

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Strategy](#)  
**Cc:** [Cllr Lisgo, Libby](#); [Cllr Baker, Lee](#); [Cllr Pritchard, Andy](#); [Giuseppe Frascini - Councillor](#); [Rod Williams - Councillor](#)  
**Subject:** Cheddon Action Group  
**Date:** 15 March 2020 11:38:50

---

Dear Planning Strategy,

further to our recent email and your reply, we have submitted our comments on the Pyrland Farm site appraisal online. However, I am emailing also because we would like a response to the questions we have raised in our submission (copy attached). I am also copying in our local councillors who have been involved in our group meetings and emails.

Best wishes

Pip Sheard  
on behalf of Cheddon Action Group

Dear Planning Strategy,

**Re: Somerset West and Taunton Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Alternatives Report**

I am submitting the comments below on the site appraisal for S-048 Pyrland Farm on behalf of Cheddon Action Group of local residents opposed to the development of Pyrland Farm.

We have studied the site appraisal for Pyrland Farm in detail and would like you to consider making the following changes to the site appraisal to better reflect the characteristics of the site to achieve a correct overall colour coding to assist your decision on which sites should be incorporated in the new Local Plan. We note that your consultants gave some sites an overall red code (in the first column) and we believe that this site should also be coded red overall.

1. Planning History – this is not correct. The site does not have planning permission on part of the site. Reserved matter planning permission was not approved in November 2018. A planning application for the site was refused in July 2019 on landscape grounds.
2. Distance from GP surgery – the distance is not 651m but 1175 metres ( we have walked it ) so it should be a amber code not green.
3. The distance to the nearest bus stop is not 301m but 515m and the site is sloping ( we have walked it). Your colour code for 301m is green and the 515m distance meets your amber colour code. However we think your system of colour coding should be revised in line with the CHIT recommended maximum walking distances to a bus stop. They are outlined in their publication Buses in Urban developments January 2018 P18 Table 4. All Taunton bus routes would be classified as **less frequent** and therefore the **maximum** walking distance should be 300 metres . Your colour code should show all distances over 300m as red. We consider that 515m to a bus stop ie this site should have a red coding for public transport. Also to be taken into the account is that the site is sloped and Cheddon Road needs to be crossed which is narrow and visibility is poor at that point. The 400 metres used in your site appraisal has been superceded and was itself a **maximum** rather than the starting point as used in your site appraisal.
4. The nearest SAC is Hestercombe which is not 6.5km (colour code green) It is 1.4km which we think is so close to the up to 1km (red code) that it should be red coded.
5. Heritage assets – there are 2 not 1 listed buildings adjacent to the site – Pyrland Farm and Pyrland Hall which has a 2 star\* grading. The site is currently given a amber code with 1 listed building , would having 2 increase this to a red code?.
6. Green wedge – the site is in the Green wedge not adjacent to it so should have a red colour code rather than amber
7. Sensitive ridge line – this development does affect a sensitive ridge line – the setting of the Quantocks ANOB as supported by reports from your Council landscape officer, ANOB and independent consultants so should have a red colour code.
8. Biodiversity – this site has been given a amber code for protected species and biodiversity comments. We would like an explanation of the biodiversity coding for sites. We assume all sites with protected species get an amber coding until the chief ecological officer produces a report. Who then decides what score is given for in the biodiversity comments column, the

ecology officer or the planning committee? There is no explanation in Table 4.1 what the red code in the biodiversity comments means. We consider that the mitigation proposed for this site would not prevent the loss of Lesser Horseshoe bats on the site and therefore it should receive a red coding.

We note that your consultants have given some sites which have 7-8 red codes for site criteria an overall red code and we believe this should apply to this site.

We would be grateful to be added to your future contact list and to be informed when the final site appraisal has been published so that we can continue to lobby for this site to be removed from the Local Plan site allocation.

Best wishes

Pip Sheard  
Cheddon Action Group

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]