

PMB/MAG Notes of meeting 23/11/11

Workshop 9: Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Sundry Matters

Present: Cllr Sue Steele, Cllr Angie Singleton, Cllr Patrick Palmer, Cllr Ric Pallister

MAG Officers present: Andy Foyne, Jean Marshall, Martin Woods, Dave Norris, Andrew Gillespie, Kim Close, Lynda Pincombe

Other officers present for first item (Jo W, Jo M, Nick C, Keith L) then Nick Cardnell for Yeovil, Jo Wilkins for Chard, Jo Manley for employment and retail and Keith Lane re SS2

1. Minutes of Workshop 8

Notes agreed with exception of IDP – amend draft IDP to state that it is the first draft version. Must be clear this is not Council policy

Matters arising:-

IDP - as above, IDP to be clearly annotated. CS will also not go to 22/11 District Executive (DX) as indicated as whole process delayed because of draft IDP. See also proposed other meeting agendas.

Carparking standards – will go to December PMB. SCC's draft Carparking Standards currently being considered within SSDC and then will be presented to Portfolio holders with option for a workshop to engage other members of the Portfolio holders consider this appropriate

Retail threshold policy – revised report being brought back – see agenda item 7. Ilminster Transport Assessment (TA) - two provisos originally to the recommendation to move to option 1 but these can now be confirmed as ok as TA shows option is accessible with no requirement for major new infrastructure

2. Review of Growth Projections

Arisen out of M Fysh's comments and queries. Happy that evidence is robust for clarifying everything with exception of the growth projections as there are more up to date figures from BRES (Business Register and Employment Survey). Baker report made assumptions which haven't been borne out when looking at BRES info for the period 2008-2010. Upshot is not +1000 to add to projections of job growth 2010-2026, it's -2100. All figures therefore been reworked as per the paper.

If look at Row UJ: two scenarios, 14,200 dwellings or 10,000. This though is solely based on economic projections. We should also be looking at household projections to 2028 too, which would take us to 15,900 or 13,050 households. Going from as much up to date info from economic and household the range is 10,000 to 17,300. Up to SSDC where we go. AF – recommendation is we go for top end of range namely 17,300.

Disadvantage of going at bottom mean we are reactive and don't commit to the Greenfield allocations at Yeovil or Chard, cannot just drop Yeovil. RP – only thing we can get wrong is if we undersupply. KC – what about the impact on regeneration in the town centres? There is an aggressive brownfield land programme in Yeovil. Initial IDP indicates only 2 areas unviable for full rate of CIL and those are two urban extensions mainly due to additional cost of infrastructure.. KC – would employment figures have a disproportionate effect on Yeovil and if so should growth be more reduced in Yeovil? No, its based on trends of employment provision. If take population projections would come out near the top end. If look at last local plan

period we vastly exceeded jobs number of jobs we are now suggesting and housing build rates 2010-2011 also higher than ever despite it being recession.

RP – even if have massive crash people don't go away. Might not be able to buy houses but will still need something to live in! national policy is to grow our way out of recession. If we went for the bottom end we don't need any additional growth at all as we have already got more than this committed and that is nonsense! AF - In reality, 3 options presented if members were to accept a reduced provision of 14,200:- lose Chard (lose urban extensions and have key sites instead) lose 1000 off the rural centres (and rural settlements allowance) and keep all growth in 7 major places or lose all growth in Market towns – none of these are palatable.

Not possible to just lose growth in Yeovil, have to lose growth across whole district if that's the decision, 50% jobs in Yeovil requires 50% of homes. Key sites are all coming forward now. It's not a question of if we need this level of growth, just the question of in what timescale.

Would suggest go for the 15,950 figure (not very top 17,300 figure) as this reflects experience to date.

Jo M – have looked back at the growth rates since 1991, 48% of job increases are in Yeovil so still right to look at the 50:50 split between Yeovil and rest of district (and this is what came out of Sustainability Appraisal and has been agreed). To lose 1200 dwellings to meet the 15,950 dwellings total onw would need to stick to a 50:50 split, some will need to come off YUE (although can recommend leave at the same size and accept some goes beyond plan period as for Chard). Chard is already lagging behind its projections so can lose another 430 dwellings beyond the plan period there too. Remaining 300 would be “bled” out across the board.

If you go to the pessimistic levels need to lose 3000, would still have to have key sites (without the benefits in level of facilities larger scale growth would bring) and there would also be huge resistance to having no growth in market towns.

Evidence suggests approx 16,000 and the cluster workshops also recommend that and it's robust. Any alternative is just not reasonable or practical (given commitments in particular). Even villages are looking for some growth so need to keep options for rural growth. Rural areas are always growing and can't suddenly stop it. Problem is services also gone down and not going to change this. Losers will be the market towns because won't invest growth in them and ultimately rural centres will suffer if market towns fail. Community vision remains for growth; they want growth in market towns and rural areas. Have huge manufacturing base here in SSDC so although broadband will have an impact will not affect our manufacturing base.

PMB/MAG AGREED, 15,950 dwellings but need to add in SSDC's “Vision” as a justification for the scale of growth (not just the projections numbers game). To remove 1250 over what was agreed in Workshop 1 (bleed beyond plan period)

PMB/MAG confirmed should be 50:50 split between growth in Yeovil and rest of District.

3. Oral Update on YUE tour

KL - gave an oral update on a useful visit to South and north-west Yeovil. Area South Members plus Angie Singleton and Jo Roundall-Greene. 11 or so stopping points around south and 6/7 to north-west. Was about showing the two sites, rather than

discussing pros and cons of the two. Route was also made available for those unable to attend so can go by themselves.

AS – was surprised at the distance away from E Coker the YUE was proposed. Biggest blot on the landscape is existing farm buildings. The difference between the two sites was that the north-west seemed very divorced from Yeovil although understand Lufton key site would be built out first. Looking from Ham Hill NW would have far greater impact.

Tour was well received by members and at least members will now make decisions based on informed view. NB M Fysh indicated thought parts of HEA were inaccurate
AF TO ACTION CHECK think this is about grades of LBs.

Energy study indicates possible locations for energy centre but the one to the North-west would be in an inappropriate given potential impact on Montacute House. AF – only a suggestion but that is something that would come out of masterplanning. Locations shown are the optimal and this is just a piece of evidence. MW – important when published that it is made clear that it is only evidence and is not Council policy.

4. Urban Extension built development limit

Buffer line shown on drawings. Reason two fold – to protect historic assets and to protect surrounding settlements. Has been some discussion about the need for the buffer line around Barwick (point 6) as suggestion Barwick can take some growth so no need for a buffer to Barwick. Draft NPPF does set some guidelines for buffers. (Green Spaces policy) RP – what form will the actual buffer take? Line should be proposed maximum extent of built form of development. Until do masterplanning cannot give definitive position of open space, buffer could accommodate open space. RP – want a corridor drawn which can be a green space buffer zone between points 1 and 4 (on plans submitted).

PMB/MAG AGREED line and buffer (to be drawn) between point 1-4 ONLY around N and E Coker and will be designated as Local Green Space with relevant NPPF justification (need to check what final outcome will be of this).

AF - CHECK impact of having structural landscaping within the development line for the YUE (making the housing capacity smaller) or outside the development line and so in the Buffer Zone (making the housing capacity higher) to be explored for next PMB.

Possibility also of further workshop before this goes to Area South.

5. Contingency proposals for Chard

Set out Plan B based on Thomas Lister work. Main block at present is economy. Chard report will be coming forward in December to PMB.

PMB/MAG AGREE to work towards delivery of Phases 1 and 2 as set out (see pg 2)

6. Ilminster – confirmation of direction of growth

Done under matters arising above

7. Local Retail Thresholds Policy

As reported last time need evidence to support local thresholds. Doing work resulted in need to adjust previous recommendation. Need to introduce a town centre hierarchy to the core strategy (revised EP10 as shown in report)

PMB/MAG Agreed revised EP10 as shown and EP* Local floorspace thresholds.

8. Policy SS2 – further guidance on application

Builds upon previously agreed principles brought to PMB and to clarify the policy. Rural exceptions part already deleted. Policy extended to include reference to Parish plans etc.

PMB/MAG AGREED the supporting text set out in the report and the proposed policy subject to changing parish plans etc to Community led plans and adding “access to” before key services.

9. December and January PMB agendas

Agreed as set out but add the green buffer to PMB10. Timetable agreed in principle, i.e. Area Committees Feb/March 2012 with DX end of March or before Easter and Full Council 18/4. Consultation on the Submission Plan would follow in may/June. This suggested timetable to be reviewed in light of next PMB/MAG workshops.

12. AOB

none reported.