

Submission South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028, January 2013

ERRATA

District Council Proposed Amendments to the Proposed Submission South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028:

Page	Action	Reason
37*	Delete record for H Lofthouse	Included in error
47*	Delete record for P Haimes	Included in error

*Replacement page attached

Inovem Ref	Name	Ack date	Policies/ Proposals/ Paragraph Ref	Summary of Issue	Major Change Required (if yes see separate report)	Minor Change Required	Reason for and Nature of Change
6 Market Towns - Vision and Proposals							
4310881	Redrow Homes South West (Agent G Williams Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners)	13/08/2012	SD1, Strategic Objectives & Vision, SS1, 4.86, SS4, SS5, SS6, 6.21- 6.23, PMT1, EQ1, TA1, TA3	SS5 - Chard - historic failure to deliver KS/CHAR/1, Millfield link renders the scheme unviable without SSDC input, CIL evidence base is questioned, will lead to reduced levels of affordable housing in Chard, 2016 start seem optimistic, cannot be relied on to deliver continuous supply of housing land. Need additional sites to fill the gap. Para 6.21-6.23 Concerns regarding weight that can be attached to Chard Regeneration Framework. Has not had transparent scrutiny - all details should be set out in local plan. lack of consultation on formulating options. each site was not evaluated, SA, traffic impact would have no significant impact on delivery. PMT1 & Inset Map 3 - policy does not flow logically from Vision & Objectives - no separate appraisal of individual sites. Approach inconsistent with national policy. 61 dwellings will not undermine CEDA. Snowdon Farm site is sustainable. Great need for housing in Chard. All alternatives have not been considered in accordance with SEA Directive. Should not enshrine development beyond the Plan period - should be done at review.	No	Yes	In order to clarify why growth is planned beyond the plan period amend paragraph 6.21 by inserting the following additional text at the end of the last sentence: The strategic growth for Chard will be delivered within and beyond the plan period as part of a cohesive plan to regenerate the town and achieve build out. The number of homes expected to come forward within the plan period reflects market deliverability.

Inovem Ref	Name	Ack date	Policies/ Proposals/ Paragraph Ref	Summary of Issue	Major Change Required (if yes see separate report)	Minor Change Required	Reason for and Nature of Change
6828193	M Fry-Foley	06/08/2012	PMT3	Objects. Inadequate consultation contravenes SCI another round needed. No justification for link road. Impact on Ditton St and Canal Way. Increased traffic, landscape impact, increased surface water. More houses will be needed to improve viability. Should revert to Canal Way Option publicly owned - would benefit tax payers	No	Yes	In order to ensure that future development does not extend up Pretwood Hill amend Inset Map 7 - Ilminster by reducing the DOG deleting those parts that impact on Pretwood Hill. See attached plan.
6828257	J de Bowen	06/08/2012	PMT3	Objects. Should reconsider Canal Way. Shudrick Valley has special landscape value. Canal Way more sustainable location. Shudrick Valley too far from Town Centre and will have a detrimental impact on business. Dangerous for more cars to use Bay Hill. No new road needed Shudrick Lane should be connected to Frog Lane. Canal Way publicly owned - would benefit tax payers. Proposal high density not suitable for a small market town.	No	Yes	In order to ensure that future development does not extend up Pretwood Hill amend Inset Map 7 - Ilminster by reducing the DOG deleting those parts that impact on Pretwood Hill. See attached plan.
6828289	P Fry-Foley	06/08/2012	PMT3	Objects. Inadequate consultation contravenes SCI another round needed. No justification for link road. Impact on Ditton St and Canal Way. Increased traffic, landscape impact, increased surface water. More houses will be needed to improve viability. Should revert to Canal Way Option publicly owned - would benefit tax payers.	No	Yes	In order to ensure that future development does not extend up Pretwood Hill amend Inset Map 7 - Ilminster by reducing the DOG deleting those parts that impact on Pretwood Hill. See attached plan.
6828321	P J Tebbs	06/08/2012	PMT3	Objects. Canal Way was generally accepted. Previously stated that south east option could not sustain the required number of dwellings. Will unbalance the town. Increased traffic. Impact on wildlife, landscape and archaeology. High infrastructure costs - gas and water pipes cross the valley. Aspiration of Town Council - would be beneficial to Tesco. Road not needed. South west Option should be adopted.	No	Yes	In order to ensure that future development does not extend up Pretwood Hill amend Inset Map 7 - Ilminster by reducing the DOG deleting those parts that impact on Pretwood Hill. See attached plan.
6828385	P Radford & L Marshall	06/08/2012	PMT3	Object. Should reconsider Canal Way. Inadequate consultation. Town Council only in favour of Shudrick Lane as they want a relief road - not needed (Atkins report). Shudrick Valley has special landscape value. Impact on wildlife. Public right of way runs across. Increased traffic. Canal Way more sustainable location.	No	Yes	In order to ensure that future development does not extend up Pretwood Hill amend Inset Map 7 - Ilminster by reducing the DOG deleting those parts that impact on Pretwood Hill. See attached plan.
6830337	D & J Gundry	06/08/2012	PMT3	Object. Inadequate consultation. Oppose road. Landscape impact. Canal Way a more sustainable option. Will destroy character.	No	Yes	In order to ensure that future development does not extend up Pretwood Hill amend Inset Map 7 - Ilminster by reducing the DOG deleting those parts that impact on Pretwood Hill. See attached plan.