be modified to reflect this as it is currently considered a more restrictive policy than the Framework.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Conclusions	Gladman Developments Team		
		Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the ECNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a) and (d). Setting a housing target could mean that sustainable development is restricted from coming forward on the edge of Yeovil and the wording of several policies does not accord with the Framework.	Gladman Developments Team		
		Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.	Gladman Developments Team		
			Gladman Developments Team		
		Comments made on behalf of the Wessex Farms Trust	Savills Wessex Farm Trust	The table referred to is appendix 3, but is within the letter	
		Savills has provided planning advice to the Wessex Farms Trust (WFT) for a number of years. WFT is the owner of part of the southern Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) which is also known as Keyford and sits on the edge of Yeovil. The site is allocated for comprehensive development in the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and once completed will include 800 new homes, business space, a primary school, a health centre, and a neighbourhood centre. A planning application has been submitted for the whole of the site and is currently being considered by the District Council (SSDC).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		The East Coker Draft Neighbourhood Plan (ECDNP) recognises this position and devotes some time to the Keyford site. We have reviewed what it says at this draft stage and would like to make a small number of comments that should improve the Plan and its performance. These short comments fall under five headings and are set out below. I trust this an acceptable format - but please let me know if you would like me to complete the forms instead.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		The Neighbourhood Plan Area	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		The first two points concern the area that the Neighbourhood Plan covers.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		On one hand we appreciate the rationale for extending the Plan area to the whole of the Parish (as this can inform the reaction of the District Council to the overall concept). However, from a review of the ECDNP, it is clear that its primary focus is on the villages themselves, with less attention given to wider issues about the Parish or its relationship with Yeovil (or its other neighbours).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		This theme is reinforced by the references to the key planning policy framework for the ECDNP. Putting to one side the SUE, the early parts of the ECDNP concentrate on Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (SSLP). That policy relates to rural settlements and is linked to Policy SS1 which sets out the settlement hierarchy in South Somerset. East Coker and North Coker are obviously rural settlements and therefore Policy SS2 applies, but the whole parish is not.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		1 This is important because Policy ECH1 of the Plan makes no distinction between settlement and parish. It should just apply to East Coker and North Coker, although ECH1 probably doesn't need to be in the ECDNP at all given that it is effectively already in the Local Plan (or other planning guidance).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		On this basis the ECDNP could cover a smaller area and perform the same function (or meet the same objectives).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		Inclusion of the Keyford site	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		This point (about extent), is especially relevant to the treatment of the Keyford site. As the ECNDP acknowledges, there has been substantial discussion about the SUE and its overall planning status is firmly established. The ECDNP also recognises that the Keyford site accommodates growth for the whole of Yeovil (and is in the form it is to meet the town's requirements and not East Coker's or North Coker's). The development will be subject to national and local planning policy and the development management process - which have the same quality objectives and requirements that the ECDNP plan repeats.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		A number of suggestions could be made in this light. However, because of the ECDNP's focus (and function) and because the Keyford site is already subject to quality control (that is at least equivalent to that proposed now), as a starting point we recommend that the Plan Area is reconsidered generally and/or that the Keyford site is removed from it.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		Policy ECH1	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		This approach should also resolve our third comment, which concerns policy ECH1. As it stands, this policy excludes the SUE but provides no other guidance on where the additional development it refers to may take place. That process will presumably come from the application of policies in the SSLP. The policy also fails to make provision for a review of the SSLP (between now and 2028 when both plans will expire). If this policy needs to be in the ECDNP (and we are not sure it does - see footnote on previous page), then we recommend that such a reference is added to the end.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		The Need for Policies ECCN1, ECCN2, ECCN3, ECCN4, ECCN5, ECCN8, and ECCN9	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		This approach could help to shorten other parts of the ECDNP too. At the moment most of the Policies in section 10 do not add anything to controls already in place through the SSLP or national planning policy and guidance. The following table identifies which policies in the Local Plan and paragraphs within the NPPF cover the various matters set out in policies ECCN1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9:	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		Neighbourhood Plan Policy South Somerset Local Plan Policy NPPF Paragraph Number	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		Whilst policies ECCN6 and ECCN7 do add a local or extra dimension, the above policies could therefore be removed.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		Proposals Map	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		Our final comment is a request for some changes or additions to the proposals map. Assuming that the references made within the document are to the plan that is on pages 39 and 40 of the ECDNP, then we recommend that it is checked to ensure that all of the features it should show are actually shown. At the moment we think that some may be missing (or could benefit from extra explanation). In addition, and if our recommendation, above (about extent) is accepted then the boundary of the plan could be changed.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		
		These comments are meant to be helpful and I hope they are clear. If you need to discuss any of the matters raised do please call or contact me.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		



















