

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Strategy](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Creech St Michael Parish Council
Date: 13 March 2020 14:10:42
Attachments: [SWTC Local Plan Consultation Response from CSM PC 13 3 2020.pdf](#)

Please find enclosed the response from CSM PC to your consultation exercise on the SWTC Local Plan 2040.

There are four parts;

1. An overview and wider statement.
2. Issues with Land South of Manor Farm Langaller Dev Site
3. Issues with MH Dev site
4. Responses to your specific consultation questions.

Please accept the PC thanks for consulting,

Steve
Clerk
CSM PC

SWTC Local Plan Consultation 2040 – Response from CSM PC 10 3 2020

CSM PC feels that the TDBC was too enthusiastic in embracing the Governments Housing agenda and counsels that SWTC should determine its own revised figure based on need which should be lower than those put forward in the consultation options. It appreciates that this may need you to have a basis for a lower figure and to argue the case. The PC supports the distribution of development (Topic Paper 1 Option D) with concentration of development being focused on Taunton.

The Council is mindful that the plan period extends to 2040 and therefore has considered likely to emerge issues in the plan period. The CSM PC does not want to see further building east of the M5. To be clear this includes building in Henlade/along the old A358 once the A358 (A303) is duelled and Henlade bypassed AND it includes the former Crown Estate Land now owned by Taylor Wimpey.

Turning to Settlement Tiers. CSM PC does not wish to have a repetition of the current plan experience where having been designated as a Minor Rural Centre and having just had the Hollingworth Estate built out CSM then found itself immediately taking the brunt of the minor rural allocation and getting three more developments. The PC was disappointed in the last plan with the wording which stated MRCs should have at least 250 houses and that the Planning Authority did not protect CSM in order to ensure a more equitable sharing of the 250 homes across all 5 villages. CSM PC wishes to be recognised as a Village not a MRC. The PC suggests that MRC and Village categories become one and they become a single tier - and that protection from development is provided to both any one Village from getting an unfair share and Villages close to the M5 (Opposite to Option 2Cvi and in line with Option 8aiii)).

In fact, the Districts Historic villages should be protected from coalescence and development. Given the amount of housing land allocated in the Parish and developments permitted in the village CSM PC does not wish to see its Planning development boundaries changed for either CSM Village or Creech Heathfield. Small Scale development should be identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and not be imposed by DC. The new Local Plan should provide for Traffic Calming to be done in existing villages.

The Parish already has two large designated sites for development – MHUE2 and Land South of Manor Farm, Langaller. The PC has made constantly clear that its priority ahead of works proceeding is road safety in the Parish but this has not yet been recognised. This was a point made at the December Full SWTC Council Mtg and its January Executive meetings. The PC wants a “Grampian” agreement to be placed on the developers through a S106 agreement to ensure that road safety (North End to St Michaels Road in CSM) that has occurred as a result of the full impact of the phase one of the development essentially having not being identified until the ERR was opened and the problems with “rat running” immediately became apparent. This needs to be addressed before any additional houses, roads or development takes place.

The PC has also communicated to SWTC the issues it has with the current plans for these two development areas put into the public domain by SWTC below;

To these it would add that CSM regular suffers from Flooding and this should be addressed.

It is also suggested that the river and canal should feature in the Local Plan (not “as a being placed back as a feature of the town”) but as a feature for the whole District to enjoy with the plan outlining the future enhancement of their setting and facilities and to links with cycle and walk routes links. Also questioned is what is defined as Affordable - the definition of what constitutes “affordable housing” should be amended to reflect the cost of a mortgage based on a % of the local average wage rather than on house sale value as at present.

Below are the PC comments on both the allocated developments sites and responses to the consultation questions you posed.

A. Comments on Land South of Manor Farm Langaller Development Proposals.

1. The PC would prefer all the Development land at the end of Hyde Lane/Off ERR to be developed as housing. The PC questions the need for additional Land at the end of Hyde Lane/off ERR. The PC supports employment land being sited at and accessed through Walford Cross.
2. Access onto Hyde Lane can be retained (but should be removed if the industrial estate remains).
3. Hyde Lane to become a cycle/footpath beyond the cottages as proposed as proposed but there is a need to upgrade the surfacing over the motorway bridge as this is currently unwalkable (they were not designed to be pavements), neither do they meet the requirements to be a cycleway and the bridge parapets need heightening by Highways England.
4. The access from the Hardys Road roundabout on the ERR into the site should reflect the road layout already consented in the planning permission for the sports pitches. If the access road takes the route proposed the car park provision for the sports pitches will be removed.
5. That part of the planned cycleway along the side of the Hyde Lane Cottages (i.e. over the bund) be removed to avoid overlooking.
6. We seek assurance on agreeing realistic trigger points and implementation plan and to be consulted on these if any renegotiation is subsequently required then the Joint PC Panel with West Monkton is involved in decisions being taken. That a series of trigger points be agreed to ensure that industrial units are built in line with the number of houses.
7. That sufficient parking spaces are provided with each house and grass crests are used to enable better on street parking. Where there are grass verges which are not suitable for parking, bollards should be included to prevent parking on grass verges. It is clear that the lessons of MH1 have not been learnt on parking because estate roads become impassable to emergency vehicles, refuse wagons, and domestic delivery vehicles when cars are parked on both sides of the street. This has been documented and reported in Roys Place.
8. Experience of MH1 demonstrates that courtyard parking is largely not used with the result that on road parking occurs with the subsequent problems of access that creates.
9. Flats are to be subject to adequate on and off-street parking.
10. Bus Services. There needs to be both "rapid" buses direct into Town and "Hopper" buses that run through the estates timetabled. We wish more discussion on the plans for buses. Support HIF bid for public transport.
11. Buses to be available from day one of build in order to ensure/embed bus use.
12. That buildings are typically 1 or 2 floors with only some 2 ½. No buildings are to be three storeys.
13. Bungalows to be 10% of the build at open market value.
14. Examples of local estates deemed to have quality and character are St Quintons Park, Acacia Gardens, Hilly field's and Fry's Jurston. The PC is keen to have houses with good design with chimneys, bay windows, balconies etc. Boundaries should be stone or brick walls and not panel fencing to support the garden town feel.
15. Houses to be orientated to get solar gain.

16. Houses to have solar panels. To be supplied with inverters and batteries so residents' benefits and any surplus is fed into the grid. All houses should have a 5kw system with minimum 2 x 2.4kw batteries.
17. Homes to have accessible charging points for cars.
18. Increase Allotment provision to 50 plots.
19. Need to ensure that adequate funds are provided to ensure that the pavilion to be built alongside the sports fields is adequately funded.
20. Site need to have playgrounds with quality and challenging equipment (LEAP and NEAP)
21. Rec Park in Hyde Lane is the closest main Park/Rec Ground. Need to ensure a good footpath/ cycleway is provided to access it.
22. Trees Planting to be "Heavy standards" not whips.
23. Implement a scheme of tree planting along both sides of the motorway in order to screen and reduce noise.
24. It is not clear from the proposals what school provision is being made. There should be sufficient s106 money made available to provide additional classrooms at current local schools already full e.g. Creech St Michael Primary, West Monkton Primary. As all local schools are full there this will create management issues for the schools and adversely impact on pupils.
25. Clarity is sought over management arrangements for the open spaces and these need to be set out within sale contracts. The option to transfer the open space to the Parish Council should be included.
26. Need to ensure that the green context/Garden Town principles are fully embraced.
27. Lighting (LED) position suitability to avoid solar glare.
28. Homes to have highspeed internet to be available from day one.
29. Development to reflect the policies of both Parishes Neighbourhood Plans

B. Comments on MH2 Master Plan Dev Proposals

1. While integrating MH1 and MH2 is supported, the proposal to remove the road link between the two roundabouts at Langaller with a circuitous route through the District Centre is not. The current road should be kept open and heavily traffic calmed with adequate pedestrian crossing points in order to create a tree lined Bouvard with a cycleway and footpath along side. The practicalities of businesses elsewhere in West Monkton using these roads have not been properly addressed.
2. Close Boome Road at its junction with Adsborough Hill and address CSM Village (North End/St Michaels Road) in order to address road safety issues ahead of any development.
3. ERR2 to be built ahead of housing development to be completed in one build out. To be tree lined with sufficient width to permit future duelling.
4. ERR1 to have a second turn left lane at the roundabout at Bathpool (when travelling towards Town/ Creech Castle).
5. Query over funding as ERR2 is not in current HIF bid.

6. Yet to see a Strategic Management Plan and Impact Assessment.
7. Existing A38 to be downgraded before School opens.
8. School Parking. The realities of family life are that parental choice and 'two worker house holds' "dropping and running" creates parking issues outside school unless enough car parking is provided. The Panel would like that school access to be via the existing A38 away from the MH2 centre. Also, for the school to have sufficient carparking spaces for all its staff, deliveries, visitors and coach pickups/drop-offs accessed from existing A38. School to have main pedestrian /cycle access/ frontage onto MH2 centre.
9. New entrance to be provided by the developers for Monkton Elms Garden Centre off existing A38.
10. We don't understand the logic of the extended bus calmed area. Suggest just installing a bus gate.
11. Bus Services. There needs to be both "rapid" buses direct into Town and "Hopper" buses that run through the estates timetabled. We wish more discussion on the plans for buses. Support HIF bid for public transport.
12. Would wish to see a bus lane at the bottom of Yallands Hill as it goes onto Priorswood Road.
13. Play areas to be provided (to the left of the green lane crossing) as originally planned - not ever more pitches. Suggest full size lit MUGAs capable of Tennis and other sports. Also, a skateboard park, bowls green etc. Both Parishes have consulted with their Parishioners as part of their Neighbourhood Plans and can share this research need.
14. West Monkton Scout Group have suggested a serviced site for a Scout Hut and their request is supported for either development site.
15. The "Tunnel" under the motorway (owned by Highways England) and accessible by existing RofW to be upgraded and made available by developers to enable another access to CSM.
16. The panel wants the development to have more of a village urban feel and look rather than a town urban feel. No 3 level houses. Want bungalows and low-cost housing for young people (starter homes). Bungalows are part of Neighbourhood Plan policy
17. Provision for senior citizens; warden controlled and sited very close to village centre.
18. MH2 must minimise the impact on CSM.
19. Development to reflect the policies of both Parishes Neighbourhood Plans.
20. Panel wants the Industrial site to be limited to category B1 and B2 (not B8) given the lorry and van traffic B8 generates and the look of the site adjacent to housing.

C. SWTC Local Plan 2040 - Consultation Questions and responses;

5.2 Sustainable locations

Option 2a: The settlement tiers – there are 7 Tiers

Question 2a: do you agree with the tiers that identifies Taunton followed by 6 tiers covering the other settlements. If not, what changes would you make and why?

Response. No CSM PC think the MRC should be merged with Villages. CSM is a village as is West Monkton.

Question 2b: do you think Watchet and Williton should be seen as associated settlements for the purposes of the Local Plan due to their close proximity and in complementing the services of each other (and therefore be in a higher tier to Bishop Lydeard and Wiveliscombe)?.....

Response. Yes.

5.3 New and affordable homes

Option 3a: Providing the right number of new homes

- i) to reflect the standard method (minimum of 14,040 dwellings over 20 years 2020-2040 or 702 dwellings per year) or
- ii) to use a higher housing requirement figure with the precise figure to be determined following further work. To be informed by:
 - economic growth strategies;
 - the need to support strategic infrastructure improvements;
 - the need to accommodate any unmet need from neighbouring planning authorities; existing delivery rates (existing Local Plan requirement is a minimum of 19,900 dwellings over 20 years 2020-2040 or 995 dwellings per year)

Question 3a: should our housing requirement figure match the Government's minimum figure of 702 dwellings per year or should we have a higher figure?

Response- No it should be lower.

5.3.2. Issue: Providing pitches for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people

Gov guidance requires council to identify sites for pitches for at least 10 years' worth of need.

Option 3b: providing pitches for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.

Response - to support iii) allocating sites specifically for pitches

5.3.3. Issue: providing accessible and lifetime homes

Option 3c: providing accessible and lifetime homes

Question 3c: should we require all new housing developments to make sure that a percentage of the new homes are designed to be accessible, adaptable and wheelchair accessible?

Response – Yes.

5.3.4. Issue: Providing custom self-build plots

Option 3d: Providing custom self-build plots

Response - the PC supports the following options:

- ii) identify and allocate specific sites for self-build plots in locations related to where people want to live according to our self-build register; and/or
- iv) allow self-build plots on Rural Exception sites provided that they are secured as affordable housing in perpetuity

Question 3d: should we allocate sites and/or make sure a percentage of housing developments are for self-build plots for people wanting to build their own homes? Should we allow self-build plots on Rural Exceptions sites provided that they are affordable?

Response - the PC supports the following options:

3e/1 requiring affordable housing on sites of 10 dwellings or more, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or greater (matching the Planning Practice Guidance)

3e/2 a percentage requirement of affordable housing on residential and mixed-use sites with residential to be informed by a Viability Assessment and a balance of other developer contributions (see section 5.5.1 which is developer contribution)

3e/3 a tenure mix requirement with the intermediate tenures limited to those evidenced as affordable in our area. Tenure mix to be informed by evidence of need and a Viability Assessment

3e/4 a housing size mix to reflect need in our area. A Supplementary Planning Document or Technical Advice Note could provide more detail

3e/6 requiring internal space of dwellings to meet the Government's space standards

3r/7 policy detail to guide development for outdoor space requirements; conversions, alterations and extension; ancillary accommodation; subdivision of dwellings and live/work units

5.5 Infrastructure

5a – deciding on our priorities for developer contributions

Response - the PC supports the following option:

- ii) Less affordable housing but higher design and infrastructure requirements

What is also most important out of:

Response - the PC view on priority is:

1. Strategic infrastructure (school place provision; bus services, walking and cycling; community and sports facilities). *Add* traffic modelling management.

Jointly;

2. Carbon reduction design/renewable energy infrastructure

- 2 Accessible, adaptable or fully wheelchair accessible homes. *Add*- Ensure design enables easy adaption

Question 5a: On what infrastructure should we prioritise developer contributions?

Additional policy approaches to meet Objective 5:

5b/1 set out the approach of using viability assessments

5b/2 set out the approach to infrastructure provision via S106 or CIL

5b/3 Policy detail to guide development for power lines and telecommunications equipment

5b/4 Policy for requiring water and sewerage infrastructure and for surface water to be disposed of using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)

Response - the PC view supports all.

Question 5b: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Option 8a: Managing development in rural settlements

Response - the PC supports the following option:

iii) Have a policy which is a hybrid of (i) and (ii) where there are settlement boundaries only in areas of greater development pressure, i.e. parts of the District that are more accessible – closer to the M5, Taunton and Wellington areas.

Question 8a: should we keep or remove settlement boundaries? Or should we have settlement boundaries in areas where there is higher pressure from development i.e. closer to Taunton, Wellington and Wiveliscombe but remove them in more remote areas to provide more options for development?

We propose these additional policy approaches to meet Objective 8:

Response - the PC supports all the options to protect from Development:

8b/1 criteria-based policy for when development in the countryside (outside of settlement limits) would be acceptable.

8b/2 support for sustainable tourism and facilities in settlements subject to criteria

8b/3 support for farm diversification and transformation particularly where it responds to the need to address climate change impacts and mitigation

8b/4 policy to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land

8b/5 criteria-based policy for the removal of agricultural/forestry occupancy conditions would be acceptable

8b/6 ensure coastal development can take place without causing unacceptable damage to the coastal environment

8b/7 limit development within the coastal change management areas and areas that are vulnerable to rapid coastal erosion

8b/8 ensure that Hinkley Point C nuclear power station proposals mitigate short and long term adverse cultural, economic, environmental and social impact and provides a net gain in biodiversity of the area.

Question 8b: do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Response - the PC supports all these options:

Wellbeing of our residents – Objective 9 to improve wellbeing, inclusivity and a reduction in inequalities enabling independence and facilitating social interaction

5.9.1 Issue: Achieving high quality design to reduce inequalities – healthy, inclusive and safe places that promote social interaction, are safe and accessible and enable and support healthy lifestyles. The ability to access suitably designed and affordable housing is a key factor in the wellbeing of people

5.9.2 Issue: Encouraging healthy lifestyles

Local Plans are encouraged by the NPPF to do more in terms of supporting healthy lifestyles for personal physical and mental health and for minimising our impact on the climate.

We propose these additional policy approaches to meet Objective 9:

Response - the PC supports all the options:

9a/1 ensure the consideration of healthy place-shaping from the outset by requiring Health Impact Assessments from larger developments (threshold to be determined) to demonstrate how the design incorporates Active Design measures

9a/2 require high quality design from all developments to reflect the site and its context, including existing topography, landscape features and the historic environment and potentially requiring character appraisals to support proposals. The Council will be producing a Supplementary Planning Document on Design and will set out design principles/design codes for key development sites

9a/3 allow flexibility in the design of the highway and public realm to achieve high quality design that maximises accessibility by those who are less mobile and prioritises accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport over the car

9a/4 strengthen the self-containment of our settlements through the protection of community uses (eg pubs, sports facilities, recreational open space, community and leisure facilities, allotments), the allocation of sites to include multi-purpose community uses and support for uses that improve the balance of land uses and create mixed communities

9a/5 ensure that air quality, pollution, contaminated land, noise, nuisance, smell, land instability are considerations for planning applications

9a/6 include policies on public art, landscaping and tree planting

9a/7 ensure new development enhances and does not detract from the Taunton skyline

CSM PC / Clerk / SWTC Local Plan 2040 Consultation Response / 10 3 2020