

PMB/MAG Notes of meeting 16/3/12

Workshop 13: Review of Area Committee consideration of draft District Executive Report

Present: Cllr Sue Steele, Cllr Peter Seib, Cllr Tim Carroll, Cllr Ric Pallister

MAG Officers present: Andy Foyne, Jean Marshall, Martin Woods, Dave Norris, Rina Singh, Rob Murray, Helen Rutter, Debbie Moseley (part)

Policy Officers present: Keith Lane, Nick Cardnell, Jo Wilkins, Jo Manley, Elizabeth Arnold

1. Minutes of Workshop 12 and matters arising

Notes agreed.

Matters Arising - Actions:-

- . Rob Murray text now incorporated into report
- . BPA happy the Chard modelling is fit for purpose and responded to SCC
- . CIL done and now at consultation
- . Aff Housing done for final text
- . AF rechecked the ONS projections position re publication of latest projections
- . Session prior to Area Committees held

2. Area Committee meetings

Matrix done showing outcomes of area committees to date and will form basis of Appendix L
Main issues arising from areas to date need to be discussed by PMB and a decision made on stance.

- . Housing Numbers AE want housing numbers reduced to 13,050. Should PMB consider reducing figure to this or not?

AF confirmed figures based on 2010 data and will be reviewed in light of imminent new data and will discuss any implications with consultants to ensure evidence base is robust.

Discussion about importance of next weeks pop'n projection figures compared to economic projections which won't change. Strong evidence that SSDC should maintain economically led document. Need to also consider that the projections won't take into consideration growth coming for RNAS Yeovilton (630 personnel) or for the SHMA indicated numbers of retiring people annually moving to SSDC.

Need to take into consideration that if change figures substantially will have to go back to consultation and this will require reconsultation. Developers are not going to accept lower growth so this argument will be rehearsed at Inquiry anyway.

Do need to ensure latest data is considered. Whilst this might be primarily about cutting the YUE its not the principle of the urban extension per se that is being questioned but the scale (and location) of it. Cannot just cut out the YUE, would need to consider various options for reduction and none of those are palatable, namely,

- cut YUE - affects Yeovil's role as economic driver as need housing to go alongside jobs
- Take off Chard's growth – won't see regeneration
- Take growth out of Market Towns – these suffer with no additional facilities or support for their roles (and can't remove Wincanton's as already committed)
- Take out allowance for all rural growth in rural settlements

If significant change would also need to reconsult – no specific guidance as to when a new Reg 25 consultation kicks in, PINS advising should do one but implications of not doing it are longer debate on this at Inquiry.

Some debate about whether development industry will bring forward sites as present market depressed but this is going to 2028. Got to forget about the short term blips in the data, got to look longer term at big trends not react to what happens in 5 years.

Must ensure growth is in the places where employment is most likely to go too as must have balance.

PMB/MAG Agreed to leave figure at 15,590 but to review again when latest pop'n projections are published

Reason behind this is that the growth should be aspirational and enable development. Any reduction would affect a number of other key aspirations particularly economy.

. Market Towns concern raised about the difference in two scales of Market Town. Already recognising that there is a difference in role and function.

PMB/MAG Agreed to split the Market Towns into Primary Market Towns and Local Market Towns. Local Market Towns would be Castle Cary/Ansford, Langport/Huish Episcopi and Somerton. Primary Market Towns would be Ilminster, Crewkerne, Chard, Wincanton

. Recommendation 6 and table of growth. Discussion on confusion arising from table not adding up to 15,950 when look at individual settlements and the 6% increase in figures. AF strongly advise not to deviate from this as it reflects the bottom up approach from Clusters. If scale Yeovil back to taking 49% of the growth (not 50:50 split) and apply pro rata rates to other settlements can make it equal the 15,950 (when figs are rounded. This is a 10% hit on everywhere except for Wincanton whose growth is already committed. This will have an impact on Ilminster and Castle Cary where need the growth to fund the roads required though.

Is a debate to be had about where the figures come off but if you take off Yeovil number you are fundamentally altering the balance of the whole plan and the sustainability appraisal etc. If want and should have 50% of the jobs going to Yeovil should have 50% of the housing there too, danger that you move away from economy led plan.

AF the difference in the figures is the reflection of the community's aspirations but can appreciate difficult for public to understand. Suggest pro rate downwards and use term "about" 15950.

to stay with the 15, 950 but be aware of the other alternative with reduction across board. Agree keep 16,911 as part of SS4 but add better explanation as to why it is 16,911 and not 15,950 to explain to the difference

. Direction of Growth for Yeovil. Paper circulated with the various options, question is do you reduce from the 2,500 and therefore do you change the DoG. Option 2a shows scale of growth in the plan period as 1580 but retains aspiration for 2,500 beyond the plan period and the buffer zone stays as previously shown.

If go down to 1250 dwellings this would effectively be a key site and there would need to be a significant re doing of the evidence base, SA etc. Discussion as to whether can actually identify the site – can't as not an allocations document – that would be the next stage as masterplan or allocations DPD. Fine to give thought to how the site would be developed but important to ensure this is led by locals. Chard is different and has a specific site as it is duplicating work already published in Chard regeneration framework but can't have site specific allocation for Yeovil. Key importance of planning for a sustainable community requires a certain scale of development was recognised.

NPPF expected 21/3/12. May not still have the "green zones" policy in the emerging NPPF. Gut feeling is that the green area as shown in option 3 would be too excessive to meet the NPPF policy.

Evidence 2003-10 of 49% employment growth should be taken on board and this will reduce the overprovision by 160 dwellings. Recognition also that revised Urban Capacity study will take 150 dwellings off the urban extension size within the Plan period.

PMB/MAG Agreed that should be Option 2a with 1580 within the plan period and 49% growth in Yeovil. Accept that in order to keep infrastructure costs down this will inevitable lead growth towards A37 initially.

PMB/MAG Agreed Map 1 showing the buffer zone but amended to include the two additional fields. Agree will show 1580 in plan period and 920 beyond.

RP – concern that if we don't get on and do the Core Strategy it will all go out of our hands through developers.

- Phasing policy particularly being raised for the market Towns. Main issues:-
 - Do you deliver employment before housing? – cannot deliver this, can only enable land not provide jobs, all this would do would prevent housing
 - Incremental affordable housing. Cannot stop AH coming first if have grants – though this is unlikely to happen again.
 - Infrastructure first – no identified critical infrastructure in first 5 years which cannot be delivered apart from Chard where a phasing policy exists.
 - PDL before Greenfield – cannot refuse to develop Greenfield as cannot force owners of PDL to release it or bring it forward. Would result in development by appeal.

Mid Devon policy – discussion on workability, should this be a policy or aspiration? Concerns raised that this would be better placed in allocations DPD and would be thrown out by Inspector. Cannot dictate how the market works. Need to be better at phasing through S106/CIL

PMB/MAG Agreed to include the Policy as worded related to 5 year trajectory and see if it gets through Inquiry. Acknowledge that will be replaced by CIL/S106 in longer term

. Affordable Housing Should the target be reduced to 25%. Have asked to get additional information from Colin McDonald re the “preserved right to Buy” and also look at the difference achieving 35% would give. Concern that setting a 25% target would result in virtually no affordable housing.

PMB/MAG Agreed to stick with 35% affordable housing target. In terms of the 5% and 10% for the thresholds **PMB/MAG Agreed** to stick with the figures as given because there is good evidence for them but explain it better by putting the figures in and illustrative examples.

. Ilchester **PMB/MAG Agreed** the revised town centre boundary for Ilchester

Retail threshold issue about reducing the threshold for sequential tests. Castle Cary want figure reduced due to the specifics of the very small shops there. Some discussion as to whether this should apply to Somerton too but store there considerably bigger so not agreed.

PMB/MAG Agreed to reduce the figure to 250 sq m in Castle Cary

. Climate Change probably no need for the Policy now given that things have moved on considerably in legislation and Building regs

PMB/MAG Agreed to deletion of Policy as its time expired

. Rec 53 and 65 historic environment do we need separate reference in these policies to historic environment

PMB/MAG Agreed not to change policy as already covered in EQ2

4. Other Matters

- Parson’s Brinkerhoff – highways Agency happy with modelling being done and outcome confirming slight difference between north and South YEU’s. need to get HA to confirm whether they have a preference or whether they are neutral.

PMB/MAG noted comments

- Langport and Huish views presented - **PMB/MAG noted issue**

- Tourism impact on E Coker – need the evidence. N Cardnell to pursue trying to obtain from objector

- Employment – need to note minor changes required to Policy SS5 to reflect any changes in growth in Policy SS4, in particular the resulting drop in employment land for YUE to 8 ha -

PMB/MAG noted and agreed

5. Forward Plan

Equality meeting 20/3. Will need further PMB in Mid April prior to deadline for Full Council

Action AF to set up meeting and provide agenda

Further PMB by 11/5 to consider SA, AA and EqA **Action AF to set up meeting and provide agenda**

PMB/MAG noted that need to be out at consultation on Core Strategy by 25/5

Draft Policies required by Royal Haskoning for AA.

6. AOB

- . Policy SS4 reference to SHLAA misleading **PMB/MAG agreed** deletion of reference to SHLAA in Policy SS4

- . How to deal with Directions of Growth – does first application get approved and where does neighbourhood planning fit? Agree to hold separate discussion on this between ADM/DM and Policy

- . Chard Junction – had letter from SCC which doesn't assist. AF view that this would blight land if a policy was added. PMB noted concerns