

South Somerset District Council Duty to Co-operate Report

Contents

1. Introduction
2. How has South Somerset District Council co-operated with others in the production of the Local Plan?
 - What does the Duty to Co-operate mean for South Somerset
 - How does the Duty to Co-operate affect South Somerset's plan making
 - How has South Somerset co-operated with others in the production of the Local Plan
 - On-going co-operation
3. Conclusions

Appendices

Appendix 1	Map of Neighbouring Authorities
Appendix 2	Co-operation with Neighbouring Authorities
Appendix 2a	Summary of Neighbouring Authorities Representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and Officer Recommendations
Appendix 2b	Copies of correspondence between South Somerset District Council, Wilshire and East Devon District Council
Appendix 2c	Dates of Duty to Co-operate Meetings with Neighbouring Authorities and Notes
Appendix 3	Co-operation with Prescribed Bodies
Appendix 3a	Summary of Prescribed Bodies Representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and Officer Recommendations
Appendix 3b	Dates of Duty to Co-operate Meetings with Prescribed Bodies and Notes
Appendix 4	Co-operation with Other Bodies
Appendix 5	Summary of when Duty to Co-operate 'authorities and bodies' formally commented on the Local Plan
Appendix 6	Notes of Duty to Co-operate Meeting 9 November 2012

1. Introduction

The Localism Act which received Royal assent on 15 November 2011, aims to shift power from central government back into the hands of individuals, communities and councils.

The 'Duty to Co-operate' became a legal requirement under the provisions of the Localism Act. In essence it requires all local planning authorities such as South Somerset to co-operate on strategic matters with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies, to maximise the effectiveness when preparing Development Plan Documents such as the Local Plan.

The Government recognise that many social, environmental and economic issues can only be effectively addressed at a 'larger than local' scale, as people and businesses do not confine their activities to one council area. Strategic planning naturally deals with such 'larger than local' issues, for example, new housing across a housing market area that encompasses more than one local authority. The duty to co-operate, in effect replaces the role previously undertaken through regional and countywide planning.

The new duty:

- relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or a planning matter that falls within the remit of a county council,
- requires that councils set out planning bodies to address such issues,
- requires that councils and public bodies 'engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis' to develop strategic policies, and
- requires councils to consider joint approaches to plan making.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) also makes reference to the duty to co-operate. It states that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic priorities, and that that local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated in planning for issues with cross boundary impacts, when submitting their plans for examination.

Paragraph 156 of the NPPF sets out the strategic issues where co-operation might be appropriate, namely: -

- the number of new homes and jobs needed in the area
- the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development
- the provision of infrastructure (including transport, water/drainage and other utilities)
- the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
- climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment.

"The Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities" (para 178, NPPF). Co-operation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking, through to implementation.

In addition to working with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies, the NPPF also indicates that there is an expectation that collaboration on strategic planning

issues will also occur between local planning authorities and private sector bodies, utilities and infrastructure providers. Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Nature Partnerships are specifically mentioned as bodies to collaborate with in the NPPF but are not directly named in the relevant Government regulations.

The NPPF states that co-operation could be demonstrated by plans or policies being prepared as part of a joint committee, a memorandum of understanding or a jointly prepared strategy, which is presented as evidence of co-operation. Co-operation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation (NPPF, para 181).

2. How has South Somerset District Council co-operated with others in the production of the Local Plan?

What does the duty to co-operate mean for South Somerset?

In practice the duty to co-operate means that South Somerset is required to demonstrate how it has worked jointly and co-operated with neighbouring authorities, prescribed bodies and other bodies such as infrastructure providers to address cross boundary issues and relevant strategic planning matters.

The NPPF anticipates joint working to occur on areas of common interest, taking into account different geographical areas where appropriate. For South Somerset the relevant neighbouring local authorities are considered to be Somerset County Council, Mendip District Council, Taunton Deane Borough Council, Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset District Council, Dorset County Council, Wiltshire Council, East Devon District Council, North Dorset District Council and West Dorset District Council. These are illustrated in Appendix 1.

The prescribed bodies are defined in part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Those relevant to South Somerset are:

- Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- the Civil Aviation Authority
- the Homes and Communities Agency
- Primary Care Trusts
- the Office of Rail Regulation
- the Highways Authority (i.e. Somerset County Council); and
- the SOS as Highways Authority (i.e. the Highways Agency).

South Somerset needs to have regard to the Somerset LEP – Heart of the South West, which forms a collaborative body and Local Nature Partnership.

Co-operation works two ways and it may not always be possible to reach agreement with neighbouring authorities, prescribed bodies or other bodies. The Duty to Co-operate does not presume agreement is needed.

How does the duty to co-operate affect South Somerset's plan making?

When the duty to co-operate legislation was enacted in November 2011, the South Somerset Local Plan (previously known as Core Strategy) was at an advanced stage of preparation, having already been subject to two stages of consultation. The Issues and Options document was published for consultation in March 2008, and the

Draft Core Strategy (incorporating Preferred Options) was published for consultation in October 2010. These are detailed in the Consultation Statement (June 2012).

Whilst the legal duty to co-operate only came into force recently, the Council has, through the preparation of the Local Plan, and its associated planning work, sought to liaise with and work jointly with neighbouring authorities and relevant organisations to deal with strategic planning issues that extend across the local authority's boundaries, and these arrangements are ongoing. It should be emphasised strongly from the outset that South Somerset's approach is not confined to consultation, rather it is one of building meaningful and productive partnerships, and taken together, these activities help to demonstrate how the duty to co-operate has been fulfilled in preparing the South Somerset Local Plan.

How has South Somerset co-operated with others in the production of the Local Plan?

In terms of developing an understanding of cross boundary issues collaboration has occurred in the following ways:

- embedding or mainstreaming partnership working into the everyday work of the Council,
- joint working groups to produce evidence base,
- engaging through formal Local Plan consultation, and
- specific duty to co-operate meetings to address issues head-on

Partnership working is at the heart of the way in which South Somerset District Council operates and joint working with others and partnership is seen as essential to influence and implement the vision for the District. The Council's area committee structure ensures that the organisation is well placed to work creatively with partners to support practical ways to influence or take control locally.

The Council's ethos of partnership working and collaboration has been embedded into the way in which the Local Plan has been produced from the outset, this collaborative work has taken many forms and includes: -

- Involvement in the Somerset Strategic Planning Conference (SSPC) - formed in 2001, the SSPC was created to take the lead on strategic land use and transport matters on behalf of the Somerset Strategic Partnership, and comprised both officers and members. An officer group was also formed to manage the joint commissioning of cross boundary evidence based studies, and share working practices. Whilst the formal structure was suspended in 2010 (pending an outcome of the review regarding streamlining of partnerships at the County Council), the officer group continued to meet on an informal basis, testament to the strength of cooperative working. Recent meetings in relation to duty to co-operate have allowed both officers and members to reinstate the joint working group, albeit not under the name of the Somerset Strategic Planning Conference (see below).
- Collaborative working (through the SSPC) during the preparation of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. A particular example being the work commissioned jointly by all the Somerset authorities to identify district level housing allocations in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy.
- Jointly produced or procured evidence to support planning policy development. The jointly produced Somerset Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which has

influenced the delivery of housing and given a strategic overview for the Local Plan's housing policies in relation to targets and thresholds for affordable housing and mix of market housing is a good example. As is the jointly produced Somerset Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, which addressed the need countywide and identified South Somerset's requirement and informs Local Plan Policy HG7.

- Involvement in the preparation of plans in adjoining areas through the consultation and engagement process, for example making representations to the Somerset County Council Minerals and Waste Core Strategies, West Dorset Core Strategy and North Dorset Core Strategy.
- Work on the Infrastructure Plan (IP) (previously Infrastructure Delivery Plan) and other infrastructure related work such as Yeovil Transport Modelling, to support the Local Plan. This has included extensive liaison with Somerset County Council and other key infrastructure providers to support the level of growth expected in South Somerset. The growth of Yeovil has also required cross border strategic highways matters between Somerset County Council and Dorset County Council to be addressed.
- Work to support the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA, including a jointly commissioned report "Appropriate Assessment for Somerset Authorities Core Strategies" (2009) to ensure no adverse impact on the integrity of the Levels and Moors as a result of the combined authorities' scale of growth.
- Work to support the development of countywide parking standards, to they extent that they have been incorporated with minimal amendment into Local Plan Policy TA1.
- Collaborative working with other Somerset districts to identify evidence base and share evidence and best practice in relation to planning policy.
- Established groups such as Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership and new ones such as the emerging Hinkley Point C Strategic Delivery Forum (see below).

In order to demonstrate more clearly how South Somerset has fulfilled its duty to co-operate, and how this has influenced the Local Plan, a number of appendices have been produced setting out the authority/body, the strategic issue, how the co-operation has taken place, the outcome and how this has influenced the Local Plan. For ease, these appendices have been brown drawn in the following way:

Appendix 2 - Co-operation with Neighbouring Authorities

Appendix 3 - Co-operation with Prescribed Bodies

Appendix 4 - Co-operation with other Bodies

Appendix 5 - Summary of when prescribed bodies and neighbouring authorities have commented on the Local Plan

Ongoing Co-operation

The Council will continue to co-operate on cross boundary and strategic planning matters, for example, the Master planning of the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension will involve co-operation from a number of the authorities and bodies listed already such as West Dorset District Council, Dorset County Council, Somerset County Council, English Heritage, the Environment Agency and others, and ongoing joint

working arrangements in relation to certain aspects of the development of the urban extension.

The Council is also keen to continue the Somerset based joint officer and member working arrangements, (previously known as the Somerset Strategic Planning Conference) to ensure collaborative working to identify evidence and share evidence and best practice in relation to planning policy and specifically to address the duty to co-operate. This has been re-initiated following a meeting arranged by this Council on Duty to Co-operate issues held at Yeovil Innovation Centre on 9th November 2012. There was recognition from all Somerset Councils of the need to maintain a regular joint meeting involving both officers and Members in order to help fulfil the Duty to Co-operate and in particular the expectation of a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation. The notes of this meeting are set out in Appendix 6.

2. Conclusions

There are a number of ways in which South Somerset District Council has co-operated with its neighbours, prescribed bodies and other organisations with interest in the District, to address strategic and cross border issues to find solutions.

The Council considers that this report demonstrates that the duty to co-operate in relation to the planning of sustainable development, as required under section 110 of the Localism Act 2011, has been met.

Appendix 2 - Co-operation with Neighbouring Authorities

This is not an exhaustive list, but demonstrates the way in which South Somerset District Council has fulfilled the duty to co-operate in relation to strategic planning matters with neighbouring authorities.

Somerset County Council

Strategic Issues	Methods of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
<p>Transport - impacts of the proposed Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension on the Highways Network</p> <p>The scale of development is likely to have significant impacts on the highway network that will require mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Continuous two-way engagement and joint working throughout Local Plan process, for example involvement in early engagement workshops and on-going discussions regarding formal representations received on the Local Plan</p> <p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p>	<p>The joint working and jointly commissioned evidence base (Yeovil traffic modelling and the emerging Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2 (YTSR2)) helped the District Council in considering the transport effects of various potential locations for the Yeovil SUE. This has resulted in the proposed location of the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension being chosen, from amongst options, to the south west of Yeovil.</p>
<p>Environmental - location of Chard Eastern Development Area (CEDA), Yeovil SUE and Market Town Directions of Growth</p> <p>The impact of cumulative development proposals on European Protected Species - Levels and Moors and Brackett's Coppice.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure.</p>	<p>Joint working on appropriate assessment and Somerset Econet project to ensure no adverse impact on the integrity of European Protected Species as a result of the combined authorities' scale of growth.</p> <p>Econet computer based mapping system which shows the likely distribution and habitat use of the most important species in Somerset, is being used to inform the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>	<p>Recommended changes from the Appropriate Assessment in relation to Bracketts Copice, also incorporated into the Local Plan policies such as Policy YV2: Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension. The following wording was added to the Policy:</p> <p><i>'The Masterplan will be designed in such a way that features supporting bat movement are not severed and that access between feeding areas and roosts is maintained. The lighting design will also need to take account of the requirements of bats.'</i></p>

		Econet has informed Policy EQ5 and will feed into the Green Infrastructure Strategy DPD.
<p>Education - Infrastructure Delivery Planning</p> <p>Consultation on growth proposals to ensure sufficient capacity over Local Plan period. Cross border concerns that children from Somerset travel out of the County for education.</p>	<p>Consultation on all stages of the Local Plan and IDP.</p> <p>Joint Working, involving meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>Informed the IDP and Local Plan growth proposals.</p> <p>Parental choice makes education planning more difficult.</p>
<p>Economic Development</p> <p>Delivery of key infrastructure required to bring forward employment land to support Local Plan allocation through Growing Places Fund – LEP.</p> <p>Support for Connecting Devon and Somerset Superfast Broadband initiative.</p>	<p>Joint Working, involving meetings, emails, letters & telephone including information provided to Somerset County Council Data Room.</p> <p>Regular attendance of County wide Economic Development Officers Group.</p>	<p>Informed Local Plan section referring to broadband.</p>
<p>Eco Town Principles</p> <p>Somerset County Council (SCC) was a partner in securing Eco Town Project funding and in delivering a series of concept Eco Studies including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft Village Masterplan - Renewable Energy Study - Waste Studies: Waste Infrastructure Study, Integrating Waste to Energy, Site Waste Management Strategy 	<p>SCC was part of an Officer Panel and Yeovil Vision Board had responsibility for delivering these studies. SCC assumed project lead for Waste Studies.</p>	<p>Draft Masterplan, Renewable Energy and Waste Studies to be applied through the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension and Summerhouse Village Masterplan once decisions on development in principle determined through the Local Plan and work started on these Masterplans.</p>

Mendip District Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Methods of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
No cross boundary issues directly emerging from either the policies or proposals in the South Somerset Local Plan or Mendip District Council Local Plan. No emerging issues relating to scale or direction of growth.		
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation A joint assessment was undertaken to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the county.</p>	<p>Involvement in joint working groups to produce evidence base.</p> <p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>An update has been agreed in principle amongst all Somerset authorities and this will be incorporated into the Local Plan (Policy HG7) identifying a new requirement which reflects the plan period.</p> <p>Mendip was initially invited to join in producing the Strategic Housing Market Assessment but declined once clarity established that Mendip was included in the West of England Housing Market Area.</p>

Taunton Deane Borough Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Methods of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
No cross boundary issues directly emerging from either the policies or proposals in the South Somerset Local Plan or Taunton Deane Core Strategy. No emerging issues relating to scale or direction of growth.		
<p>Affordable Housing Need All the Somerset authorities jointly commissioned Fordham Research to undertake their Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which informed the affordable housing and market housing mix policies in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Involvement in joint working groups to produce evidence base.</p> <p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>Evidence emerging from the SHMAA has influenced policies HG3: Provision of Affordable Housing, HG4: Provision of Affordable Housing, Sites 1-5 and HG5: Achieving a Mix of Market Housing, relating to targets and thresholds of affordable housing and mix of market housing.</p>
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation</p>		<p>An update has been agreed in principle</p>

A joint assessment was undertaken to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the county.		amongst all Somerset authorities and this will be incorporated into the Local Plan (Policy HG7) identifying a new requirement which reflects the plan period.
--	--	---

Sedgemoor District Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Methods of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
No cross boundary issues directly emerging from either the policies or proposals in the South Somerset Local Plan or Taunton Deane Core Strategy. No emerging issues relating to scale or direction of growth.		
Affordable Housing Need All the Somerset authorities jointly commissioned Fordham Research to undertake their Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which informed the affordable housing and market housing mix policies in the Local Plan. SSDC feel that the SHMA needs updating in 2014. Sedgemoor needs to commission work immediately to addresses a local issue, and therefore not appropriate to wait to undertake a joint update.	Involvement in joint working groups to produce evidence base. Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on. Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.	Evidence emerging from the SHMAA has influenced policies HG3: Provision of Affordable Housing, HG4: Provision of Affordable Housing, Sites 1-5 and HG5: Achieving a Mix of Market Housing, relating to targets and thresholds of affordable housing and mix of market housing.
Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment A joint assessment was undertaken to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the county.		An update has been agreed in principle amongst all Somerset authorities and this will be incorporated into the Local Plan (Policy HG7) identifying a new requirement which reflects the plan period.

West Somerset District Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Methods of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
No cross boundary issues directly emerging from either the policies or proposals in the South Somerset Local Plan or Taunton Deane Core		

Strategy. No emerging issues relating to scale or direction of growth.		
<p>Affordable Housing Need All the Somerset authorities jointly commissioned Fordham Research to undertake their Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which informed the affordable housing and market housing mix policies in the Local Plan. SSDC feel that the SHMA needs updating in 2014. West Somerset needs more detailed work and have already commissioned a consultant, therefore a joint update is not possible.</p>	<p>Involvement in joint working groups to produce evidence base.</p> <p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>Evidence emerging from the SHMAA has influenced policies HG3: Provision of Affordable Housing, HG4: Provision of Affordable Housing, Sites 1-5 and HG5: Achieving a Mix of Market Housing, relating to targets and thresholds of affordable housing and mix of market housing.</p>
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment A joint assessment was undertaken to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the county.</p>		<p>An update has been agreed in principle amongst all Somerset authorities and this will be incorporated into the Local Plan (Policy HG7) identifying a new requirement which reflects the plan period.</p>

Dorset County Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
<p>Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension, and associated transport infrastructure The development could potentially impact beyond the district boundaries. The principal cross boundary issues relate to the impact in transportation/highway terms and the need to ensure the individual and cumulative impacts are considered.</p>	<p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>The views put forward by Dorset County Council are being used to inform the emerging Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2, which will inform the Yeovil SUE Master Plan DPD.</p>

Wiltshire Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
No strategic or cross boundary issues of common concern identified (see Appendix 2b)		

Devon County Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Methods of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
A30/A303/A358 Improvement project Long standing aspiration to improve connectivity on strategic routes from Wiltshire to Cornwall. Improvements sought in relation to journey time, safety and consistency/reliability and to unlock wider economic benefits.	Whilst Somerset County Council is taking the lead, SSDC has had involvement in a project group including Somerset, Wiltshire, Devon, Plymouth and Cornwall Councils as well as the Highways Agency.	On-going issue, but improvements should drive forward development in the District and deliver the economic growth anticipated in the Local Plan.

East Devon District Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
No strategic or cross boundary issues of common concern identified (see Appendix 2b)		

West Dorset District Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
Location of Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension The area of search for the urban extension included land to the west of Yeovil extending into West Dorset District.	Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on. Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.	SSDC feel there has been clear engagement with WDDC who have made their views known. Agreed that joint working will continue through the masterplanning process because of potential traffic impact on West Dorset villages.

<p>Retail Provision – Babylon Hill The Peel Centre, Babylon Hill is an out of town retail centre within West Dorset District but abutting South Somerset. There are issues surrounding the potential impact of Babylon Hill on Yeovil Town Centre.</p>		<p>Policy in emerging South Somerset Local Plan to place a ceiling on retail development in Yeovil in order to prevent overtrading and adverse impacts. Approach focusses on town centre first and prevention of further out-of-town development. WDDC confirmed that that they supported SSDC approach and will also seek to limit further retail development in the Babylon Hill area.</p>
<p>Bracketts Coppice Special Area of Conservation (SAC) The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) identified a need to accommodate Pipistrelle bats and their foraging grounds. The Area extends as far as the Yeovil SUE.</p>	<p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>On-going. Agreed that mitigation is possible. A management plan may be required.</p>

North Dorset District Council

Cross Boundary Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
<p>Henstridge Airfield Concern regarding potential traffic impact of development at the airfield on North Dorset villages.</p>	<p>Engagement over a number of years regarding the production of the Henstridge Airfield Masterplan.</p> <p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>Past engagement acknowledged. Emerging Local Plan proposes nothing new but elevates the masterplan as an informative to the Policy giving it additional weight. NDDC confirmed that they have no concerns over the Local Plan and that joint working would continue on planning applications.</p>
<p>Education provision NDDC concerned that children for Henstridge go the Stalbridge schools. Concerned that</p>	<p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p>	<p>Henstridge is a Rural Settlement in the emerging Local Plan therefore Policy SS2 would be applicable (i.e. no major</p>

<p>further development in Henstridge would exacerbate the problem.</p>	<p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>development in the countryside). Parental choice makes it difficult to stop cross boundary education trips. SSDC confirmed that SCC would be trying to retain children at Somerset Schools.</p>
<p>A357 to Shepton Mallet Historically NDDC have sought to downgrade A357 from an A to a B road.</p>		<p>SCC and SDDC are sympathetic to anything that reduced traffic along the A357, speed illustrates this. Issue to be explored further with DCC.</p>
<p>Economic influence of Yeovil Potential to improve public transport linkages between Town Centre and Pen Mill</p>	<p>Specific duty to co-operate meeting to address issues head-on.</p>	<p>SSDC and NDDC confirmed that this is not a major issue requiring joint working arrangements.</p>
<p>Growth of Gillingham 1,700 new homes proposed, consideration of implications for Wincanton</p>	<p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>SSDC confirmed that this would have no significant impact on Wincanton.</p>

Appendix 2a - Summary of Neighbouring Authorities Representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and Officer Recommendations

The following neighbouring authorities made no formal representations to the Local Plan:

- Mendip District Council
- Taunton Deane Borough Council
- Sedgemoor District Council
- West Somerset District Council
- Wiltshire Council
- Devon County Council
- East Devon District Council
- North Dorset District Council

Local Authority	Summary of Representation	Response
Somerset County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor rewording to clarify policies and implications throughout. • Car parking in Yeovil evidence base questioned • Inclusion of education in list of things accessible by sustainable transport. • Request that explicitly stated that Infrastructure Plan needs to be live and reviewed regularly, along with funding. • Where is the evidence for the new road being needed at Torbay Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor changes implemented. • Evidence base reference included. • Education included. • Changes made to explain Infrastructure Plan and its implications, review structure and finances for projects. • Policy remains but clarify in supporting text the aspiration for a road.
Dorset County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle-link between Milborne Port (in South Somerset) and Sherborne (in West Dorset) omitted from Plan. • Implications of the proposed level of growth in Yeovil on local Infrastructure. Yeovil TTWA extends well into North and West Dorset and the possibility it could exacerbate already high levels of in-commuting has not been addressed. No consideration of the proposed level of growth at Sherborne. • Concerns about securing an improved route of A37 through proposed urban extension. 	<p>Cycle-link to be referred to.</p> <p>It is considered that the housing provision in Yeovil will address in-commuting. Identified with WDDC that no strategic issue with the level of growth at Sherborne.</p> <p>Agreed to be matter for detailed masterplanning upon approval of Urban Extension through the Local Plan.</p>
West Dorset District Council	Support	Support noted.

Appendix 2b - Copies of correspondence between SSDC and Wiltshire Council and East Devon District Council, identifying no strategic or cross boundary issues of significance

SSDC Letter

Email from East Devon

From: Matthew Dickins [<mailto:MDickins@eastdevon.gov.uk>]

Sent: 29 August 2012 12:39

To: PlanningPolicy

Cc: Linda Renshaw

Subject: Duty To Cooperate - UNCLASSIFIED:

Hi Andy

Thanks for your letter of the 9 August 2012. I would not wish to raise and at this stage cannot identify any issues, in respect to Duty to Cooperate, that are of relevance/importance to us in respect of content of the Proposed South Somerset Local Plan (2012).

I am copying in this reply to Linda Renshaw in our policy team as Linda is looking at the Duty to Cooperate in a wider sense for our emerging Local Plan including cross-boundary issues. Whilst our main cross-boundary concerns relate to Exeter and Teignbridge (looking west-ward) we do also want to give consideration to possible or the potential for Somerset and Dorset (and Mid Devon) cross boundary matters and concerns.

Matthew Dickins
Planning Policy Manager
East Devon District Council

Direct Line – 01395 - 571540

David Milton
Wiltshire Council
County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire
BA14 8JN

9th August 2012

Andy Foyne
(01935) 462462

**RE: Duty to Co-operate, Proposed Submission
South Somerset Local Plan**

As you will be aware, the Localism Act (November 2011) introduced the 'Duty to Cooperate', whereby local planning authorities are required to work with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies in preparing their development plan documents.

As our Council's share a very small joint boarder and cross boundary planning issues are not significant, I am writing to you to confirm that you are content that there are no outstanding planning issues that cross our joint administrative boundaries and require any joint working. Therefore we have complied with the duty to co-operate with your authority regarding the production of our Proposed Submission South Somerset Local Plan. I would be very grateful if you could confirm this position.

Yours faithfully



Andy Foyne
Spatial Policy Manager

cc. Carolyn Gibson (Team Leader)

Appendix 2c – Dates of Duty to Co-operate Meetings with Neighbouring Authorities and Notes

Authority	Date of Meeting	Key Points of Discussion
West Dorset District Council	29/03/2010	Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension
West Dorset District Council	15/04/2010	Yeovil Urban Extension
North Dorset District Council	24/04/2011	Henstridge Airfield and associated cross boundary issues. Meeting confirmed there were no issues requiring a joint planning exercise.
Somerset Strategic Planning Officers Group	30/05/2012	Duty to co-operate – joint evidence base, county wide strategic planning and transport matters and housing strategy.
North Dorset District Council	06/07/2012	Henstridge Airfield, economic influence of Yeovil, growth of Gillingham and A303 and impact of cumulative growth.
West Dorset District Council	06/07/2012	Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension, The Peel retail Centre and impact on Yeovil town centre, and Bracketts Copice.
Dorset County Council	19/07/2012	A357 road corridor and matters of mutual interest. A30, A37 & A303 strategic route issues and Yeovil Urban Extension.
Somerset Planning Officers and Members	9/11/2012	Duty to co-operate – joint evidence base, county wide strategic planning and transport matters and housing strategy.

Notes

1. Meeting with West Dorset District Council on 29th March 2010

NOTES OF MEETING WITH HILARY JORDAN

29TH MARCH 2010

RE: YEOVIL URBAN EXTENSION

1. Historic Landscape Assessment

AF informed HJ of Historic Landscape Assessment being commissioned for periphery of Yeovil to inform Preferred Option for Urban Extension of Yeovil.

Further eco studies will be undertaken in due course. The Assessment was essential to enable SSDC to confirm a preferred option.

2. Call for Sites

AF informed HJ of need to undertake specific call for sites for urban extension in West Dorset as soon as possible and before publication of Preferred Options report in order to explore if 5,000 dwellings and ancillary land requirements can be accommodated in each option. PINS critical friend had indicated this was important. HS indicated that initial view from West Dorset was likely to be to decline consent. A possible compromise would be to take forward a call for sites as part of the Preferred Option consultation. AF indicated that a formal letter would be forthcoming shortly asking for permission. West Dorset District Council have undertaken a review of their SHLAA in January and undertake annual reviews.

3. Clarification of 5000 dwellings – Contribution in West Dorset

The position re a 5000 urban extension in West Dorset contributing to West Dorset or to South Somerset housing requirement remains unclear. The question has been asked of GOSW who have not responded. General agreement that it is best not to pursue an answer at this stage when a definitive answer was not likely to be forthcoming. An answer is only required if the West Dorset site becomes the Preferred Option rather than an option to be dismissed and is only likely to be forthcoming from GOSW if necessary.

4. Rationalisation of Core Strategies

South Somerset aims for Preferred Options report in June with consultation in June/July and a Submission Document at the end of the year.

West Dorset aims for Preferred Options report by June 20th with consultation likely over summer and into September with Submission Document due by spring of next year.

Agreed that South Somerset should pursue options in its Core Strategy and Consultation and that West Dorset should address its view of the option in West Dorset as part of its Core Strategy. West Dorset could bring forward its response on the option in West Dorset to meet the South Somerset timescale.

This would work well as long as South Somerset and West Dorset both saw the West Dorset option to be dismissed in favour of another Preferred Option. Should SS feel that the West Dorset option was the right one and West Dorset agreed then it would be taken forward through the West Dorset Core Strategy. Should South Somerset feel that the West Dorset option was the right one and West Dorset disagree then it could not proceed and South Somerset who have to invoke the issue with GOSW.

5. Informing Members

Agreed best option was for an early Leaders and key Members meeting with senior officers (D. Evans and Simon Gale) and HJ and AF to consider matters and that the outcome of this current meeting could form a briefing note for such a meeting. MPs and Town and Parish Councils, et al could then be informed of the outcome of that early Leaders Meeting.

6. Any Other Business

Sherborne likely to be promoted to take 500 – 800 more dwellings with expansion of existing LP allocation favoured at Bacton Farm to overcome an identified access issue and development to the west as 2nd favourite.

Dorset County Council (Claire Pincher) may be able to provide the Historic Landscape Assessment with relevant information.

West Dorset require 12,500 dwellings in plan period with 3,000 urban extension to Dorchester. West Dorset members do not want to expand Dorchester and are minded to go with 9,500 figures.

7. Actions

- AF to draft note of meeting and briefing note for leaders meeting
- HJ to pursue leaders meeting arrangements for an early meeting
- AF to forward evidence base information to HJ re Yeovil sites (SA, Infrastructure information, transport assessments, landscape study (et al))
- AF to inform HJ of which West Dorset Parishes had been engaged in the process
- AF to forward Call for Sites letter to HJ
- HJ to forward West Dorset LDS

2. Meeting with West Dorset District Council on 15th April 2010

15th April 2010

Joint Meeting between West Dorset & South Somerset District Council Members and Officers

Attendance: Andy Foyne (SSDC), Nick Cradnell (SSDC), Tim Carroll (SSDC), Robert Gould (WDDC), Hillary Jordan (WDDC) & ???? (WDDC)

Apologies: Simon Gale (SSDC) & Peter Seib (SSDC)

Background & Overview

AF outlined the consultation process carried out by South Somerset DC so far in determining options for growth around Yeovil for 5,000 dwellings.

- Sustainability Appraisal of Yeovil Strategic Growth Options (December 2009 & February 2010)
- Parish & Town Council Consultation Workshops (30th November 2009, 14th December 2009 & 10th March 2010)
- Infrastructure Delivery Workshop (1st February 2010)

Dorset Parishes; Bradford Abbas and Queen Thorne Group (Over Compton, Trent Nether Compton) have been engaged although only Bradford Abbas has attended.

Three options have emerged from this process;

- Brympton / Coker
- Dorset / Over Compton (West Dorset)
- Barwick / Keyford (Preferred Option)

These options will be presented in the Draft Core Strategy that is programmed for DX in June.

The Barwick / Keyford direction is SSDCs preferred option for growth, this is subject to an Historic Environmental Assessment that has just been commissioned and was a requirement from English Heritage that emerged from the Infrastructure Delivery Workshop. This option will be crucial in validating the preferred Southern option. The early results of the HEA are expected in late May and will be available as a draft in early June.

We are also required to undertake a further 'call for sites' in each of the proposed options. This was an outcome of the PINS critical friend visit (17th November 2009). Point 5 indicates that each option should be tested. Although SSDC can 'call for sites' in South Somerset, we can't do this is same exercise in West Dorset. WDDC Officers indicated that some sites had been forwarded to the Council (Babylon Hill) but there were no plans to undertake a further 'call for sites' at this time.

As the RSS does not indicate which districts housing numbers the 5,000 dwellings fall within, clarification was sought from GOSW. Although the request for clarification was noted, there was no definitive answer.

TC noted that SSDC are now in difficulty situation as we must show that we have explored all options or risk being found unsound. WDDC agreed with these concerns.

WDDC had concerns that Dorset Option was in the flood plain and would lead to fears of coalescence with Sherborne. WDDC further noted that the RSS was a flawed process in many respects having not tested growth options sufficiently or considered environmental constraints. The RSS is currently undergoing SA work.

WDDC also noted the political dimension to the RSS, as known parties have stated that the Draft RSS would be abolished if they were elected. Should this be the case, the Draft RSS figures could be discounted for lower figures in earlier drafts. AF noted that SSDC were supportive of 16,600 figure.

A suggestion was made that Core Strategy consultation should await the outcome of the General Election on May 6th 2010 (Implications on RSS) and Historic Landscape Assessment due in early June 2010. Both dates could have significant implications on the outcome of the Core Strategy consultation. There is also an expectation that SA work on the RSS will emerge at this time. There was agreement across all parties for this suggestion.

The implications for this decision are that the SSDC Core Strategy will be delayed by three months to be consulted in September 2010. There is a good opportunity to consult at the same time as the WDDC Core Strategy through joint consultation. PS supported this approach. AF noted that the risk with Eco-town funding remained the same whichever the outcome, although this would be lessened after the results of the Historic Environmental Assessment.

A second meeting is proposed to follow up this meeting after the 6th May Election and as the outcome of the Historic Environmental Assessment emerge to discuss the implications of these events on the Core Strategy process.

3. Meeting with North Dorset District Council on 24th April 2011

Duty to Co-operate Meeting with North Dorset District Council - 24th April 2011

Present: Andy Foyne & Martin Woods (SSDC)
Trevor Warwick (NDDC)

Trevor informed SSDC officers of the following:

In 2009 looked at growth potential of Gillingham

Gillingham - growth area with strategic site allocation

2,300 dwellings - addressing joint SHMAA (with other Dorset councils) - looking to change start date to 2011 - so 2,300 dwellings from 2011, yet to work out end date.

March 2010 - publication of draft Core Strategy, but stalled:

- looking again at housing numbers
- SHLAA revised

Original draft looked at 7,000 dwellings for North Dorset, but now down to 5,100 dwellings 2006-2026.

2,300 dwellings in Gillingham to 2028, and looking to get 2028 to be the end of the plan period.

Looking to focus distribution in towns - development in rural areas will be through Local Neighbourhood Plans.

Looking to develop Village Design Statements as SPD.

Gillingham has 12 hectares of employment land provision, and about 3 hectares elsewhere.

Gillingham has attracted firms from elsewhere.

Considered to be no specific issue re. Gillingham growing at the expense of Wincanton.

Andy informed Trevor of the following:

Henstridge policy approved via Master plan.

A357 upgrade – joint CIL, as suggested by Dorset County Council in response to Draft Core Strategy, but North Dorset have no aspiration to upgrade and neither do SSDC

Overall scale of growth 16,600 in Draft Core Strategy and settlement strategy set out and explained. Proposals for Wincanton set out in detail.

Conclusion: In light of discussion, it was concluded that there were no issues requiring a joint planning exercise.

There was a general discussion on the emerging NPPF and its likely implications, but agreement that until there was more certainty, there was little to work on.

4. Somerset Strategic Planning Officers Group on 30th May 2012

The following emerged from the discussion re duty to co-operate at the strategic planning officers group yesterday:

1. There was no certainty re. what was required although it is clear that Inspectors are requesting evidence in way of written memos and meeting notes of the duty to co-operate being applied - no clear Inspector's decisions to go on to date clarifying the position but we must watch for such in the near future.
2. SCC paper produced by Strategic Planning section to their members seeking resurrection of the Somerset Strategic Planning Conference with member involvement never got beyond the strategic director who indicated she wanted a light touch to this matter. So SCC are unlikely to change their current stance in the near future.
3. Taunton Deane is discussing what they have done re duty to co-operate directly with their Inspector.
4. Taunton Deane got approval to their Core Strategy prior to the requirement to undertake duty to co-operate became statutory.
5. Mendip and West Somerset are behind us in the process and didn't say much

5. Meeting with North Dorset and West Dorset District Councils on 6th July 2012

Duty to Co-operate - South Somerset, West Dorset & North Dorset District Councils - 6th July 2012, South Somerset District Council Offices, Yeovil

Present

South Somerset District Council (SSDC)

Cllr Tim Carroll (Portfolio Holder for Spatial Planning and Finance)

Andy Foyne (Spatial Planning Manager)

Jo Manley (Spatial Planner)

North Dorset District Council (NDDC)

Cllr David Walsh (Portfolio Holder for Development)

Trevor Warrick (Planning Policy Manager)

West Dorset District Council (WDDC)

Cllr Sarah East (Executive Champion - Planning)

Cllr Teresa Seall (Policy Scrutiny Member)

Hilary Jordon (Planning Policy Manager)

Jo Witherden (Head of Spatial Policy and Implementation)

1. Purpose of Meeting

- a) Summarise joint working to date,
- b) Clarify joint working issues, and
- c) Obtain member endorsement.

Previously SSDC have met with both authorities, purpose of today's meeting is to:

- Summarise work on duty to co-operate to date,

- Obtain member endorsement, and
- Confirm that there are no issues previously not considered.

A meeting was held with WDDC on 15th April 2010, where the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) was discussed at officer and member level. There has been a history of consultation on the matter between the both authorities, given that there was an East Yeovil/West Dorset option. WDDC have attended the 'cluster workshops' and made formal representations to the Local Plan.

A meeting was held at an officer level with NDDC on 24th April 2011, where it was agreed that there were no major issues requiring a joint planning exercise. Henstridge Airfield Master Plan was published in July 2009 and it was considered that the exercise undertaken to produce this should be sufficient to satisfy that cross-boarder issue.

Action: Jo M to forward notes of previous meetings electronically to Hilary & Trevor.

A meeting has been set up with Dorset County Council (DCC) to explore whether there are any joint working issues, they previously submitted a representation to the Local Plan regarding the A357 corridor and the potential impacts of development on that route. SSDC, are also looking to set up a meeting with Somerset County Council (SCC), to discuss joint working.

Action: Jo M to invite Hilary & Trevor to attend the DCC meeting.

SSDC believe we have co-operated with adjoining authorities in the preparation of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, but to ensure there are no outstanding issues, are embarking on these meetings.

Other cross boarder authorities – East Devon, Wiltshire and the 3 other Somerset districts. A letter will be written to East Devon and Wiltshire to confirm no major issues requiring joint working and the 3 Somerset districts will be included in discussions with SCC.

2. Local Plan updates - implications for co-operation

SSDC

Draft Core Strategy went out to consultation in October 2010. There were many representations received to the Yeovil SUE, so SSDC have undertaken further engagement and evidence gathering, including taking the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) into account. Full Council approved the Proposed Submission Local Plan (2006-2028) in April and consultation period began on the 28 June until 10 August 2012.

It is anticipated that the Plan will be submitted to the Inspector at the end of September, with an Examination in January 2013 and adoption in the summer of 2013. The caveat being if SSDC or the Inspector wants to make any major changes, if so, the period will be extended by approx 3 months.

SSDC proposals of a cross boundary nature:

- Overall growth 15,950 2006-2028, of which 7,800 to Yeovil.
- Yeovil SUE.
- Retailing strategy – places a ceiling on the growth of Yeovil, so that it does not grow at the expense of other town centres. This will also benefit West Dorset's town centres, in our opinion.

- Wincanton – no additional major housing growth, 5 hectares of employment land in total (this is a reduction from the Draft Core Strategy where an additional 350 houses were proposed).
- Henstridge Airfield.

WDDC

The plan was held up by the proposed abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), but in the autumn of 2011 work got underway again with a round of intensive consultation. The Pre-Submission Draft Plan (2011-2031) went out to consultation in June, until 27th July 2012.

The Plan is a joint plan with Weymouth and Portland. The Plan contains some significant land allocations, including the increasing residential development at Sherborne by 230 dwellings to 800, and 6 hectares of employment land.

Cross boarder issues in addition to Weymouth & Portland arise with East Devon and SSDC. The history of working with SSDC on SUE has been explained, but WDDC would expect continued involvement in any master planning and traffic impact work etc.

WDDC proposals of a cross boundary nature:

- Overall growth 9,400 2011-2031, of which 800 to Sherborne. The location of the Sherborne allocation is to the north west (Barton Farm).

Submission to the Inspector is expected in February, Examination in May, with adoption in October 2013.

WDDC are also out to consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) draft charging schedule. The same Inspector will be used to examine CIL as the Local Plan.

NDDC

Draft Core Strategy was published in March 2010, before the elections in May. Following the election, Members wanted to review the housing numbers, so the Plan has been delayed whilst evidence base gathering is being undertaken. Neighbourhood Planning is very much at the heart of the revised plan. Pre-Submission Local Plan will be out in January 2013

Three main issues are 1) overall level of growth, 2) detailed proposals for Gillingham (1,700 dwellings) and 3) village development - through neighbourhood plans.

The growth 2006-2026 was 7,000, re-based to 2011-2026 equates to 4,200 dwellings for the district. Focus on the towns, but flexibility in the villages.

There is evidence for the need for Gillingham Urban Extension, joint study with DCC to identify a preferred direction of growth. Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan is being undertaken at the same time, and the community have bought into the growth, its location and the potential benefits it can bring to the town.

3. Cross boarder issues

West Dorset District Council

- **Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension**

SSDC feel that there has been clear engagement with WDDC and they have made their view clear. Agreement that the joint working will continue through the master planning process because of the potential traffic impact on West Dorset villages,

although Parsons Brinckerhoff report has demonstrated that increased traffic is to an acceptable level.

- **The Peel Centre, Babylon Hill - retail impacts on Yeovil Town Centre**

A policy has been included in the Local Plan which places a ceiling on retail development in Yeovil to prevent overtrading and adverse impacts on other town centres. Focus also very much on town centres first approach, and prevention of further out-of-town development. WDDC confirmed that they support SDDC approach and would not support additional retail growth at Babylon Hill and there are Local Plan policies to that effect.

- **Bracketts Coppice**

Habitats regulation Assessment (HRA) identified a need to accommodate Pipistrelle bats and their foraging grounds. The area extends as far as the Yeovil SUE – mitigation is possible.

NDDC had a similar issue in Blandford with Greater Horseshoe Bats, mitigation was possible, but may find you need to commit the land to some sort of management plan, because their food sources need to be maintained.

North Dorset District Council

- **Henstridge Airfield**

Henstridge Airfield Master Plan was produced in consultation with NDDC and DCC, traffic is the main concern. The Local Plan proposes nothing new, but elevates the Policy from the master plan into Local Plan for additional weight. NDDC may need to take a report to Cabinet to form a view.

Action – Trevor to confirm NDDC have no concerns over the Local Plan and Henstridge and joint working to continue on any forthcoming planning applications.

- **Education Provision**

NDDC have concerns that children from Henstridge go to Stalbridge schools. Concerned that further development in Henstridge would exacerbate the problem. Henstridge is a Rural Settlement in the emerging Local Plan and therefore Policy SS2 would be applicable (i.e. no major development as countryside). Parental choice makes it difficult to stop the cross boarder education trips, but Tim Carroll confirmed that SCC would be trying to retain children for Somerset schools.

- **A357 Issues**

In the past sought a downgrade from an A road to a B road, but SDDC/SCC are sympathetic to anything that reduces traffic along the A357, speed illustrates this. DCC have raised this as an issue and it will be explored further at the meeting with them.

Action - Andy to raise the issue of A357 to Shepton Mallet with DCC.

- **Economic influence of Yeovil - (potential to improve public transport linkages between Town Centre and Pen Mill)**

SDDC and NDDC confirmed not a major issue requiring joint working arrangements.

- **Growth of Gillingham (1,700 new homes proposed - implications for Wincanton)**

SDDC confirmed that this would have no significant impact on Wincanton.

- **A303 - traffic impact of cumulative growth from 3 local authority areas**

Currently a case is being made by SCC for upgrading the A303, A30 & A358 and this should be the forum for joint working. The key is creating a business case for the upgrading, WDDC and NDDC to support. See link for more details:

<http://www.thisissomerset.co.uk/Survey-identify-demand-road-upgrades-A303-A30/story-16456453-detail/story.html>

4. Duty to co-operate - summary of progress and ongoing consultation arrangements

Need to be aware of the following:

Progress on Neighbourhood Planning – cooperation on any arising cross boundary issues.

Population projections from ONS - 16th July 2012 (District level)

Business Register Employment Survey (BRES) - 25th September 2012 (jobs data)

5. Date of next meeting

There was general agreement that there is no need for another meeting at the moment. DCC have a Memorandum of Understanding for the Duty to Co-operate in the county, might be something to consider.

6. Meeting with Dorset County Council on 19th July 2012

Duty to Co-operate - South Somerset District Council and Dorset County Council

19th July 2012, South Somerset District Council Offices, Yeovil Notes

Attendance:

Paul Willis and Sue McGowan, Dorset County Council

Andy Foyne and Jo Manley, South Somerset District Council

Summary of Issues:

1. A303 - mutual interest for both authorities, and agreed that the Somerset County Council led forum which is working up a case for upgrading the A303, A30 & A358 should be the forum for joint working.
2. A30 - no substantive issues, mutual interest that congestion in Yeovil is not increased as a result of any further retail development at the Peel Centre, Babylon Hill.
3. Henstridge Airfield and access to the A357 – recognition that limited growth could occur under Policy EP6 and that this would not be at the expense of traffic levels on the rural road network. Henstridge Airfield Master plan contains the level of growth and presents the basis for continuing monitoring.
4. Strategic development at Gillingham and Wincanton – growth at Gillingham and limited further growth at Wincanton presents no major cross border issues for either authority..
5. A357 road corridor – no major proposals to develop further as not a strategic freight route. Managing existing traffic by keeping the rurality and slowing down traffic. Keep a watching brief.
6. A37 and the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) – DCC long aspiration to upgrade A37 (because of commercial requirements to access A3088 and A303),

as upgrade Dorset side has not been matched by SCC. SUE will be an opportunity to improve route management mechanisms and improve the safe and steady flow of traffic from Dorset to the A3088 and A303. The view of SSDC and SCC is that a new road, which achieves access to A3088 and A303 (through SUE) will be a challenge to deliver and this should be explored through the master plan and the Yeovil Transport Strategy Review. SSDC to invite DCC to attend up coming meeting on YTSR.

DCC believe that environmental and capacity benefits of a new local link road require highlighting – northern end of A37 to Quick Silver roundabout, improvements for residents on West Coker Road and South Somerset residents in general.

SSDC expect DCC to make a representation to the Local Plan consultation, setting out points raised and focussing on route management incorporating a new local link through Yeovil SUE..

7. Heart of Wessex Line – both recognise mutual gains to improve rail service frequency and bus links to Penn Mill, for benefit of to commuters from Dorset. Future joint working on this will be in the context of the priced option now contained in the franchised bid.

Nest Steps:

1. Meeting to be set up between SSDC, DCC and SCC to discuss SUE and A37.
2. SCC to be asked to invite DCC to attend the YTSR meetings.
3. DCC to make a representation to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. This will be taken through their cabinet and will ensure Member sign off of the issues from their end. (if any issues raised by DCC members, a Portfolio Holder meeting will be required between SSDC and DCC)

7. Meeting with Somerset Planning Officers and Members on 9th November 2012

Duty to cooperate meeting, 9.30am - Friday 9th November, Innovation Centre, Yeovil - Notes

Present: Cllr. Tim Carroll, Martin Woods, Andy Foyne & Jo Manley (SSDC)
Cllr. David Hall, Stephen Walford & Guy Robinson (SCC)
Cllr. Keith Turner & Martin Wilsher (WSDC)
Cllr. Nigel Woollcombe-Adams & John Meeker (MDC)
Cllr. Mark Edwards & Roger Mitchinson (TDBC)
Nick Tait (SDC)
Ruth McArthur (ENP)

Joint evidence base work

- AF recited a list of previous joint evidence base working that presents a clear record of positive past engagement, and evidence of joint working.

SHMA

- The possibilities of undertaking a new joint SHMA were raised. It was concluded that there was no merit in producing a joint SHMA for a number of reasons:
 - Mendip's is in a different Housing Market Area and looks to West of England, therefore difficult to find areas of communality and not appropriate to undertake joint working.

- West Somerset relates to the Northern Peninsular, and has already commissioned Housing Vision who undertook Torridge and North Devon's SHMA to do their update, therefore not appropriate.
 - Exmoor National Park also relates to the Northern Peninsula and has commissioned their own evidence gathering, therefore not appropriate. Given the special statutory purpose, looking to identify estimated need, rather than requirement.
 - Sedgemoor has very recently committed to reviewing their SHMA. Required urgently due to the potential Hinkley effect so there is a need to commission the work immediately and therefore due to timing and localised imperative, joint working is not appropriate.
 - Taunton Deane had not envisaged updating SHMA until 2014 as existing is fit for purpose. Will continue dialogue with Sedgemoor because of the shared Housing Market Area.
 - South Somerset is looking to commence their own SHMA in latter half of 2013 following examination. Existing SHMA considered fit for purpose for Local Plan examination.
- Agreed that various methodologies should be shared and that all would 'observe' what others are doing and this meeting or successor would be an appropriate forum

Action:- - *Martin Wilsher and Nick Tait to distribute methodologies to group.*

GTAA & GTA DPD

- Agreement that the GTAA needed updating and that it should be done at a countywide level using previous consultants (Loughborough University with Jo Richardson leading for the University). Clear merits in using existing consultants who should be able to update existing GTAA relatively quickly/cheaply. AF informed meeting that an early approach to Jo Richardson indicated an Easter 2013 start would be earliest they could do and an indication of cost was not possible at this stage
- Potential timing issue for Taunton Deane but would be ok if consultants could deliver 3 to 6 months thereafter. Issue of competitive tender process was raised. It was considered that SSDC could appoint as they appointed previously under their rules of procurement as long as a special case could be made.

Action:- *AF to establish definitive start date (Easter 2013), establish length of time update will take and establish procurement rules to ensure that there is no requirement to go out to competitive tender.*

- Less appetite for a countywide GTA DPD. Majority of authorities have a minimal requirement and feel that they have a 5 year land supply. Agreed to discuss this further at a subsequent meeting but potential to go individual ways on this issue for operational and resource issues.

Action: - *matter of joint GTA DPD to be brought to a future meeting.*

Transport matters (county wide)

- SW (SCC) updated the meeting on progress on the Somerset, Devon and Wiltshire A303 economic impact assessment study priority. Final study being prepared to be signed off next week. Then onto the Minister. Opportunity to lobby for capital and revenue funding.

- Districts have identified countywide strategic priorities for SCC to consider for post 2015 funding - no new money before then. Priorities will go into new body, the Local Transport Board, who will have a separate funding allocation, to look at priorities across the Local Enterprise Partnership area. There will be more freedom than in the past, each LTB will have an allocation and will need to establish how to spend it. Potentially £15-16m a year across the authorities comprising the LEP, in other words one major scheme per authority a year. SW thanked authorities for indicating their priorities (although some hadn't) and promised to forward a recent report on the priorities to AF for distribution to the group.

Action: - SW to forward recent priority paper to AF to circulate to the meeting members.

- Regional Growth Fund and Growing Places - £5m threshold dropped, so smaller schemes enabling housing and economic development, could come through this pot.

Strategic planning matters

- There was general confirmation and acceptance of neighbours' scale and level of growth and that they were mutually consistent. West Somerset and Exmoor National Park were in discussion over levels of growth and their location. Mendip in discussion with BANES.

Eco initiatives (outcome of work undertaken)

- SSDC are awaiting confirmation of the urban extension location for Yeovil before applying the energy and waste reports via the future masterplan for the urban extension.
- Taunton Deane in a similar position. Their studies have confirmed that District Heating schemes not viable for them.

Somerset Moors and Levels

- All Councils happy with the outcomes of the Econet project. Taunton Deane and Sedgemoor have SPD's on biodiversity based on Larry Burrows work at County and SSDC are looking to incorporate into their emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy. General support
- Larry Burrows (SCC) looking to pursue further SPD work on back of the Econet project which will require consideration and co-ordination. Should this be a County wide SPD or will it be picked up separately by Councils. This to be a matter for a future meeting - is there any merit in going beyond the Econet?

Action: - matter of a County wide Biodiversity SPD to be brought to a future meeting.

Hinkley Point

- DH (SCC) indicated that currently considerable work ongoing on the section 106 agreement funds and their distribution. Others wondered how to access such funds.
- General concern on labour and skill impacts and need to ensure through tertiary education sector amongst others that skill shortages for Hinckley and general labour market do not occur.
- DH indicated their intention to set up a Hinkley Point Strategic Delivery Forum and there was general support for this and the SCC intention to involve the other Councils of Somerset within it.

Action: - SW to inform his colleagues and other Councils to be involved in Strategic Delivery Forum once inaugurated.

Housing Strategy

- Co-ordination of housing strategy being proceeded by Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership and this needs to be co-ordinated with Councils' SHMAs and other documents.

Action:- AF to inform Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership of imminent SHMA programmes and to seek in return programme of Housing Strategy for further consideration.

AOB

- There was agreement that the meeting had been useful and that further meetings should proceed on Duty to Co-operate matters on a 6 monthly basis (or ad hoc if an issue arose). It was agreed that SSDC should act as secretariat for the 1st year and convene a second meeting and then the secretarial duties would pass to another Council.
- There was some discussion about make up of the meeting. General agreement that it should be portfolio holder and Key officer and the same Councils (and ENP) as were at the meeting. There was also discussion that it should be widened to include strategically important stakeholders such as Environment Agency. On the one hand this was all inclusive but on other the Council's power to act and commonality of interests would be weakened. After a discussion on this no agreement was reached and it was left to SSDC to investigate out of the meeting with others to gain their individual views

Action: - AF to explore wider membership of next meeting with each organisation.

Finally there was a round up of Councils' Plans progress for information:

- SSDC - hope to submit Local Plan by Christmas with examination in April. Consultation on a preliminary draft charging schedule, and are looking to go out in engage with consultants to provide further supporting information to justify the assumptions currently being made. Consultation on draft charging schedule is anticipated summer 2103, examination in the autumn and adoption of CIL Rate early in 2014, before the cut off in April 2014.
- SDC – Local Plan adopted. Consultation on a preliminary draft charging schedule has taken place, working on adoption late summer 2013.
- SCC - Waste main modifications consultation current. Minerals at Preferred Options stage
- WSDC - Preferred Options consultation on Local Plan due by March, as further consultation was undertaken to address NPPF.
- ENP - Preferred Options consultation April 2013. Adoption anticipated June 2014.
- MDC - Pre submission draft Local Plan consultation December 2012, Examination Summer 2013, Adoption later in 2013. CIL to follow adoption of Local Plan (Autumn 2013). Work has already commenced - IDP and updated

viability work completed for affordable housing policies and some testing of CIL levels.

Appendix 3 - Co-operation with Prescribed Bodies

This is not an exhaustive list, but demonstrates the way in which South Somerset District Council has fulfilled the duty to co-operate in relation to strategic planning matters with prescribed bodies.

Environment Agency

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
<p>Flooding and water management, including surface water run off.</p> <p>Conservation of biodiversity.</p>	<p>Consultation on all stages of the Local Plan including the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>Joint working, for example SSDC membership on steering group for the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This included meetings and providing comments on drafts of the SFRA.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>Setting the scope for the SA.</p> <p>Actively involved in the SFRA, a key piece of evidence that informed the policies and proposals in the Local Plan, for example directions of growth and Policy EQ1.</p> <p>Influence over policies such as - EQ5: Green Infrastructure.</p>

English Heritage

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
<p>Conservation of the historic environment, including Heritage Assets of the District.</p>	<p>Consultation on all stages of the Local Plan including the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>Specific meeting initiated through consultation response on the Local Plan regarding the potential impacts of the proposed Yeovil urban extension on the Roman Villa at Dunnocks Lane – objection against soundness of Local Plan.</p>	<p>Setting the scope for the SA.</p> <p>Consultation responses taken into account in amending/reviewing the Local Plan. Changes to policy EQ3 and supporting text agreed and implemented.</p> <p>Agreed that additional evidence base work is required to establish the setting of the Roman Villa. This will be used to inform Master</p>

	Emails, letters & telephone.	Planning once the plan is adopted. Meeting held on 24 th October and further meeting to be held prior to Full Council consideration of schedule of minor amendments to seek to resolve outstanding issues.
--	------------------------------	---

Natural England

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
Conservation of biodiversity. Protection of Somerset Levels and Moors	<p>Consultation on all stages of the Local Plan including the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>Somerset-wide jointly commissioned report “Appropriate Assessment for Somerset Authorities Core Strategies” (2009) involving consultation with Natural England and the Environment Agency, using Natural England criteria, to support the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA to ensure no adverse impact on the integrity of the Levels and Moors as a result of the combined authorities’ scale of growth.</p> <p>Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.</p>	<p>Setting the scope for the SA.</p> <p>Consultation responses taken into account in amending/reviewing the Local Plan, for example, the recommended changes from the Appropriate Assessment are incorporated into the Local Plan policies such as Policy EQ2: Design - amended to ensure that development does not affect the integrity of local, national and international wildlife sites.</p>

Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
The operational airfields in the District are RNAS Yeovilton (military), Henstridge (private) RNAS Merryfield (military) and	Consulted on the Local Plan - no comments received.	No need for change.

Westlands airfield (private). There is a policy to protect the Westlands airfield flight safety zone.		
The CAA act as an independent aviation regulator and provider of air traffic services.		
No strategic issues of common concern identified.		

Homes and Communities Agency

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
Funding for largely affordable housing. No strategic issues of common concern identified.	Consulted on the Local Plan - no comments received. HCA were however involved in the CEDA project and its initial funding.	Evidence base to support the strategic growth of Chard.

Primary Care Trusts

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
Strategic health infrastructure	Consulted on the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Meetings, emails, letters & telephone.	Infrastructure Delivery Plan has informed the Local Plan's growth proposals.

Office of Rail Regulation

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
A key responsibility of the Office of Rail Regulation is to ensure that network rail	Consulted on the Local Plan - no comments received.	No direct influence.

<p>manages the network efficiently.</p> <p>Whilst there has been no two-way correspondence with the Office of Rail Regulation, Network Rail and the local train operating companies, South West Trains, First Great Western, Rail Freight and DB Schenker have been consulted in greater detail.</p>	<p>Emails with local train operating companies.</p>	
--	---	--

Highway Authority (see above under Somerset County Council)

Highways Agency

Strategic Issues	Method of Co-operation	Outcomes and Impact on South Somerset Local Plan
<p>Transport</p>	<p>Consulted on all stages on the Local Plan and the IDP</p> <p>A30/A303/A358 Improvement project –is an example of a joint working group with the HA, to secure the long standing aspiration to improve connectivity on strategic routes from Wiltshire to Cornwall. Improvements sought in relation to journey time, safety and consistency/reliability and to unlock wider economic benefits.</p>	<p>Identified highways improvements should drive forward development in the District and deliver the Local Plan’s vision for economic growth. Confirmed preference for Yeovil’s Urban extension to south and West of Yeovil.</p>

Appendix 3a - Summary of Prescribed Bodies Representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and Officer Recommendations

The following prescribed bodies made no formal representations to the Local Plan:

- Civil Aviation Authority
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Office of Rail Regulation

Prescribed Body	Summary of Representation	Officer Recommendation
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Quality policies relate only to air quality and are not sufficiently developed to include water quality – recommend new water quality policy. • Environmental Quality policies also neglect to include Somerset’s Waste Plan and how this impacts on development in South Somerset. 	Both of these comments have been taken on-board and their recommended changes included in the amended plan.
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Quality policies fail to address South Somerset’s Heritage Assets at risk. • Strategic Objectives and Vision fails to include reference to South Somerset’s cultural and heritage assets. • Yeovil policies should include safeguards to assess potential impacts on historic character of area, in particular more evidence is needed to assess the impacts 	<p>Policies implicated by comments have been reworded and amended to include a more explicit reference to Heritage and Cultural Assets and measures to preserve them.</p> <p>Additional references to <i>historic</i> environment in introductions to related policies.</p> <p>Additional evidence base work to establish the setting of the Roman Villa. Meeting held on 24th October and further meeting to be held prior to Full Council consideration of schedule of minor amendments to seek to resolve</p>

	on the proposed urban extension on the Roman Villa at Dunnocks Lane – objections against soundness of Local Plan.	outstanding issues.
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Quality policies require additional wording to emphasise urban-scale green-infrastructure provision. • Rewording of policy on Langport/Huish Episcopi Direction of Growth to ensure development will only proceed if habitat protection can be guaranteed. 	Rewording and additional wording to amend affected policies according to wishes with employment development being identified for the more sensitive locations nearer to West Moor SSSI.
Primary Care Trusts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure Delivery must include health infrastructure – imperative that Health and Wellbeing policies expanded to include this. • Health Impact Assessment to be undertaken for new developments. 	<p>Comments taken on-board; all infrastructure provision should be outlined in the Infrastructure Plan and this itself is subject on-going review.</p> <p>Impact Assessments will be included in future master plans for new developments where appropriate.</p>
Highway Authority (see above under Somerset County Council)		
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeovil Vision supported. Improvements required at the Cartgate Roundabout can be achieved through joint working with councils on the Area Action Plan. 	Agreed. Cartgate Roundabout improvements now in receipt of funding from the Department for Transport.

Appendix 3b – Dates of Duty to Co-operate Meetings with Prescribed Bodies and Notes

Authority	Date of Meeting	Key Points of Discussion
English Heritage	24/10/2012	Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension

2. Meeting with English Heritage on 24th October 2012

There are two versions of the notes as they have yet to be agreed.

Version One – SSDC version of the notes

South Somerset's Proposed Submission Plan – discussing issues raised by English Heritage

Wednesday 24 October 2012, 10am – 12 noon, Corporate Meeting Room, Brympton Way, Yeovil

Meeting Notes

1. Introductions

Attendees: Caroline Power (CP), English Heritage; Robert Archer (RA), SSDC; Adron Duckworth (AD), SSDC; Steve Membery (SM) Somerset County Council Archaeologist; Andy Foyne (AF), SSDC; Keith Lane (KL), SSDC.

2. Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension

CP: the Local Plan does not include sufficient consideration of the various historic assets in the location identified for the urban extension and its vicinity.

Action AF: additional text to be added to paras 5.46-48 of the plan as a minor change to highlight areas that have particular historic significance.

AF/RA: Yeovil Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) is considered sufficient to determine the broad location of the urban extension, in advance of the forthcoming masterplan which will consider the various historic assets in greater detail. CP reassured to see the evidence in the HEA.

Action CP: Confirm English Heritage acceptance in principle that the HEA establishes that the Roman Villa can be suitably protected within an urban extension.

Action CP/SM: English Heritage to engage with SM to commence additional work on the setting of the Roman Villa's in the vicinity of the urban extension (Dunnock's Lane and Chessels) in November together with a nominated English Heritage Inspector, with a view to informing the examination and subsequent masterplan of how the Roman Villa's setting can be protected within the urban extension.

Action CP: Reconsider comment on 'multi-site'/north west option following a reconsideration of the HEA. In particular withdraw support for a 'multi-site'

approach to development in context that HEA identifies archaeological sites that would be affected by a multi-site approach.

3. Policy EQ3: Historic Environment

CP pleased to see the addition of a policy specifically on the historic environment. The rewording suggested in CP's comments on the plan is a possible example as would like more in depth analysis in the policy. CP expressed content to the Council's intention to address heritage matters in much more detail through a Heritage Strategy.

Action AD: proposed rewording of para 12.40 and Policy EQ3 as follows:
"The Council will develop a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment that will include:

- Guidance and advice for owners and developers in relation to the conservation of the historic environment, nationally and locally designated assets including archaeological sites.
- The council's approach to identifying and managing heritage assets at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, and to their conservation and return to sustainable use where appropriate.
- A programme for the review of existing Conservation Area boundaries, the preparation of Conservation Area Assessments and Management Plans and making new designations.
- Encouragement for the development of local skills, crafts and the production of local materials relevant to the historic environment.
- Measures to identify locally significant historic assets including buildings, parks and gardens and archaeological features and the preparation of a district-wide list of such assets.
- Detailed advice for developers preparing proposals that may have an impact upon any aspect of the historic environment about conservation, good design and positive enhancement of the assets and their settings.
- Opportunities to improve historic townscapes, landscapes and the public realm."

Add the following para to Policy EQ3 (at the beginning):

"Heritage assets will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Their potential to contribute towards the economy, tourism, education and local identity will be exploited".

Action AF: Add the intention to produce a Heritage Strategy and include in the Local Development Scheme to para 12.40 of the Plan.

Action AF: Add reference to the single battlefield in the District (para 12.38).

Action AF: Amend indicator under Policy EQ3 to “avoidance of development that will impact on heritage areas on the national list.” Add reference to the production of a Heritage Strategy to the monitoring indicators.

4. Other issues

Action AF: Add reference to the historic environment to strategic objective 9 consistent with CP’s recommended change.

Action AF: Add reference to the historic environment to the Vision in para 2: “There will be continued protection of distinctive historic, urban and rural environments.”

CP concerned that the Local Plan lacks historic environment evidence for the other main settlements, particularly given the historic importance of these. RA explained that peripheral landscape studies did consider historic environment issues. KL highlighted the spatial portraits for the main settlements include detail on historic environment. AF explained that Sustainability Appraisal of growth options did consider the historic environment, and that the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document will consider the impact of development upon the historic environment in further detail.

CP/SM state that the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Ilchester is not as extensive as indicated on the Local Plan inset map.

Action AF: amend the extent of the Scheduled Ancient Monument on the Ilchester inset map.

Nb. All of the amendments identified above will be included as ‘minor changes’ to the Local Plan when it is submitted to the Secretary of State.

Action CP: It was agreed that upon circulation and acceptance of these notes by English Heritage, CP would formally write back to AF and confirm that EH withdraw their earlier concerns about the soundness of the Plan expressed in their representations on the Proposed Submission Local Plan and in particular those expressed in relation to:

- The adverse impact of Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension on the setting of the Roman Villa;
- Multi-site approach to development being favoured;
- Level of detail in Policy EQ3: Historic Environment.

5. AOB

None raised.

**South Somerset's Proposed Submission Plan – discussing issues raised by
English Heritage**

**Wednesday 24 October 2012, 10am – 12 noon, Corporate Meeting Room,
Brympton Way, Yeovil**

Meeting Notes

1. Introductions

Attendees: Caroline Power (CP), English Heritage; Robert Archer (RA), SSDC; Adron Duckworth (AD), SSDC; Steve Membery (SM) Somerset County Council Archaeologist; Andy Foyne (AF), SSDC; Keith Lane (KL), SSDC.

2. Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension

CP: the Local Plan does not include sufficient consideration of the various historic assets in the location identified for the urban extension and its vicinity.

Action AF: additional text to be added to paras 5.46-48 of the plan as a minor change to highlight areas that have particular historic significance.

AF/RA: Yeovil Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) is considered sufficient to determine the broad location of the urban extension, in advance of the forthcoming masterplan which will consider the various historic assets in greater detail. CP reassured to see the final version of HEA. Unfortunately, EH had not received a copy before the meeting.

Action CP: English Heritage to reconsider their position in the light of the HEA subject to an assessment of significance and the study's findings in respect of the Roman Villas and how they can be suitably protected within an urban extension.

Action SM: commence additional work on the setting of the Roman Villa's in the vicinity of the urban extension (Dunnock's Lane and Chessels) in November together with a nominated English Heritage Inspector,* with a view to informing the examination and subsequent masterplan of how the Roman Villa's setting can be protected within the urban extension.

Action CP: Reconsider comment on 'multi-site'/north west option following a reconsideration of the HEA. In particular reconsider stance on 'multi-site' approach to development in the context of the HEA, bearing in mind that the HEA identifies archaeological sites that would be affected by a multi-site approach.

3. Policy EQ3: Historic Environment

CP pleased to see the addition of a policy specifically on the historic environment. The rewording suggested in CP's comments on the plan is a possible example as would like more in depth analysis in the policy. CP

expressed content to the Council's intention to address heritage matters in much more detail through a Heritage Strategy.

Action AD: proposed rewording of para 12.40 and Policy EQ3 as follows:
"The Council will develop a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment that will include:

- Guidance and advice for owners and developers in relation to the conservation of the historic environment, nationally and locally designated assets including archaeological sites.
- The council's approach to identifying and managing heritage assets at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, and to their conservation and return to sustainable use where appropriate.
- A programme for the review of existing Conservation Area boundaries, the preparation of Conservation Area Assessments and Management Plans and making new designations.
- Encouragement for the development of local skills, crafts and the production of local materials relevant to the historic environment.
- Measures to identify locally significant historic assets including buildings, parks and gardens and archaeological features and the preparation of a district-wide list of such assets.
- Detailed advice for developers preparing proposals that may have an impact upon any aspect of the historic environment about conservation, good design and positive enhancement of the assets and their settings.
- Opportunities to improve historic townscapes, landscapes and the public realm."
- Support for communities to identify locally significant historic buildings and in their preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. English Heritage considers this bullet point is important and note that it has been deleted from the above list. Is there a reason for this?
- Produce a District-wide Heritage Strategy

Add the following para to Policy EQ3 (at the beginning):

"Heritage assets will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Their potential to contribute towards the economy, tourism, education and local identity will be exploited". We are pleased to see a more comprehensive statement for this policy. Are the bullet points within Policy EQ3 to be retained?

Action AF: Add the intention to produce a Heritage Strategy and include in the Local Development Scheme to para 12.40 of the Plan. Where is the bullet point for this item?

Action AF: Add reference to the single battlefield in the District (para 12.38).

Action AF: Amend indicator under Policy EQ3 to “avoidance of development that will impact on heritage areas on the national list.” Add reference to the production of a Heritage Strategy to the monitoring indicators.

4. Other issues

Action AF: Add reference to the historic environment to strategic objective 9 consistent with CP’s recommended change.

Action AF: Add reference to the historic environment to the Vision in para 2: “There will be continued protection of distinctive historic, urban and rural environments.”

CP concerned that the Local Plan lacks historic environment evidence for the other main settlements, particularly given the historic importance of these. RA explained that peripheral landscape studies did consider historic environment issues. KL highlighted the spatial portraits for the main settlements include detail on historic environment. AF explained that Sustainability Appraisal of growth options did consider the historic environment, and that the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document will consider the impact of development upon the historic environment in further detail.

CP/SM state that the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Ilchester is not as extensive as indicated on the Local Plan inset map.

Action AF: amend the extent of the Scheduled Ancient Monument on the Ilchester inset map.

Nb. All of the amendments identified above will be included as ‘minor changes’ to the Local Plan when it is submitted to the Secretary of State.

Action CP: It was agreed that upon circulation and acceptance of these notes by English Heritage, CP would formally write back to AF and confirm that EH will consider withdrawing their earlier concerns about the soundness of the Plan expressed in their representations on the Proposed Submission Local Plan and in particular those expressed in relation to:

- The adverse impact of Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension on the settings of the Roman Villas subject to an EH Inspector’s assessment of the HEA findings*;
- Multi-site approach to development being favoured;
- Level of detail in Policy EQ3: Historic Environment.

5. AOB

None raised.

* Please contact Hugh Beamish, Inspector for Scheduled Monuments on
0117 975 0726

Copies of emails between SSDC and English Heritage demonstrating discussion and co-operation to discuss matters relating to the Yeovil SUE

From: POWER, Caroline [<mailto:Caroline.Power@english-heritage.org.uk>]
Sent: 22 November 2012 14:02
To: Keith Lane; Andy Foyne; SRMembership@somerset.gov.uk; Adron Duckworth; Robert Archer; BEAMISH, Hugh
Subject: RE: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Dear Andy and Keith,

It was most unfortunate that we had to cancel today's site visit and meeting. As agreed a new date is being fixed for Steve and Hugh to meet in Yeovil. I hope that this will be next week but it is yet to be confirmed. It is unlikely that I will be attending.

As you were aware I was to be absent from work from 23/11 for about 2 weeks. This has however all changed due to postponing my operation date- only discovered late yesterday! So I will be around to sort this out subject to Hugh's availability/ability to get on site to consider the issue around the significance and setting to the two Scheduled Monuments. Clearly, I will need time to discuss his views before coming back to you but I am hopeful that this will be achieved before 13/12.

In order to assist meeting your timescales I would be grateful if the following points could be clarified concerning the proposed expansion to Yeovil;

- The issue around settings is not simply for the Scheduled Monuments but for other designated heritage assets in close proximity to the preferred site. Consequently, there may be a need to consider the retention of more agricultural land to safeguard settings than has been currently indicated. This in turn could jeopardise the proposed size of the site. If so are there alternative solutions that have been considered?
- The Chris Blandford Report's conclusions focus on 4 areas A-D, including your preferred site. This appears to support the view of a multiple site approach, incorporating parts of A for eg. I would be grateful if you could provide more detailed reasoning as to why areas A, B and D have not come forward? The NPPF puts some weight upon delivery. Could you please explain how the preferred site can be delivered over and above the other sites with High Capacity.
- The HEA clearly indicates that there is a high potential for significant archaeological deposits within all the high capacity areas. Can you provide details of how this will be mitigated?

I have now had a chance to look at the amended **Policy EQ3** and confirm that English Heritage considers the policy wording and supporting statement to be acceptable and in the accordance with NPPF. I would, however, add a cautionary note to this as we have just had advice centrally from a PINS EIP for Solihull that appears to be a generic question from PINS and may be of assistance in tightening any loose threads;

- **Key issue: Does the Local Plan provide an appropriate, effective and soundly based framework for promoting the quality of places, including securing high quality design, conserving heritage assets and local distinctiveness, and**

safeguarding the countryside and Green Belt, which is fully justified, supported by evidence and consistent with national policy?

8.2 Conservation of Heritage Assets and Local Distinctiveness (Policy P16)

a. Is the approach to conserving and enhancing Solihull's historic environment, including the character, historic assets and distinctiveness of the Borough, appropriate, justified, effective, soundly based and consistent with national legislation, guidance and policy?

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Regards

Caroline Power

From: Keith Lane [Keith.Lane@SouthSomerset.Gov.Uk]

Sent: 20 November 2012 17:21

To: POWER, Caroline; Andy Foyne; SRMember@somerset.gov.uk; Adron Duckworth; Robert Archer; BEAMISH, Hugh

Subject: RE: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Caroline,

Revised version of para 12.40 of the Local Plan i.e. Policy EQ3 supporting text is below, followed by EQ3 itself:

“The Council will develop a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment that will include:

- Guidance and advice for owners and developers in relation to the conservation of the historic environment, nationally and locally designated assets including archaeological sites.
- The council's approach to identifying and managing heritage assets at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, and to their conservation and return to sustainable use where appropriate.
- A programme for the review of existing Conservation Area boundaries, the preparation of Conservation Area Assessments and Management Plans and making new designations.
- Encouragement for the development of local skills, crafts and the production of local materials relevant to the historic environment.
- Measures to identify locally significant historic assets including buildings, parks and gardens and archaeological features and the preparation of a district-wide list of such assets.
- Detailed advice for developers preparing proposals that may have an impact upon any aspect of the historic environment about conservation, good design and positive enhancement of the assets and their settings.
- Opportunities to improve historic townscapes, landscapes and the public realm.

- Support for communities to identify locally significant historic buildings and in their preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. “

Policy EQ3: Historic Environment

“Heritage assets will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Their potential to contribute towards the economy, tourism, education and local identity will be exploited. All new development proposals relating to the historic environment will be expected to:

- **Safeguard or where appropriate enhance the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of heritage assets;**
- **Make a positive contribution to its character through high standards of design which reflect and complement it and through the use of appropriate materials and techniques;**
- **Ensure alterations, including those for energy efficiency and renewable energy, are balanced alongside the need to retain the integrity of the historic environment and to respect the character and performance of buildings, adopting principles of minimum intervention and reversibility.”**

Regards

Keith

From: POWER, Caroline [<mailto:Caroline.Power@english-heritage.org.uk>]

Sent: 20 November 2012 16:41

To: Keith Lane; Andy Foyne; SRMember@somerset.gov.uk; Adron Duckworth; Robert Archer; BEAMISH, Hugh

Subject: RE: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Dear Keith and Andy,

As I mentioned on the phone, we are primarily engaged in survey work tomorrow. Whilst I suggested that a meeting might be helpful to you for an update on how we are dealing with this matter after we have finished, I also clearly remember saying that the Inspector will need time to consider his views. With the best of intentions, it may **not** be possible to give any formal views immediately after this survey tomorrow. It may not be appropriate to deal with 1a, b or c on that basis.

As far as Policy EQ3 is concerned perhaps you could send through the latest version ahead of the meeting tomorrow so I can have a look at it as I should be able to give you a view if I have had time to consider it first.

Regards

Caroline Power | Historic Environment Adviser

From: Keith Lane [<mailto:Keith.Lane@SouthSomerset.Gov.Uk>]
Sent: 20 November 2012 16:28
To: Andy Foyne; POWER, Caroline; SRMembury@somerset.gov.uk; Adron Duckworth; Robert Archer; BEAMISH, Hugh
Subject: RE: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Dear all

Please find attached the agenda for tomorrow's meeting.

Regards
Keith

From: Andy Foyne
Sent: 13 November 2012 17:26
To: 'POWER, Caroline'
Cc: Adron Duckworth; Martin Woods; Keith Lane; Robert Archer; 'SRMembury@somerset.gov.uk'
Subject: RE: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Hi Caroline

We seem to have misunderstood each other on several of the key points at our meeting on 24th October. I consider, and I hope that you agree, that the best way forward is for us to have another meeting to resolve the key issues where we are at odds. From my inspection of your amendments I consider that the key points to clarify are as below

- Do EH maintain their objection to the location for the Yeovil Urban Extension in the Proposed Submission Plan until their own Inspector has assessed the Yeovil Historic Environment Assessment's (HEA) conclusions in relation to the potential impact of development in this location on the roman villas (one on site and one nearby)?
- Have EH withdrawn their support for a multi site option for development around Yeovil or is this still their preference? Does their position await their Inspector's Assessment of the Yeovil Historic Environment Assessment's conclusions?

Your points in relation to support for communities is accepted and a correction to the minutes can be made. There is no need to add the bullet to "produce a District Wide heritage Strategy" as it is contained at the start of page 2 of the minutes ie "the Council will develop a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the Historic Environment"

In the event that your answer to the two questions above is that you maintain your current objection and support for a multi site development option around Yeovil pending an EH Inspector's assessment are you able to tell me when that assessment might take place and what role is there as offered at the original meeting for Stephen Membury of SCC to assist?

In relation to your email to Cllr Fysh of 9th November you recognise that Steve Membury would assist in the Assessment.

You clarify in your response to Cllr Fysh that EH's current position expressed in its response to the Proposed Submission plan is unchanged until such time as the HEA Assessment is undertaken.

Whilst I have posed the questions above in relation to the amendments made to the minutes I believe that your email to Cllr Fysh has made it quite clear that EH have not changed its position and will only do so once you have had your Inspector re evaluate the settings suggested for the Roman villas at Dunnock's Lane and Chessels by the HEA.

In this context the key matter becomes the Inspection by your Inspector (assisted by Steve Membury) and it would make sense for any meeting to take place after that inspection. The next obvious question is when would that inspection take place and how soon would a meaningful re assessment emerge? I am aware that Steve Membury is trying to set up a meeting and he is available next week. From my perspective this issue is likely to be the one outstanding that may prevent the Council meeting its current aspiration to submit its Plan to the Inspectorate by Christmas and so I can only seek the inspection and re –assessment to be carried out as expeditiously as you can.

I thought it helpful to set out this narrative and will ring you shortly to get your view (probably Wednesday now at 5.25 pm) and seek to establish a prospective timetable for a definitive position to come forward from EH

Andy Foyne

Spatial Policy Manager
South Somerset District Council

From: POWER, Caroline [<mailto:Caroline.Power@english-heritage.org.uk>]

Sent: 12 November 2012 14:31

To: Keith Lane; Adron Duckworth; Andy Foyne; Robert Archer;
'SRMember@somerset.gov.uk'

Subject: RE: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Dear Keith,

Please find attached my comments /amendments on the minutes.

I fear that my views may have been misinterpreted. As you will see from the amended minutes my interpretation is not quite as clear cut as indicated in the minutes and is subject to a number of issues being resolved- most notably being able to assess the final Chris Blandford Report fully.

This has had a knock on impact on your Committee Boards Minutes that I was informed by Councillor Fysh, have reported EH as withdrawing our objections. I copied you all into our response to Councillor Fysh so you are aware of what

has been said on our part. I would ask that these remarks and the amendments suggested are carefully considered before you respond. At present I do not believe our views have been correctly reported to your Members and or will be in a position to respond positively by the 15/11.

I await your comments.
Regards

Caroline Power | Historic Environment Adviser
(Bristol, Gloucestershire and Somerset).
Direct Line: 0117 975 0667 (internal 2267)
Mobile: 07826 869209

English Heritage | 29 Queen Square
Bristol | BS1 4ND

www.english-heritage.org.uk

From: Keith Lane [<mailto:Keith.Lane@SouthSomerset.Gov.Uk>]
Sent: 01 November 2012 10:37
To: Adron Duckworth; Andy Foyne; Robert Archer; POWER, Caroline; 'SRMembership@somerset.gov.uk'
Subject: Meeting to discuss historic environment issues in emerging South Somerset Local Plan

Dear all,

I have attached the notes of the above meeting held last Weds (Oct 24th). Let me know if you have any comments/amendments.

Caroline, could you please complete the action to formally confirm to Andy that you are content to withdraw your representations on the Proposed Submission Local Plan questioning its soundness by Thursday 15 November. This will enable us to report it to Project Management Board the following day.

Regards
Keith

Keith Lane
Policy Planner
South Somerset District Council
Tel: 01935 462497
Email: keith.lane@southsomerset.gov.uk

Appendix 4 – Co-operation with Other Bodies

In addition to the prescribed bodies and neighbouring authorities already mentioned, there have been discussions and joint working with other bodies as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that has informed the scale and location of growth across the District.

The following bodies informed the Infrastructure Delivery Planning report:

- Western Power Distribution
- Scottish Southern Electricity
- Wessex Water
- British Telecom (BT)
- Somerset Waste Partnership
- Somerset and Avon Constabulary
- Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service
- South Western Ambulance Service NHS Trust
- Wales and West Utilities
- Sustrans

Appendix 5 - Summary of when Duty to Co-operate 'authorities and bodies' formally commented on the Local Plan

This table summaries the stages at which duty to co-operate bodies commented on the Local Plan. It demonstrates a lengthy and continuous process of engagement. This report only illustrates in detail the way in which comments made in relation to Proposed Submission Local Plan, have influenced policy, the comments made since the SA Scoping report consultation have influenced and shaped the final South Somerset Local Plan (see Consultation Statement and SA Report for details of how comments were taken on board).

Details of the stages at which comments have been received from prescribed bodies and neighbouring authorities (x = comments received - = no comments received)				
Organisation	Stage in production of South Somerset Local Plan			
	SA Scoping Report	Issues and Options	Draft Core Strategy (incorporating Preferred Options)	Proposed Submission Local Plan
Environment Agency	X	X	X	X
Natural England	X	X	X	X
English Heritage	X	X	X	X
Civil Aviation Authority	Not consulted	-	X	-
Homes and Communities Agency	Not consulted	-	-	-
Primary Care Trusts	Not consulted	-	-	X
Office of Rail Regulation	Not consulted	-	-	-
Highways Authority	X	X	X	X
Somerset County Council	-	X	X	X
Mendip District Council	-	-	X	X
Taunton Deane Borough Council	-	-	-	-
Sedgemoor District Council	-	-	-	-
Dorset County Council	-	-	X	X
West Dorset District Council	-	-	X	X

North Dorset District Council	-	X	-	X
Wiltshire Council	-	-	-	-
Devon County Council	X	-	-	-
East Devon District Council	-	-	-	-