

**LDF Project Management Board Workshop 19 – Report back on Proposed Submission
consultation and initial discussions with Planning Inspectorate
Friday 26 October 2012**

Notes of meeting

Members present: Ric Pallister, Sue Steele.

Officers present: Rina Singh, Martin Woods, Jo Wilkins, Jo Manley, Liz Arnold, David Norris, Keith Lane, Andy Foyne.

Apologies: Councillor Tim Carroll

1. Notes of last meeting and matters arising

Notes agreed.

2. Housing provision review

Population projection figure on page 10 should be 15,500 dwellings, not 14,500.

The need to establish 1 housing figure for the Plan period as argued by the PINS advisor was accepted.

AF presented the various evidence sources used and explained how growth projections had taken account of the latest Census and BRES data. The ensuing range of housing figures was presented. Only key consultation comment on the Proposed Submission Local Plan that Officers support is the change to the proportion of self-employed persons. This should be considered to be 15% of the employees in employment i.e. the average percentage over several years covering the early Plan years, rather than the 11% used by Baker Associates which was based upon a single year (2010) that happened to be the lowest figure in the period 2006 – 2012.

Consideration of the impact of household size changes contained in the 2011 Census which indicates that household size is not reducing at the rate previously forecast, that the population is ageing more quickly than anticipated and that there is a likely need for a higher population to furnish the same workforce. Agreed that the delays in Government clarification on these matters and their projecting the effects means that existing latest official projections should be used. General agreement on this approach received from the Council's consultants. Some discussion ensued on the merits of Consultant review.

AF reprised the conclusions to the review paper in detail and there was general agreement of the importance of the aspiration for positive growth and the primacy of economic projections..

Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 agreed confirming a single housing figure, production of a housing topic paper for submission, continued use of latest official projections and acceptance of the new assumption on self employed persons. Recommendation 4 to be amended by removing "...by means of rounding to tally and result in one provision figure" from the first sentence. Housing provision requirement figure and

the reasoning in the report accepted. *(post meeting calculation correction will mean that the figure will be 16,450 dw).*

3. Potential amendments to the Yeovil urban area and urban extension housing provision

KL summarised responses received on policies for Yeovil and the Urban extension and explained that most were re expressions of prior arguments that had been addressed previously. He went through all the new sites that had been put forward as alternatives and explained why they were inappropriate (with the exception of two sites put forward as extensions to the existing Direction of growth).

RP asked that alternative site A to west of Yeovil airfield be additionally dismissed by virtue of the adverse impact on the flight safeguarding zones identified for the airfield and amended in the report.

KL explained the 1st recommendation in the report that the development for Yeovil within the urban area should be reduced to reflect latest windfall estimates and that the provision for the urban extension within the plan period be increased in consequence and to reflect evidence presented by a prospective developer with control over $\frac{3}{4}$ of the site. Following detailed discussion this recommendation was not accepted by the Board as the higher urban provision currently in the Plan was considered appropriate as an aspiration and potentially achievable and the prospects for early development and high rates of development at the Urban extension were not considered realistic in the light of the current market and past experience with the Council's existing key sites.

Recommendation 2 seeking the removal of two fields from the Buffer Zone was accepted given that their location was peripheral to the protection of the setting of East and North Coker, was surrounded on 3 sides by the housing and the existing riding school use was being relocated.

Recommendation 3 seeking the incorporation into the urban extension of an area of land to the south of Yeovil Court Hotel (Area B on the agenda item plan) was accepted. KL explained that the Historic Environmental Assessment's classification of this area as of low capacity to accommodate growth was predicated on a hedgerow pattern that had been effectively lost due to past agricultural practice.

Recommendation 4 was accepted in the light of KL's explanation that there was validity in objectors arguments that such a density was a matter for masterplanning and its use in the first place was to confirm in broad terms that a 2,500 urban extension could be accommodated in the urban area identified.

KL explained that English Heritage's objections to the urban extension and suggestions of a multi site approach to growth and concerns re the Plan's potential soundness had been directly addressed in a recent meeting with English Heritage. This clarified for English Heritage that the Historic Environment Assessment had been concluded and used to establish that the urban extension could be accommodated where it is whilst still protecting the on site roman villa and its setting.

Reference was made to the existence of areas of archaeology at the other sites that would come forward in any multi site approach and hence a single site approach was preferred as only one known archaeological would need to be addressed rather than at least 3 and probably more. English Heritage agreed to the explanation in relation to their concerns regarding the lightness of identified actions associated with the Historic Heritage policy in the Plan and that these would be filled in by the Heritage Strategy that SSDC were committed to. English Heritage were content to withdraw their objections to the Plan in general terms and sought some minor amendments to the Plan wording that were accepted and the upshot was that the notes of the meeting would be forwarded to English Heritage for them to agree and, in consequence, confirm withdrawal of their major objections in relation to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. It was also agreed that an English Heritage archaeologist would meet with the County Archaeologist to refine guidance on how to accommodate appropriately for the roman villa in any major masterplan process and similarly for the roman villa to the west of the urban extension area that potentially might impact on the new area agreed for potential expansion of the urban extension on land behind Yeovil Court Hotel.

4. Local Development Scheme

Based upon discussions and recommendations made by the Planning Inspectorate, RP proposed and PMB agreed, that that the priorities following completion of the Local Plan should be, in order:

1. Site Allocations DPD
2. Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension Master Plan
3. Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD.

Yeovil Town Centre Area Action Plan should not be carried forward as there is not sufficient resource to undertake it alongside the other identified priorities, however it should be a high priority once progress is made on these, at review.

If a joint county wide Gypsy and Traveller Plan could not be promoted then a stand alone SSDC Plan would need to be pursued in order to meet the NPPF and national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites requirements that must be contained within the Local Plan

The need to accommodate resource for neighbourhood planning was discussed and its potential resource implications on delivery of other Plans within the Scheme. It was agreed that this was a management issue and would be the responsibility of Asst Director Economy and the Director in order to ensure adequate resource is available. It will be discussed at PMB only if additional resource was required that needed approval.

The Asst Dir (Economy) was recognised as the most appropriate officer to take on the overall responsibility for the LDS.

The current LDS was endorsed by District Executive and it is therefore the expectation that, upon approval by the PMB, the updated LDS would be forwarded to District Executive Ctte for endorsement.

5. AOB

These meeting notes are to be sent to all Members with a covering explanation to give a progress update on the Local Plan and proposals for proceeding to submission in December.

6. Next meetings

Next meeting is on November 16th, with another PMB to be arranged for the end of November to discuss any remaining key issues.