

PMB/MAG meeting 26th May 2011, 2pm - 4.30pm

Present: Martin Woods, Rina Singh, Adrian Noon, Kim Close, Cllr Tim Carroll, Steve Joel, Andrew Gillespie, Helen Rutter, Cllr Sue Steele, Charlotte Jones, Dave Norris, Andy Foyne, Jean Marshall

Keith Lane 2pm – 4.30pm

Jo Manley 2.50pm – 4.30pm

Others 3.20pm – 4.30pm

1. Introduction

AF sent round timeline for process meetings and explained process.

Identified September meeting covering IDP and other issues. Previous PMB agreed that IDP runs in parallel to workshops with review in September in light of outcomes of IDP.

AF also gave overview of matrix which is being worked on; headlines only being brought to PMB/MAG.

MW raised question of what happens if IDP throws up major problem. AF, Yeovil and Chard already broadly known about. More worrying is NPPF and other changes. KC asked if we can't anticipate what NPPF and JHM advised simply don't know, will have to suck and see.

HR asked when final draft document will go to committee. AF stated draft ready for January. Intend to take responses matrix and any new evidence to Area Committees in October and DX but final document to be edited by policy team and signed off by PMB. TC whilst the area workshops will address the big issues, may have to get Area Committee to make recommendations to DX on any issues they still disagree with. MW suggests have pre meeting with Area Chairs. ADMs already invited to relevant meetings. AF to prompt ADMs/Area Chairs re 5th July.

SJ asked does IDP need to have series of meetings given its complexity. AF outlined process of IDP.

2. Review of Market Towns

3. Review of Rural Centres

Very little public response on this except from Langport/Huish and to lesser extent Ansford/Castle Cary. Somerton more concerned at scale of growth not status.

CJ think scale of growth is still an issue for Langport/Huish

Following discussion feel Langport should revert to Market Town.
AGREED by PMB/MAG

TC raised issue of new settlement.

COMMENT Are we certain that a new settlement shouldn't be BUILT? AF yes happy can support our stance – paper done on this.
AGREED by PMB/MAG

4. Review of Policy SS2 Rural Settlements

AF outlined background. Generally policy supported in public consultation but many felt confusing in relation to affordable housing. Spatial Policy considers policy should be split again. Some were unhappy at loss of prescriptive development limits, though others argued in favour of such loss

Spatial Policy suggest policy be split again to separate out affordable housing, shouldn't reintroduce development limits and no real case for other settlements to be upgraded to Rural Centres, Templecombe being the nearest front runner for such. Not sufficient service provision for Rural provision for Rural Centre status – little change since LP Inquiry Inspector concluded the same.

KL hard balance to strike but think we have it right as it gives greater flexibility for community benefits. DN thinks policy is a good DM policy as allows flexibility for community benefits. Could be exploited if members wanted to allow development. CJ felt that public consultation, when properly explained people understood that growth could still occur, the development limit and allowing the private sector to build within it over last 20 years not prevented shops and pubs closing.

PMB/MAG AGREED policy approach on loss of development limits.
PMB/MAG AGREED happy splitting policy again for clarity
PMB/MAG AGREED no other settlements to be added to Rural Centres list.

5. Housing requirement for South Somerset

AF outlined the background to update on Baker report and the new evidence. 16,000 dwellings recommended. Housing used latest date - 2008 household projections adjusted for early signs of any change, looked at various scenarios and tried to recognise fluctuations and presented strong case for market capacity for economic growth leading to requirement for housing to ensure sustainable growth (with similar level of self containment for Yeovil as at present). AF outlined recent Cllr correspondence criticising levels of economic growth saying it is too optimistic based on Oxford Economics projections but a range of projections are more favourable.. Next household changes not due til 2012 and can't wait until then. Maybe prudent to look again after June 2011 population estimates. JM added if restrict housing growth you restrict the potential for economic growth too.

MW very difficult to get public to see that housing growth will lead to economic growth. Very sure this will be raised and challenged. SS raised issue of Yeovilton as now know 400 houses growth. AF to check if Bakers figures took this into account. AN - needs to be brought out in figures that the extra 16000 houses isn't just needed because of extra 23,000 population (due to subdivision of houses) and need to see clear logical sequence of 12,200 jobs generating a requirements for 16,000 dwellings. AF stated that this was clearly presented in the Baker report and would be sent round the PMB/MAG – drafting issue need to make it clearer.

PMB/MAG AGREED the recommendation on 16,000 dwellings (to 2026) BUT get Bakers to check in June whether latest population estimates might require an adjustment.

COMMENT HR need to get across in easy to understand step by step analysis. Take these as background working papers

6. End date of the Plan to 2028

Have to have 15 years so advocating April 2028 as end date of plan. All figures projected forward

PMB/MAG AGREED new end date of 2028 and new consequent housing requirement of 17,200 dwellings (which is comparable with Bakers projection of 16,000 to 2026)

SJ asked if all other strategies should likewise be rolled forward – yes if possible!

7. Distribution of Growth, Yeovil, Market Towns, Rural Centres and rural settlements (Policy SS4)

AF explained rationale.

Yeovil and Chard rolled forward by extra 2 years growth to equate from 2026 – 2028.

Langport status change and increased provision therefore proposed.

Castle Cary and Somerton concerned at scale of growth and as similar to Langport have scaled back. Recognised that there is a difference in scale between these smaller market towns and the remainder

CJ and TC both want it made clear that housing figures currently show all grow 2006-2028. Must explain what is the **extra growth** and explain what is already being built or under construction. SJ what is already committed is also critical for IDP.

Wincanton will be scaled back to what is committed already as this is appropriate for the scale of the town's size and nature.

South Petherton had been constrained due to road issues but not considered to be justified given objector's evidence showing specific transport issues can be resolved and given consistency of arguments on internal road capacities viz a viz Martock and Stoke Sub Hamdon. so reinstated some growth

No changes proposed for Chard, Crewkerne, Bruton, Ilchester, Martock, Milborne ports or Stoke Sub Hamdon

Rural Settlements, initially made no provision as cannot allow for windfalls. Taken view that the SHLAA is identifying potential so no site is therefore a windfall!! Have therefore made a provision of 1200 which are those already committed plus further 800 over rest of plan period. Rural settlements therefore 2000 recommended in total.

Table will need to be rounded up to general terms.

AN – think we underestimated no of sites which will come forward under SS2. DN agree and maybe figure should be doubled. SS and HR feel what constitutes community benefit needs to be tightened. Is it more a question of definition of SS2 being tightened?? If increase rural areas would need to take some off market towns and that isn't sustainable. 2 houses here and there will not keep the pub open or school open. SJ SS2 good policy but need to really define what "community benefits" means, set out what we would expect to see as community benefits.....HR concurs. This would then act as a constraint on levels of growth.

DN/AN don't want to see it constrained too far, don't believe members will want to not approve single dwellings in rural areas.

PMB/MAG AGREED distribution levels as per report but rounded (appendix 1) BUT

- ❖ Raise Rural Settlements figure to 2400
- ❖ Include committed and built in the table for clarity
- ❖ Spell out community benefits to be derived from SS2 in supporting text
- ❖ Keep close eye on this through monitoring cumulative impact of SS2
- ❖ Explain need for roll on from 2026-2028.

SS advises push point on need for members to engage. CJ asked when this becomes public – at Committee recommendation