

Appendix 4 – ‘draft Core Strategy incorporating preferred options’ appraisal matrices

Appendix 4 contents:

Testing the Local Plan objectives against the SA framework – page 1

Strategy – page 4

Housing – page 31

Economic Prosperity – page 43

Transport and Accessibility – page 61

Health and well being – page 67

Environmental Quality – page 71

Testing the Local Plan objectives against the SA framework

At the preferred options stage, the Local Plan objectives were refined following comments received during consultation. The strategic objectives set out in the Local Plan have been subject to sustainability testing in order to ensure they provide a sustainable basis for developing the policies (that follow on from the strategic objectives). This exercise ensures that any conflicts or tensions between the two sets of objectives (i.e. SA objectives and Local Plan strategic objectives) are highlighted early on which might, in turn, influence the nature of the Local Plan policies that are subsequently developed. The results of this exercise are set out below.

The nine Local Plan strategic objectives, derived from the Sustainable Community Strategy, are:

| | |
|----|--|
| 1. | Safe, resilient, socially just and inclusive and sustainable communities (with a higher proportion of jobs locally available) with strong networks and confident people sharing respect for each other. |
| 2. | A health enhancing environment developed by promoting walking and cycling and non car based transport. |
| 3. | Low Carbon quality services and facilities focused on Yeovil, Market Towns and Rural Centres (and in particular their centres) are designed around the needs of the Community, enabling everyone to have fair and equitable access. |
| 4. | An integrated sustainable transport system developed both within and between towns and especially to and from Yeovil whilst promoting enhanced delivery of services direct to rural areas through Information and Computer Technologies. |
| 5. | A comprehensive, high performing economy that is diverse, adaptable and provides the required jobs growth and upward wage levels through a thriving Yeovil, regenerated Chard and Market Towns and a diversified rural economic environment able to attract and retain visitors (through a vibrant tourism industry), consumers and high quality sustainable businesses. |
| 6. | A balanced housing market with a range of general housing and affordable housing to meet the required numbers and sited and built to support sustainable lifestyles with low carbon emissions, delivered through a sustainable District settlement strategy and hierarchy. |
| 7. | An Eco Town for Yeovil to deliver on the balanced housing market objective, provide an exemplar to move towards more sustainable, lower carbon consumption living and provide a boost to new low carbon technologies and industries. |
| 8. | Movement toward a Carbon Neutral economy by 2030. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 9. | Protection and enhancement of our natural environment and biodiversity, retaining the distinctiveness of settlements and reflecting known environmental constraints, including flood risks, in locating development. |
|----|--|

It is important to test consistency between the strategic objectives of the plan and the SA objectives. In accordance with Task B1 of the SA process, the following matrix tests the compatibility of the Local Plan strategic objectives with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, and highlights any potential areas of conflict between the two sets of objectives.

Compatibility of the Local Plan strategic objectives and the SA Objectives

| | | SA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| Local Plan Strategic Objectives | 1 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ● | ✓ | ● | ● | ● |
| | 2 | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ✓ |
| | 3 | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | 4 | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● |
| | 5 | ● | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ● | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ |
| | 6 | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ✓ | ● | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ |
| | 7 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ● | ● | ● |
| | 8 | ● | ● | ● | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● |
| | 9 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ | ● | ● | ✓ | ✓ |

- ✓ compatible
- ✗ Incompatible
- no significant link.

The table above shows that the strategic objectives of the plan are broadly compatible with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, and there is much support for several SA objectives. Indeed, around half of the Core Strategy objectives have are compatible with SA objectives. Overall, these results are encouraging as they show that a positive approach to sustainability is at the core of the plan.

However there are some tensions, primarily between Local Plan strategic objectives 5 and 6 relating to economic development and housing supply, and the SA objectives that are focussed on transport and the environment (including climate change). There is a requirement for housing and economic growth to meet the needs of additional household creation, to ensure that the district continues to remain prosperous,

and the social benefits that arise from meeting these development needs. It is vitally important that the effects of this development are sufficiently mitigated in order to minimise the adverse effects of this growth and maximise the beneficial effects. Although these particular SA and Core Strategy strategic objectives are potentially incompatible, the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. avoiding development in highly valued environmental areas, promotion of green infrastructure, encouraging alternatives to car travel) should ensure adverse effects are avoided or minimised. Indeed, strategic objective 6 does explicitly support sustainable lifestyles with low carbon emissions, which should help overcome any potential incompatibility.

It is notable that despite these tensions between strategic objectives 5 and 6 and some of the 'environmental' SA objectives, there is also compatibility, principally with regards to supporting a strong, diverse and vibrant economy, providing sufficient housing, and improving education and skills.

Most of the SA objectives are positively impacted upon by several plan strategic objectives, apart from the SA objective on crime (6) and flooding (13). The lack of significant links for these two objectives may mean that more explicit consideration of crime and flooding within the plan strategic objectives is required in order to ensure the whole range of sustainable objectives are fully encouraged in the plan. Additionally, SA objective 14 on biodiversity is both positively and negatively impacted upon by two strategic objectives.

As a result of initial findings on the compatibility of the Local Plan strategic objectives and the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, the following changes to the strategic objectives of the plan have been recommended in order to improve their sustainability, and the objectives amended accordingly:

- Greater clarity is required as to which aspect of 'sustainability' is being encouraged by the Core Strategy strategic objectives e.g. to ensure crime and flooding are explicitly mentioned as set out above.
- Clear mention of the need to address climate change through both mitigation and adaptation measures is required.

Draft Core Strategy policies which haven't been assessed as they aren't options in the plan-making sense:

Draft Policy EP14 – Comparison Floorspace in Yeovil

| Policies that have been screened out (i.e. not formally appraised) | Reasons why |
|---|--|
| Draft Policy SS7 | This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA. |
| Draft Policy SS8 | This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA. |
| Draft Policy YV1 | The total number of dwellings for Yeovil was appraised as part of Draft Policy SS3, and potential locations for the urban extension are appraised in Appendix 4. |
| Draft Policy CV3 | This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA. |

'Strategy'

Draft Policy SS1 – Settlement hierarchy and Draft Policy SS2 – Development in Rural Settlements

See 'strategy' sustainability appraisal below.

Spatial Strategy Option 1 – 'business as usual' / dispersed

This option presents the 'business as usual' approach by projecting the dwelling completion rate that has occurred in recent years (2006-09) over the entire plan period (2006-26), until the (now revoked) RSS 'Proposed Changes' requirement for 8,300 dwellings (to be built in settlements outside Yeovil) is met. The outcome of these projections is that although there would be a focus on the Market Towns with around half (4,190) of new dwellings, this option would result in just 1,465 dwellings located in Rural Centres, with 2,700 in the Rural Settlements and countryside, leading to a dispersed strategy for new development.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | This option would lead to a high proportion of development in Rural Settlements outside Market Towns and Rural Centres where there is currently limited access to services and facilities – much of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in terms of access to services (IMD, 2007). The provision of more development in rural areas could help to make new facilities viable, although evidence suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline. | - |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The dispersal of development may not maximise opportunities in the most deprived areas (in terms of income) by limiting development in the most deprived areas – outside Yeovil, the most deprived wards are in Chard and Crewkerne (IMD, 2007) – and therefore reducing the economic benefits that new development can bring. Dispersed development would mean greater reliability on car transport which would increase fuel costs/poverty, and increased social exclusion of those without access to a car. Energy efficient buildings should be encouraged to reduce fuel costs. | - |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Need in the rural communities for housing/affordable housing would be met, but restriction at Rural Centres in particular may mean need is not met at these settlements. Homelessness tends to be focussed at larger settlements so less opportunity to tackle this with a dispersed approach. | + |

| | | |
|--|---|---------|
| 4. Improve health and well being | Greater development in rural areas would mean less opportunity to access existing 'strategic' health facilities (i.e. outside Yeovil only Chard, Crewkerne Wincanton, and South Petherton have a hospital), and leisure facilities (sport's hall/swimming pool). However smaller scale facilities in rural areas could be supported and potentially improved from an increased rural population. | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Lack of access to the more strategic education facilities, which are located in the Market Towns and Rural Centres and also a lower supply of workers where the jobs are located. Less opportunity to focus on Chard and Crewkerne where access to education, skills and training is poorest (IMD, 2007). But additional rural population may support rural primary schools. | - |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Ensure that high quality design standards are incorporated in new developments to 'design out crime'. The effect should be more certain at the design stage at a site specific level. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | New development in general would bring positive benefits, and dispersal could benefit the economy in rural areas in particular, but there are several negative effects of dispersing this growth. Most jobs are located in the Market Towns and Rural Centres, so balanced economic growth would not be achieved with such a high proportion of development in rural settlements where there are limited job opportunities. Increased commuting distances and lack of public transport would require more journeys by car to work are made. The vitality and viability of town centres, particularly at settlements identified as Rural Centres may be detrimentally affected by the dispersal of development to rural areas. May not assist businesses in finding appropriate land/premises, as there is greater choice in the larger settlements. | + / - - |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Although some focus on Market Towns, significant proportion of development in rural areas would increase the need to travel to the main settlements to access jobs, shops and key services. Given the rural nature of the district, journey's are most likely to be by car, and increase congestion. | - - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Dispersed development is likely to have a disproportionate impact on the townscape and surrounding landscape of rural settlements – large amount of development at South Petherton. Less opportunity to regenerate brownfield sites in Market Towns. | - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Depends upon location of development in relation to particular historic features, but South Somerset generally has a high quality historic environment with a large number of Conservation Areas. Mitigation of adverse effects should be possible. | - / ? |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Although some focus on Market Towns, greater CO2 emissions from car journeys are likely due to dispersed growth due to lack of viable alternatives to the car in the rural areas. Medium term negative effects of new buildings likely to mean increased CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. New development should be located and designed to cope with hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters. | - - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Additional car journeys likely due to dispersed development, that is likely to worsen air quality. There will be a short term negative effect associated with construction e.g. vibration, noise. Pollution of land and soil will depend on location of development – areas of best and most versatile agricultural land are located near to most Market Towns and Rural Centres, which is likely to mean development pressure on this resource. | - |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Uncertain until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk is an issue at several Market Towns. Surface water flooding is also an issue (e.g. Crewkerne floods in May 2008). Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to reduce flood risk to people and property. | ? |

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) identifies the following potential impacts on the Somerset Levels and Moors from new development: increased recreational disturbance from population growth, particularly at Yeovil and Chard but also Crewkerne, Ilminster, Wincanton, Somerton and Ansford/Castle Cary; water quality from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, Somerton, Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne, and Ilminster; renewable energy projects near and in the fly ways to the Levels and Moors. Mitigation measures are recommended in the HRA which would mean no adverse impact on the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors. Generally uncertain biodiversity and geodiversity effect until more precise locations for development are proposed, but European Protected Species are widely present in the district – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated. | - / ? |
| Conclusion: The outcomes of a dispersed approach to development leads to mostly negative effects, including lack of access to services, increasing the need to travel, increase in CO2 emissions, and the impact on the landscape and townscape of Rural Settlements. There is greater scope to meet affordable housing need in rural areas, but this may mean need in Market Towns and Rural Centres is not met. This option score's most poorly of the three strategic options. | | |

| Spatial Strategy Option 2 – Focus on Market Towns and Rural Centres and Draft Policy SS4 – Delivering new housing growth | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| Under this scenario there is a greater focus on the Market Towns with around twice as much development in Market Towns (5,800 new dwellings) as elsewhere in the district (2,600 dwellings). Rural Centres would be the focus for development outside Market Towns, with development in rural areas limited to that which is already committed (1,200 dwellings). | | |
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Positive effects resulting from a high proportion of new development at Market Towns, and to a lesser extent Rural Centres, where there is existing access to service and facilities, and greater opportunity to walk, cycle and use public transport. But lack of development in rural areas could limit/inhibit access to services in Rural Settlements. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Greater focus of development on Chard and Crewkerne (contain most deprived areas outside Yeovil) should help to regenerate deprived areas. Ability to access jobs, facilities will reduce need/cost of travel and reduce fuel poverty associated with transport costs. Energy efficient buildings should reduce fuel costs. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | The spread of development across Market Towns and Rural Centres allows housing need, including affordable housing need, to be met across a wide geographic range across the district. But need in rural settlements may not be met. | ++ |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Good accessibility to the more 'strategic' health facilities at Market Towns (although only Chard, Crewkerne, Wincanton and South Petherton have hospitals); new development could potentially enhance these facilities. Rural Centres also contain health facilities which could potentially be enhanced with new development, although overloading health facilities is an issue for some settlements e.g. Somerton. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | The Market Towns and Rural Centres all contain education facilities so future population would have the opportunity to improve education and skills, which could increase the supply of skilled workers to the economy. Lack of secondary school at Somerton and Ilminster may limit these positive effects in the towns. | ++ |

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | The focus of development at Market Towns and additional population could potentially lead to increased crime at these settlements, but the incorporation of high quality design standards in new developments can offer the opportunity to 'design out crime'. The effect should be more certain at a site specific level. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Most employment opportunities are provided at Market Towns and Rural Centres meaning that balanced economic growth could be fostered. Potential to access work by walking, cycling and public transport is greater at these settlements. Town and local centres' vitality and viability would be promoted, and tourism opportunities could be enhanced e.g. at Langport/Huish Episcopi, Bruton, Martock. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Focus at Market Towns but allowing growth at Rural Centres should assist in reducing the need to travel and promoting sustainable travel across the key settlements in the district. Increased congestion is an issue at some Market Towns, particularly Chard, so sustainable travel should be prioritised. | - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The distribution of development to all Market Towns and Rural Centres could have a negative effect on the landscape and townscape at some of these settlements, although it will mean that smaller, rural settlements are protected. Potential for significant impact on landscape at Chard given scale of development and proximity to Blackdown Hills AONB. High quality design and landscaping should be incorporated that fosters local distinctiveness. | ? / 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | South Somerset has a high quality historic environment, and all Market Towns and Rural Centres contain Conservation Areas. Generally uncertain effect until more precise locations for development are determined, but adverse effects on the historic environment should be mitigated. | ? / - |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | The distribution of new development to Market Towns and Rural Centres, where job, shops, and community facilities are located should ensure the need to travel is minimised. Medium term negative effect of new buildings likely to mean increased CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. Sustainable construction should be encouraged in new development, including water efficiency measures, in order to adapt to climate change. New development should be located and designed to cope with hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters. | - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | The focus of development at Market Towns and Rural Centres should minimise pollution by reducing the need to travel, and disperse adverse impacts on air and water quality compared to Option 3. There will be a short term negative effect associated with construction e.g. vibration, noise. Best and most versatile agricultural land is distributed widely across the district, which is likely to mean pressure on developing this resource. | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Uncertain until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk is an issue at most Market Towns and Rural Centres, particularly at Langport/Huish Episcopi, although the area affected is relatively small in most cases. Surface water flooding is also an issue (e.g. Crewkerne floods in May 2008). Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to reduce flood risk to people and property. | ? |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) identifies the following potential adverse impacts on the Somerset Levels and Moors from new development: increased recreational disturbance from population growth, particularly at Yeovil and Chard but also Crewkerne, Ilminster, Wincanton, Somerton and Ansford/Castle Cary; water quality from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, Somerton, Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne, and Ilminster; renewable energy projects near and in the fly ways to the Levels and Moors. Mitigation measures are recommended in the HRA which would mean no adverse impact on the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors. Generally uncertain until more precise locations for development are proposed, but need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated – European Protected Species are present around all Market Towns to a greater or lesser extent, but particularly at Chard and Ilminster. | ? / - |
| Conclusion: This more balanced approach to the distribution of development has many advantages over Option 1 by ensuring better access to jobs, shops, and facilities and services. This should help reduce the need to travel in the district. The focus on Market Towns and Rural Centres will allow housing need in the larger settlements to be met, whilst limiting new housing in rural settlements where there is generally poor access to jobs, services etc. The landscape and townscape of rural settlements should be better protected than Option 1. Overall, this option performs best of the three strategic options in terms of sustainability and has informed draft Policy SS1 and SS2. | | |

| Spatial Strategy Option 3 – Concentrate all development in Market Towns This option presents a concentrated approach to new development (outside Yeovil) with all dwellings that are not already committed or allocated being built in the Market Towns. This would result in nearly 6,500 new dwellings at the Market Towns, just 650 dwellings in Rural Centres and around 1,200 dwellings in Rural Settlements. | | |
|--|--|---------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | A high level of access to services and facilities is achievable at Market Towns, although all 'strategic' facilities (Table 4.8, Settlement Role and Function Study) are only found at Chard, Crewkerne and Wincanton. However, limiting development at Rural Centres could reduce the viability of services in more rural areas. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Increased development at Chard and Crewkerne should assist in benefiting particularly deprived areas in these settlements. However lack of development outside Market Towns could inhibit social inclusion across the rural parts of the district. Energy efficient buildings should reduce fuel costs. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Although total number of dwellings accords with ONS household projections and RSS Proposed Changes, the lack of new dwellings in rural areas would mean the housing needs, including affordable housing, of Rural Centres and rural areas are not likely to be met. | + / - - |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Good accessibility to the more 'strategic' health facilities at Market Towns (although only Chard, Crewkerne, Wincanton have hospitals); new development could potentially enhance these facilities. However, could potentially overload facilities at Market Towns – more information required on the adequacy of health facilities. | + / - |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | The focus of development at Market Towns should help improve education and skills as education facilities are already in place, and new development could contribute to enhancing these facilities. New development would bring additional workers. However, the restriction of development in rural areas could affect the viability of schools in rural areas. | + / - |

| | | |
|--|---|-------|
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | The incorporation of high quality design standards in new developments can offer the opportunity to 'design out crime'. The effect should be more certain at a site specific level. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Additional development will benefit the district's economy generally, but the benefits will be limited to Market Towns to the potential detriment of the more rural areas, and town and local centre vitality at Rural Centres. Tourism opportunities in rural areas may also be adversely affected. A positive effect is that accessibility to work by foot, bike and public transport is generally better in Market Towns. | + / - |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Although accessibility is generally better at Market Towns meaning the need to travel is reduced in these places, the lack of development in more rural areas could mean the need to travel will increase for rural residents in large parts of the district. Increase in congestion at Market Towns (issue at Chard and Crewkerne in particular) so sustainable travel should be prioritised at these places. | -- |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The landscape and townscape of rural areas will be protected, but there will be greater impact on Market Towns. Given that brownfield land tends to be concentrated in larger settlements, this strategy should have a positive impact on reducing the amount of derelict land. Potential for significant impact on landscape at Chard given potential development here and proximity to Blackdown Hills AONB. High quality design and landscaping should be required. | + / - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | South Somerset has a high quality historic environment, and all Market Towns contain Conservation Areas. Historic environment of the wider district will be conserved. Generally uncertain effect until more precise locations for development are determined, but adverse effects on the historic environment should be mitigated. | ? / - |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Easier to incorporate low carbon energy such as Combined Heat and Power plant on larger development schemes with a mix of uses. Medium negative effect of new buildings likely to mean increased CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. CO2 emissions from transport as a result of new development may be minimised through only permitting development at the most accessible settlements, but travel from rural areas to Market Towns could increase due to lack of employment development outside Market Towns; so overall a neutral impact is proposed. Sustainable construction should be encouraged in new development, including water efficiency measures, in order to adapt to climate change. New development should be located and designed to cope with hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters. | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Any adverse impacts upon air / water quality, and pollution will be disproportionately focussed on Market Towns; although sustainable travel should be easier to achieve at these settlements. There will be a short term negative effect associated with construction e.g. vibration, noise. Best and most versatile agricultural land is located around most Market Towns. | - |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Uncertain until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk is an issue for most Market Towns, although the area affected is relatively small in most cases. Surface water flooding is also an issue (e.g. Crewkerne floods in May 2008). Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to reduce flood risk to people and property. | ? |

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) identifies the following potential impacts on the Somerset Levels and Moors from new development: increased recreational disturbance from population growth, particularly at Yeovil and Chard but also Crewkerne, Ilminster, Wincanton, Somerton and Ansford/Castle Cary; water quality from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, Somerton, Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne, and Ilminster; renewable energy projects near and in the fly ways to the Levels and Moors. Mitigation measures are recommended in the HRA which would mean no adverse impact on the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors. Generally uncertain until more precise locations for development are proposed, but need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated. European Protected Species are present around all Market Towns to a greater or lesser extent, but particularly at Chard and Ilminster. | ? / - |
| Conclusion: Greater concentration at the Market Towns would enable good access to services, facilities, jobs and shops for new residents. However the economic benefits of new development would be limited to Market Towns and not spread as widely as Options 1 and 2 – potentially to the detriment of jobs and services in other settlements, which could mean travel is increased in rural areas. This option would result in limited housing provision in rural areas, particularly affordable housing, that would mean rural needs are not met, and housing affordability worsens. | | |

Table: Spatial Strategy options 1, 2, and 3 used in the sustainability appraisal above

| | | Chard | Crewkerne | Ilminster | Wincanton | Somerton | Castle Cary / Ansford | Total for Bs | Langport/Huish | Ilchester | South Petherton | Martock | Bruton | Milborne Port | Stoke Sub Hamdon | Total for Cs | Other | Grand Total |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Proposed | B | B | B | B | B | B | | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | | N/A | |
| Option 1 (Business as Usual) | Commitments | 491 | 289 | 191 | 703 | 65 | 188 | 1927 | 129 | 1 | 145 | 96 | 97 | 181 | 5 | 654 | 1199 | 3780 |
| | Future Allocations | 1044 | 724 | 418 | 43 | 34 | 0 | 2263 | 169 | 0 | 346 | 196 | 0 | 74 | 26 | 811 | 1503 | 4577 |
| | Total | 1535 | 1013 | 609 | 746 | 99 | 188 | 4190 | 298 | 1 | 491 | 292 | 97 | 255 | 31 | 1465 | 2702 | 8357 |
| Option 2 (2:1) | Commitments | 491 | 289 | 191 | 703 | 65 | 188 | 1927 | 129 | 1 | 145 | 96 | 97 | 181 | 5 | 654 | 1199 | 3780 |
| | Current Allocations | 1372 | 639 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 50 | 2215 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 2286 |
| | Future Allocations | 328 | 100 | 340 | 350 | 281 | 262 | 1661 | 118 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 120 | 100 | 50 | 688 | 0 | 2349 |
| | Total | 2191 | 1028 | 531 | 1053 | 500 | 500 | 5803 | 300 | 151 | 145 | 246 | 217 | 299 | 55 | 1413 | 1199 | 8415 |
| Option 3 (All B's) | Commitments | 491 | 289 | 191 | 703 | 65 | 188 | 1927 | 129 | 1 | 145 | 96 | 97 | 181 | 5 | 654 | 1199 | 3780 |
| | Future Allocations | 1900 | 890 | 390 | 500 | 485 | 362 | 4527 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4527 |
| | Total | 2391 | 1179 | 581 | 1203 | 550 | 550 | 6454 | 129 | 1 | 145 | 96 | 97 | 181 | 5 | 654 | 1199 | 8307 |

Option 1 (Business as Usual): The current completion rate over the last 3 years has been projected forward to the RSS plan target (8,300). Current commitments and allocations have then been subtracted from the future allocations.

Option 2: This is based on information from the settlement role and function study, site constraints mapping, land availability and town/parish council cluster workshops. This option results in a rough 2:1 split between B (Market Towns): C (Rural Centres) and Rural Settlements.

Option 3: This option presents an extreme concentrated approach with all remaining development not already committed or allocated directed towards B (Market Town) settlements only.

| Draft Policy SS3 – District wide housing provision | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| Under this option, 16,600 dwellings would need to be provided in South Somerset, of which 8,200 dwellings would be at Yeovil and 8,400 elsewhere in the district (plus accompanying employment and infrastructure development). | | |
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Although access to services in the main settlements is relatively good, most of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in 'barriers to housing and services' (IMD, 2007). The provision of 8,400 dwellings outside Yeovil could help to make services and facilities more viable, although evidence suggests (in the RSS) that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | South Somerset is not particularly deprived in general, although there are pockets of deprivation in Yeovil, Chard, and Crewkerne in particular. New development should bring economic and housing opportunities that should help to tackle poverty and social exclusion. Fuel poverty can be assisted through the development of energy efficient buildings. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Under supply in housing delivery which would not meet the latest (2009) CLG household projections (22k increase in homes over plan period) or the further investigation into these figures by the district council (19,800). The SHMA states that 659 affordable homes would be needed annually to meet the needs of the community; greater potential to meet this need compared to Option S1A above. | - |
| 4. Improve health and well being | South Somerset is relatively healthy according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, apart from parts of Yeovil which are in the most deprived 20% in England. Additional development will require enhancements to health and leisure facilities. The provision of open space and green infrastructure should be encouraged to improve health and well being. Generally uncertain impact. | ? |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Somerset is characterised by having many small primary schools, reflecting the rural characteristics of the area – a general decline is predicted in the number of primary school pupils in Somerset, in line with national trends. This level of growth would support existing education needs (Implications of ONS Household Projections for Somerset, 2007). | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Crime levels in South Somerset are generally relatively low, although parts of Yeovil are in the 20% most deprived in England for crime rates. Fear of crime is also an issue in the more urban areas at night time. High quality design standards in new developments should be incorporated in order to 'design out crime'. Level of development that should be matched by improvements in service provision in order to ensure that crime does not increase with additional population. Uncertainty as to the effect. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Yeovil's economy would be able to support the level of dwellings identified at the town (Implications of ONS household projections for Somerset, Baker Assocs 2007). Additional development compared to first option should bring further local economic prosperity to shops and other businesses. | ++ |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Additional development likely to increase traffic levels. Some focus on Yeovil should reduce the need to travel where there is greater access to jobs, services and facilities. But large amount of development in more rural areas compared to option A could increase the need to travel by car outside Yeovil. Sustainable transport modes should be prioritised. | - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The rural nature of South Somerset means that the landscape is a prime element of the district's character. The peripheral landscape studies identify land with landscape capacity to accommodate new development around the main settlements. Potential negative impact on smaller settlements due to large amount of development proposed outside Yeovil. Sensitive design standards should be incorporated. | - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | South Somerset has a rich historic environment, which new development should conserve and enhance. More precise effects should become apparent when specific locations for development are proposed, but the level of development under this scenario should enable significant adverse impacts on the historic environment to be avoided. | ? / - |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Increased CO2 emissions as a result of new development, although medium-long term effects likely to reduce as building regulations require buildings to be zero carbon (2016 for residential, 2019 for non-residential). Large amount of development outside Yeovil has the potential to increase car use and therefore CO2 emissions. Sustainable construction should be promoted. | - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Deterioration in air quality due to additional traffic generated by new development – a major negative effect on Yeovil is likely to be due to significant levels of development and presence of the Air Quality Management Area. Best and most versatile agricultural land is relatively widespread around Yeovil and most of the other main settlements – development should use lower quality land in preference. | - |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Some uncertainty until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding is an issue at many of the main settlements with sewer flooding at Yeovil identified as a particular issue. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to minimise flood risk to people and property. | ? / - |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) identifies the following potential impacts on the Somerset Levels and Moors from new development: increased recreational disturbance from population growth, particularly at Yeovil and Chard but also Crewkerne, Ilminster, Wincanton, Somerton and Ansford/Castle Cary; water quality from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, Somerton, Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne, and Ilminster; renewable energy projects near and in the fly ways to the Levels and Moors. Mitigation measures are recommended in the HRA which would mean no adverse impact on the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors. European Protected Species are widely present in the district, particularly around Yeovil, Chard and Ilminster – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated. | - |
| Conclusion: Under provision of homes compared to household projections, but evidence suggests that the economy can support this level of housing development. Likely to be negative environmental effects but mitigation measures should ensure these are limited. | | |

Draft Policy SS5 – Delivering new employment land

The employment land figures identified generally stem from the number of economically active residents that are expected to be living in a particular settlement by 2026, i.e. the policy is providing enough land to deliver enough jobs for the future population.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|--|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Providing sufficient employment land should in theory ensure that there are sufficient jobs for economically active residents. The number of jobs in relation to economically active residents may have an impact on the viability of existing essential services and facilities, and the ability to provide new ones in an area. Providing enough jobs to meet the need, as opposed to fewer, may result in less people travelling to locations outside of the District for work, thereby sustaining more services and facilities locally. This is however an unknown quantity. | ? |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Unless sufficient employment land is provided through the Core Strategy, there will not be an opportunity to provide sufficient jobs and so unemployment levels amongst the economically active population could increase. Policy seeks to ensure that the right amount of employment land is provided in the right settlements to enable job creation. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Generating wealth in an area will give developers greater confidence in the market and may assist them in bringing forward projects. Some uncertainty. | + / ? |
| 4. Improve health and well being | The policy may indirectly improve the health and well being of residents by providing sufficient employment land, leading to job creation - many studies illustrate the positive health benefits of working. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Providing sufficient jobs may lead to the retention locally of the better-educated or more skilled residents. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | May indirectly reduce crime and fear of crime, by providing sufficient employment land, leading to job creation - higher rates of unemployment are linked with higher rates of crime and criminal behaviour, and so the same should apply vice versa. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Delivery of these levels of employment land will ensure sufficient job creation in line with population growth from the new house building proposed within the new settlement hierarchy, which will support the economy and provide employment opportunities. Increasing the total available employment land in South Somerset will ensure the creation of local jobs, vital for the economic prospects of the District. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The aim is to provide additional employment land in the locations identified in order to improve the jobs to working population ratio thereby enhancing the economic self-sufficiency of the District as a whole and the towns, villages and countryside within it, in accordance with the Vision and Spatial Strategy. This will reduce the need to travel by increasing self-containment, however economic growth is likely to increase traffic levels in such a rural district. | - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | A low carbon economy should be encouraged to help address climate change. Increasing self-containment and enabling more people to use public transport or walk to work, and so minimising carbon emissions. | 0 |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Increasing self-containment and enabling more people to use public transport should minimise air pollution. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) does not anticipate a likely significant effect on the Somerset Levels and Moors due to the relative small scale of development proposed at Langport/Huish Episcopi. | 0 |
| Conclusion: It is essential that enough employment land is delivered across the main settlements in the District to enable residents to access work and to support growth of the South Somerset economy. The distribution of employment land allows residents to have the option to work locally, which raises the level of self-containment in settlements, reducing the need to travel and enabling local services and facilities to be supported. The danger of not delivering sufficient land is that it would raise the level of unemployment and all the resultant negative impacts associated with this, see above. | | |

| Draft Policy SS6 – Phasing and Cumulative Impact | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The draft policy seeks to ensure that community infrastructure is developed alongside new development, ensuring that the infrastructure that has been identified as required, is built at the same time as the new development. In the past for example, new residential development has been built without the required infrastructure and rather than that following on at a later stage, sometimes it has never followed, leading to a community deficit. The draft policy would improve access to essential services and facilities for potential residents of new development, as it would deliver them in line with any new homes. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | The phasing of development in relation to infrastructure includes affordable housing. As explained above, phasing will ensure the delivery of infrastructure at the same time as any new development. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Through the delivery of new health facilities, sports provision and cycle routes amongst other infrastructure. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Through the delivery of new schools. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Through the delivery of road and highway improvements and contributions towards sustainable modes of transport (including footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways). | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Indirectly through the provision of a package of infrastructure all designed to make development more sustainable and energy efficient. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Through the provision of infrastructure. | + |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: The draft policy seeks to ensure that new development is properly phased in relation to the provision of community infrastructure. This will ensure that any new development adds to the sustainability and self-containment of the District's communities as it will deliver the required infrastructure alongside delivering new development. Draft Policy SS4 outlines some of the infrastructure that will be required, this will aid bullet 1,3,4,5, 8, 11 and 13 should they be required. | | |

Draft Policy TV2 – Yeovil urban extension

The sustainability appraisal of potential locations for Yeovil's urban extension is set out in Appendix 4.

Draft Policy TV3 – Yeovil urban village

This site was considered and sustainability appraised as part of the Yeovil Urban Development Framework (2005).

Draft Policy YV4 – Modal shift for Yeovil 'Do Minimum' (Maintain current % modal shift)

In addition to the generic policies that support 'Low Carbon Travel' throughout the district (draft policy TA1), all residential and employment developments in Yeovil should dependent on the thresholds indicated above:

- i. Provide bus stops, bus shelters and timetable information, dependent of the scale of the development and existing provision, within 400 metres of each dwelling or unit in the development.
- ii. Provide cycling and pedestrian routes both to and permeating the site.
- iii. Protect and improve existing cycling and pedestrian routes within 200 metres of the site to facilitate links to and from the site to the wider network.
- iv. Provide facilities for cycle parking within the new development.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|--|---|--------------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy should ensure a higher level of accessibility to key services by walking, cycling and public transport. However the 'Do-minimum' is not specific enough and there are also concerns regarding robustness both in terms of ensuring developer sign and actual delivery. | + |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Increased walking and cycling increases social interactivity – Again concerns policy is not specific enough and robust in terms of ensuring developer sign up to and actual delivery. Initial thought that active involvement in the Community may not be encouraged, however converse could be true as most groups would take advantage of the improved opportunity to network through IT. Whilst it would reduce travel costs would inevitably increase home fuel costs. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Possible easing of access to further education for those without a car | ? |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Probability that the increased social interactivity delivered through walking and cycling could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. However this is likely to depend on other factors relating to location, proximity and type of services and facilities, general design and safety features such as lighting etc. Access by foot or cycle that's Safe & Secure by design should therefore be included in the policy. Potential for anti-social behaviour associated with bus shelters which good design through ensuring over looking of public spaces should seek to overcome. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Some concerns policy is not specific enough and robustness both in terms of ensuring developer sign up to and actual delivery. Increased walking and cycling can also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Do-Minimum scenario may not deliver to the full potential - policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However care needs to be taken to ensure design of shelters is appropriate for the area. The Do-minimum policy is unlikely to deliver any noticeable difference and again policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. Degree of contribution from electric cars will be dependent on how electricity generated. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Improves air quality and minimises noise pollution, although for public transport a criteria for modern low emission/hybrid type vehicles should be in place. A stronger policy is needed to reflect this. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: The Do- Minimum policy will have a positive effect through improved modal shift. However the degree of modal shift will have a direct bearing on the degree of effect on the SA objectives. The 'Do-minimum' may not prove specific enough or sufficiently robust to ensure developer sign-up and actual delivery. Given the anticipated growth, it may well struggle to even maintain the current % of modal shift. However they do form as basis for modal shift policies and we should consider including/revising as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provision of bus stops (where bus routes exist) may not be practical or affordable for smaller developments ∴ set threshold for larger developments with Planning Obligations to be sought for smaller developments. ii. The provision of cycling and pedestrian routes should be in draft policy YV4 for all major developments (> 10 dwellings/1000sq m). iii. Improving cycling and pedestrian routes where necessary within 200 metres may not be sufficient. Extend to 400 metres. iv. Cycle Parking needs to reflect the SCC Cycle Parking Strategy <p>Subject to these amendments these criteria should be included in the draft Policy YV4.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| <p>Draft Policy YV4 – Modal shift for Yeovil 'Do More' (Target to reduce single car occupancy car use from 57% to 40%)</p> <p>In addition to the generic policies that support 'Low Carbon Travel' throughout the district (TA1) and the 'Do Minimum' above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Direct contributions to either enhance existing public transport services (frequency and standard) or as an alternative in the case of larger employment sites the setting up of bespoke works' buses or demand responsive works' buses. ii. Provide bus stops, bus shelters and timetable information, dependent of the scale of the development and existing provision, within 200 metres of each dwelling or unit in the development. iii. Provide preferential and quality spaces in car parks for car sharers at employment sites. iv. Protect and improve existing cycling and pedestrian routes within 400 metres of the site to facilitate links to and from the site to the wider network. | | |
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy should ensure a higher level of accessibility to key services by walking, cycling and public transport. However the 'Do-more' is still not specific enough. For public transport the degree of effect will be dependent on the level & frequency of routes, where those routes run and end-to-end journey times. | + |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Increased walking and cycling and increased provision of public transport will deliver greater social interactivity and maximise opportunities for all members of society. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Possible easing of access to further education for those without a car | ? |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Probability that the increased social interactivity delivered through walking and cycling could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. However this is likely to depend on other factors relating to location, proximity and type of services and facilities, general design and safety features such as lighting etc. Access by foot or cycle that's Safe & Secure by design should therefore be included in the policy. Potential for anti-social behaviour associated with bus shelters which good design through ensuring over looking of public spaces should seek to overcome. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Policy is still not specific or robust enough both in terms of ensuring developer sign up to and actual delivery. Increased walking and cycling can also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Positive effect although the Do-More scenario is still unlikely to deliver to the full potential - Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However care needs to be taken to ensure design of shelters is appropriate for the area. The Do-more policy is still unlikely to deliver any noticeable difference and again policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. For public transport the degree of effect will be dependent on the level & frequency of routes, where those routes run and end-to-end journey times. Low emission buses an essential part of the QBP. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Improves air quality and minimises noise pollution, although for public transport a criteria for modern low emission/hybrid type vehicles would need to be in place. A stronger policy is needed to reflect this. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: The Do-More policy should improve the potential for delivery of the SA framework objectives developed for South Somerset through improved modal shift. However the degree of modal shift will have a direct bearing on the degree of effect on the SA objectives and the 'Do-more' may still not prove specific enough or sufficiently robust to ensure actual delivery. Given the anticipated growth, we should perhaps aim higher in Yeovil. Therefore suggested that move towards the "Do-max" option with the following noted/included in relation to these policies:</p> <p>i. Contributions to public transport should be flexible* to meet the needs of the development & be deliverable. _ * i.e. may be appropriate to either improve existing or establish new routes.</p> <p>ii. Concern over bus stops within 200 metres. 400 metres would be more reasonable based on ped-sheds "where homes are within 400 metres of a public transport node" (Eco towns transport worksheet p14). 400 metres also recommended in "Planning for Public Transport in Developments" – The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation. Therefore amend YV4 to 400 metres.</p> <p>iii. Preferential car parking for car sharers should be in Policy YV4.</p> <p>iv. Improvements to the existing cycling & pedestrian routes should be included in draft Policy YV4.</p> <p>Subject to these amendments these criteria should be included in the draft Policy YV4.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| <p>Draft Policy YV4 – Modal shift for Yeovil 'Do Maximum' (Target to reduce single car occupancy car use from 57% to 40%)</p> <p>In addition to the generic policies that support 'Low Carbon Travel' throughout the district (TA1) and the 'Do Minimum' and 'Do More' above</p> <p>i. Development contributions to sustainable transport interchange within the town.</p> <p>ii. Development contributions to and establish Quality Bus Partnerships (QBP) to achieve greater patronage</p> <p>iii. All new development to fund the resource needed for Personalised Travel Planning</p> <p>iv. Managed car parks on employment sites to minimise usage by those employees living within walking or cycling distance or with good public transport links</p> <p>v. Contribute to the provision of Park & Ride or Park & Bus/Cycle schemes.</p> | | |
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | QBPs need to be specific and must deliver the key goals of frequent and appropriate routes with competitive journey times. (Potential to link to UWE work). Crucial that Personalised Travel Planning is linked to walking, cycling, public transport, and car park management initiatives. | ++ |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can achieve this. | ++ |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can achieve this. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will provide ease of access to further education for those without a car | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | The increased social interactivity delivered through improved high quality sustainable transport should lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | QBPs need to be specific and must deliver the key goals of frequent and appropriate routes with competitive journey times. (Potential to link to UWE work). | ++ |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 "Green & Complete" could deliver this. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can have a significant impact on emissions – link to UWE projects? | ++ |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will reduce pollution. | ++ |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. Potential to link to the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 “Green & Complete” | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: The Do- Maximum policies can deliver the modal shift needed, however, there will often need to be specific projects to achieve the levels of sustainable travel required. There is potential to link to the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Projects, although these are more likely to be effective through the Eco Town/urban extension policies (dependent on preferred urban extension option when known). It is therefore suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contributions to Sustainable Transport Interchange within the Town should be included in draft Policy YV4. ii. Development of QBPs should be included as an option, although in some instances it may be more appropriate to improve existing services and this should also be included to ensure flexibility to provide the appropriate level of service. iii. Personalised Travel Planning has proved very effective in Darlington, Peterborough & Worcester. It should therefore be included in draft YV4. iv. Management of car parks at employment sites would be difficult to police & the implementation of measures such as charging are likely to cause displacement to nearby on street and could also prove anti-competitive in comparison with neighbouring locations, which in turn could have the opposite effect than intended for modal shift due increased travel to employment sites in other locations. However preferential and quality spaces in car parks for car sharers (as per “Do-More”) are considered deliverable and should be included in the draft Policy YV4. (Otherwise Management of car parks at employment sites should not be included in YV4 but as appropriate in YV5) v. Park & Ride or Park/bus cycle schemes. The former will be considered in the YTSR 2 and the latter may well have scope to be included in the Eco Town/Urban Extension, depending upon the location of the preferred option. <p>Where indicated above the criteria should be amended as appropriate and included in draft Policy YV4. Similarly those indicated as either not deliverable or appropriate within draft Policy YV4 should be omitted.</p> | | |

Draft Policy YV5 Modal Shift for Yeovil Eco Town & Urban Extension Do More - (Target to ensure 50% of travel is by sustainable means)

In addition to the generic policies that support 'Low Carbon Travel' throughout the district (TA1) and the 'Do Minimum, 'Do More' and 'Do Maximum' above, in respect of Yeovil (YV4) above the Eco Town developments should provide:

- i. Intrinsically linked well-designed infrastructure for footpaths, cycle ways ensuring filtered permeability that deliver journey times that are quicker than the car and in place from first occupancy.
- ii. Free deliveries for bulk shopping journeys using low emission/electric vans
- iii. Car parking management at Eco Town facilities, employment sites & shopping centre including the supermarket, which gives priority to electric vehicles and discourages car use for these short journeys whilst avoiding the perverse incentive of travelling further by car to access these services.
- iv. A traffic-free immediate environment with limited residential parking separated from the residential areas. These sustainable links designed to enable easy access from the Yeovil Eco Town and urban extension to the town centre, main employment sites, transport interchanges, health and educational establishments.
- v. Low emission bus routes that are designed to establish quicker end-to-end journey times in comparison with the private car.
- vi. A Quality Bus Partnership to deliver modern desirable bus routes with a frequent service to the minimum specification indicated above.
- vii. All sustainable transport links to be in place and operational from first occupancy.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Generally these policies should deliver modal shift but care needed to avoid perverse incentives of cars travelling to other locations in order to access services and facilities which could potentially increase the need to travel. QBPs need to be specific and must deliver the key goals of frequent and appropriate routes with competitive journey times. (Potential to link to UWE work). Crucial that Personalised Travel Planning is linked to walking, cycling, public transport, and car park management initiatives. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Should enable easier and more equitable access for all but requires more specific policies to ensure this. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can achieve this. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Possible easing of access to further education for those without a car. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | The increased social interactivity delivered through improved high quality sustainable transport should lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. | + |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | There is even greater promotion of sustainable travel under this option. Generally these policies should deliver modal shift but care needed to avoid perverse incentives of cars travelling to other locations in order to access services and facilities which could potentially increase the need to travel. QBPs need to be specific and must deliver the key goals of frequent and appropriate routes with competitive journey times. (Potential to link to UWE work). Crucial that Personalised Travel Planning is linked to walking, cycling, public transport, and car park management initiatives. | ++ |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 "Green & Complete" could deliver this. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can have a significant impact on emissions. – Link to UWE projects? | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will reduce pollution. | ++ |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Potential to "increase the appeal of walking & cycling through the provision of a biodiverse and green environment that connects people to nature" (Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 "Green & Complete") | + |
| Conclusion: The Do- More Eco policies should deliver the modal shift needed, however, there will need to be specific projects to achieve the levels of sustainable travel required. There is potential to link to the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Projects. These criteria have been included in draft Policy YV5. | | |

Draft Policy YV5 Modal Shift for Yeovil Eco Town & Urban Extension Do Maximum - (Target to ensure 60% of travel is by sustainable means)

In addition to the generic policies that support modal shift throughout the district (TA1) and the 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Maximum' above, in respect of Yeovil (YV4) above the 'Do More' for Eco Town developments (YV5 above) should provide:

- i. Enhancing the existing cycle route 26 to permeate the Urban Extension, link to Yeovil Junction station and improve links to the eastern end of Yeovil (Leisure centre & bus station) and Yeovil Pen Mill Rail Station.
- ii. Develop a Quality Bus Partnership to deliver quality and frequency improvements to existing bus routes (4, 68, & 212)
- iii. Link bus and cycle routes with a Park & Bus/cycle interchange off of the main distributor road (A37)
- iv. In-House, in-Workplace, in-shops/shopping area, and at transport nodes real time public transport information (bus and train).
- v. Set up an Electric Car Pool scheme, with provision for on-going management, to tie in with public transport.
- vi. Set up a freight transfer centre adjacent to the distributor road using a low emission/electric van to provide deliveries of white goods to residential areas and simultaneously service shopping and employment sites.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|--|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Potential to really achieve significant modal shift. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Even greater potential to maximise opportunities for all members of society through the provision of alternatives to the car. | ++ |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Easy access to facilities – increased ability to build in exercise to the daily routine. | ++ |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Increased accessibility to education for all. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Increased social interaction from more walking & cycling has the potential to reduce the fear of crime – high standards of design should encourage this. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Easier access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Even greater potential to achieve modal shift. | ++ |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The provision of green corridors through cycle and walking links should help protect and enhance the landscape and townscape. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | The design of sustainable transport measures should conserve and enhance the historic environment where appropriate. | ? |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Significant reduction in CO ₂ emissions due to modal shift. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Air pollution will be minimised due to likely modal shift. | + |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Potential to” increase the appeal of walking & cycling through the provision of a biodiverse and green environment that connects people to nature” (Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 “Green & Complete”) | + |
| <p>Conclusion: The Do- Max Eco policies for the preferred option can deliver the modal shift needed. However, these measures will need to be costed through the Transport Assessment and tested for viability. Some measures would of course be suitable for other development locations and also other sustainable transport corridors may be feasible e.g. if on eastern corridor – a green BRT corridor linked to existing cycleway/station. Criteria I) ii) iii) & vi) are specific to location and inclusion in the policy would therefore be dependent upon the selection of the preferred option. However criteria iv (a comprehensive network of real time public transport information) & v (an electric Car Pool scheme) should be included in the draft policy YV5.</p> | | |

Draft Policy CV1 – Chard growth area

See Appendix 6.

Draft Policy CV2 – Chard phasing

See Appendix 6.

| <p>Draft Policy CV4 – Modal shift for Chard ‘Do Minimum’ (Maintain current % modal shift) In addition to the generic policies that support ‘Low Carbon Travel’ throughout the district (draft Policy TA1), all residential and employment developments in Chard should dependent on the thresholds indicated above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide bus stops, bus shelters and timetable information, dependent of the scale of the development and existing provision, within 400 metres of each dwelling or unit of the development. ii. Provide cycling and pedestrian routes both to and permeating the site. iii. Protect and improve existing cycling and pedestrian routes within 200 metres of the site to facilitate links to and from the site to the wider network. iv. Provide facilities for cycle parking within the new development. | | |
|--|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy should ensure a higher level of accessibility to key services by walking, cycling and public transport. However the ‘Do-minimum’ is not specific enough and there are also concerns regarding robustness in terms of ensuring developer sign up to and actual delivery. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Increased walking and cycling increases social interactivity –concerns that the policy is not specific and robust in terms of ensuring developer sign up and actual delivery. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Possible easing of access to further education for those without a car. | ? |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Probability that the increased social interactivity delivered through walking and cycling could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. However this is likely to depend on other factors relating to location, proximity and type of services and facilities, general design and safety features such as lighting etc. Access by foot or cycle that's Safe & Secure by design should therefore be included in the policy. Potential for anti-social behaviour associated with bus shelters which good design through ensuring over looking of public spaces should seek to overcome. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities. Concerns policy is not specific enough and robust in terms of ensuring developer sign up and actual delivery. Increased walking and cycling can also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Positive effect, although the Do-Minimum scenario may not deliver to the full potential - Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However care needs to be taken to ensure design of shelters is appropriate for the area. The Do-minimum policy is unlikely to deliver any noticeable difference and again policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. Degree of contribution from electric cars will be dependent on how electricity generated. Potential benefits of Home Working needs to take account of possible increased CO ₂ emission in the home. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Improves air quality and minimises noise pollution, although for public transport a criteria for modern low emission/hybrid type vehicles would need to be in place. A stronger policy is needed to reflect this. | + |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: The Do- Minimum policy will have a positive effect through improved modal shift. However the degree of modal shift will have a direct bearing on the degree of effect on the SA objectives. The 'Do-minimum' may not prove specific enough or sufficiently robust to ensure developer sign-up and actual delivery. Given the anticipated growth, it may well struggle to even maintain the current % of modal shift. However they do form as basis for modal shift policies and we should consider including/revising as follows:</p> <p>v. Provision of bus stops (where bus routes exist) may not be practical or affordable for smaller developments therefore set threshold for larger developments with Planning Obligations to be sought for smaller developments.</p> <p>vi. The provision of cycling and pedestrian routes should be in draft policy CV4 for all major developments (> 10 dwellings/1000sq m).</p> <p>vii. Improving cycling and pedestrian routes where necessary within 200 metres may not be sufficient. Extend to 400 metres.</p> <p>viii. Cycle Parking needs to reflect the SCC Cycle Parking Strategy.</p> <p>Subject to these amendments these criteria should be included in the draft Policy CV4.</p> | | |

| <p>Draft Policy CV4 – Modal shift for Chard 'Do More' (Target to reduce single car occupancy car use from 58% to 53%)</p> <p>In addition to the generic policies that support modal shift throughout the district (TA1) and the 'Do Minimum' above:</p> <p>i. Make direct contributions to support the doubling of frequency of bus routes at first occupancy to enable 'pump-priming' of these routes</p> <p>ii. Provide bus stops, bus shelters and timetable information, dependent of the scale of the development and existing provision, within 200 metres of each dwelling and unit in the development.</p> <p>iii. Provide preferential and quality spaces in car parks for car sharers at employment sites</p> <p>iv. Protect and improve existing cycling and pedestrian routes within 400 metres of the site to facilitate links to and from the site to the wider network.</p> | | |
|---|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Doubling frequency of bus routes should achieve greater accessibility. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Increased walking and cycling and increased provision of public transport will deliver greater social interactivity and maximise opportunities for all members of society. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. Easier access to health care facilities. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Possible easing of access to further education for those without a car. | ? |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Probability that the increased social interactivity delivered through walking and cycling could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. However this is likely to depend on other factors relating to location, proximity and type of services and facilities, general design and safety features such as lighting etc. Access by foot or cycle that's Safe & Secure by design should therefore be included in the policy. Potential for anti-social behaviour associated with bus shelters which good design through ensuring over looking of public spaces should seek to overcome. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Policy is still not specific or robust enough both in terms of ensuring developer sign up and actual delivery. Increased walking and cycling can also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Positive effect, although the Do-Max scenario is still unlikely to deliver to the full potential - Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However care needs to be taken to ensure design of shelters is appropriate for the area. The Do-more policy is still unlikely to deliver any noticeable difference and again policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. For public transport the degree of effect will be dependent on the level & frequency of routes, where those routes run and end-to-end journey times. Low emission buses an essential part of the QBP. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Improves air quality and minimises noise pollution, although for public transport a criteria for modern low emission/hybrid type vehicles would need to be in place. A stronger policy is needed to reflect this. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. | 0 |

Conclusion: The Do-More policy should improve the potential for delivery of the SA framework objectives developed for South Somerset through improved modal shift. However the degree of modal shift will have a direct bearing on the degree of effect on the SA objectives and the 'Do-more' may still not prove specific enough or sufficiently robust to ensure actual delivery. Given the anticipated growth, we should perhaps aim higher in Chard. ∴ suggested that we move towards the "Do-max" option with the following noted/included in relation to these policies:

- v. Contributions to public transport should be flexible* to meet the needs of the development & be deliverable. _ * i.e. may be appropriate to either improve existing or establish new routes.
- vi. Concern over bus stops within 200 metres. 400 metres would be more reasonable based on ped-sheds "where homes are within 400 metres of a public transport node" (Eco towns transport worksheet p14). 400 metres also recommended in "Planning for Public Transport in Developments" – The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation. Therefore amend in CV4 to 400 metres.
- vii. Preferential car parking for car sharers should be in Policy CV4.
- viii. Improvements to the existing cycling & pedestrian routes should be included in draft Policy CV4.

Subject to these amendments these criteria should be included in the draft Policy CV4.

Draft Policy CV4 – Modal shift for Chard 'Do Maximum' (Target to reduce single car occupancy car use from 58% to 45%)

In addition to the generic policies that support modal shift throughout the district (TA1) and the 'Do Minimum' and 'Do More' above:

- i. Development contributions to sustainable transport interchange within the town.
- ii. Development contributions to establish Quality Bus Partnerships (QBP) to achieve greater patronage
- iii. All new development to fund the resource needed for Personalised Travel Planning
- iv. Managed car parks on employment sites to minimise usage by those employees living within walking or cycling distance or with good public transport links

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|---|---|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | QBPs in tandem with doubling of frequency on existing routes could achieve significant modal shift. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can achieve this. | ++ |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can achieve this. Increased accessibility to health facilities. | ++ |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will provide ease of access to education for those without a car. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | The increased social interactivity delivered through improved high quality sustainable transport could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. | + |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Potential for significant positive effect. QBPs need to be specific and must deliver the key goals of frequent and appropriate routes with competitive journey times. (Potential to link to UWE work). | ++ |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors will naturally arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. Similarly there will be opportunities to increase recreational open space and enhance the landscape and townscape. However the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 "Green & Complete" could deliver this. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant effect. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives can have a significant impact on emissions. | ++ |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Well delivered QBPs and walking and cycling initiatives will reduce pollution. | ++ |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. Potential to link to the Active and Low carbon travel (UWE) vision for Yeovil Seed Project 5 "Green & Complete" | 0 |

Conclusion: The Do- Maximum policies can deliver the modal shift needed, however, there would often need to be specific projects to achieve the levels of sustainable travel required. Given the need to encourage sustainable transport whenever possible it is therefore suggested that:

- vi. Contributions to Sustainable Transport Interchange within the Town should be included in draft Policy CV4.
- vii. Development of QBPs should be included as an option, although in some instances it may be more appropriate to improve existing services and this should also be included to ensure flexibility to provide the appropriate level of service.
- viii. Personalised Travel Planning has proved very effective in Darlington, Peterborough & Worcester. It should therefore be included in draft CV4.
- ix. Management of car parks at employment sites would be difficult to police & the implementation of measures such as charging are likely to cause displacement to nearby on street and could also prove anti-competitive in comparison with neighbouring locations, which in turn could have the opposite effect than intended for modal shift due increased travel to employment sites in other locations. However preferential and quality spaces in car parks for car sharers (as per “Do-More”) are considered deliverable and should be included in the draft Policy CV4. (Otherwise Management of car parks at employment sites should not be included in CV4)

Where indicated above the criteria should be amended as appropriate and included in draft Policy CV4. Similarly those indicated as either not deliverable or appropriate within draft Policy CV4 should be omitted.

'Housing'

| Draft Policy HG1 – Strategic Housing Sites | | |
|---|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The Lufton and Thorne Lane (aka Brimsmore) key sites will be 'self-sufficient' for many facilities with primary schools, public transport, walking and cycling all included. Thorne Lane is also providing a local centre with pub, shops and health centre. CLR also provides a primary school, country park, employment, community facilities and a new road. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Community sports and leisure are provided at all sites with accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. Affordable housing provision and facilities will also serve a wider area for Thorne Lane and Lufton, but CLR will not achieve such high % of affordable housing due to construction costs of new road. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Mixed tenure, 35% affordable housing with rent and shared ownership helping to meet wider housing need for Thorne Lane and Lufton. CLR will achieve a lower % of affordable housing provision. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | All sites provide major new open space and formal and informal recreation space with footpaths and cycleways. Thorne Lane also provides for a community wood and the developers are negotiating with the health service for a new doctor surgery. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Primary schools are proposed at Thorne Lane, Lufton and CLR, with contributions to secondary education. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | All sites have outline planning permission (CLR still awaiting signing of S. 106) and detailed design will have input from Secured by Design. | + |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Both Lufton and Thorne Lane are close to existing major employment areas and will be capable of access by walking and cycling. CLR provides a range of B1, B2 and B8 uses as part of scheme. General economic benefit that development will bring, with specific job creation at construction stage. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Although there is likely to be increased traffic due to additional development, Thorne Lane and CLR are reasonable self-contained and self-sufficient. Lufton will have fewer facilities and rely on existing adjoining commercial areas. All sites will be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | All sites will be well landscaped, but all are greenfield key site extensions. | - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Existing listed buildings and conservation areas will be protected and archaeology is conditioned on the relevant outline planning permissions. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Additional development will lead to increased CO2 emissions, but Thorne Lane contains Code level 4 houses and SuDS but as these are outline permissions, details are currently unknown. Solar orientation has been encouraged and affordable homes will all have either solar panels or air source heat exchange. SuDS encouraged on all sites. | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | All greenfield sites so likely to be an impact, although Grade 1 agricultural land is avoided. | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Neither Thorne Lane nor Lufton are in an area of high flood risk. CLR has open space around area known to flood, with residential and employment away from this area. SuDS will be employed where practicable. | + |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Ecological surveys accompany all three outline permissions with mitigation where appropriate e.g. new badger sett built for Thorne Lane and dormice bridge over link road for CLR. | + |
| Conclusion: Generally positive effects would arise from developing these strategic housing/employment Local Plan allocations through economic benefits, the provision of additional homes, additional services and facilities. Likely to be negative impact on the landscape as all are greenfield sites, but landscaping schemes should help mitigate this effect. Two of the three sites have outline planning permission, and the other one has resolution to grant outline permission subject to a viability survey. | | |

| Draft Policy HG2 – Housing density | | |
|---|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | A range of housing densities across the district will assist in meeting the needs of the community where there is an accommodation shortfall as is the case in South Somerset as well allowing for constraints to be taken account of. | + |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Improve health and well being | High density living in Yeovil and the urban extension, if not properly supported by community infrastructure may result in a poorer quality environment, which could result in a negative impact on health. | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | High density housing development may lead to an increase in the perceived fear of crime. The application of Secure by Design principles to the new built form will be a positive. | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Unless high density living is properly supported by public transport infrastructure, increased congestion could arise. | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | National and regional planning guidance suggests that in order to make the best use of land and minimise the loss of greenfield land, housing densities should be set at between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare (dph). Policy H2 of the revoked RSS promotes a range of densities and expects local planning authorities to achieve a net target density of 40dph across all new housing in their Housing Market Areas, seek to achieve a net density of 40-50 dph within SSCTs (Yeovil) and 50 dph or more overall in planned urban extensions to SSCTs. A range of densities would result in less greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns being lost and give the ability to seek lower density development in rural areas or where particular environmental or historic issues justify a lower density. However, sensitive design will be required to ensure that the townscape is protected and enhanced – high density development will generally not be appropriate in rural settlements. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | A range of densities would result in less greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns being lost and allows for the impact on the historic environment, to be minimised. Wherever development is taking place the inclusion of text in the preferred policy to allow for lower density development where it can be justified for particular reasons means that any negative impacts of development can be mitigated. | + |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | A range of densities would result in less agricultural land being lost in the locations where the most growth is to be accommodated i.e. around Yeovil and the Market Towns. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Wherever development is taking place the inclusion of text in the preferred policy to allow for lower density development where it can be justified for particular environmental or historic reasons means that any negative impacts of development can be mitigated. | ? |
| <p>Conclusion: The preferred policy presents a number of positive impacts. The option of having a range of densities presents more positive impacts than having one broad density as it benefits Yeovil and the Market Towns by minimising the loss of greenfield land and the ability to have a lower density in small Towns and Villages and Rural Settlements will allow the individual character and townscape of the settlement to be respected. Wherever development is taking place the inclusion of text to allow for lower density development where it can be justified for particular environmental, historic, biodiversity or geodiversity reasons means that any negative impacts of development can be mitigated, evidence base such as the Peripheral Landscape studies can be used to inform this.</p> | | |

| Draft Policy HG3 – The use of previously developed land for housing development | | |
|--|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Since April 2001 about 50% of housing completions, housing under construction and housing commitments have occurred on PDL within development areas, with most development outside development areas being on greenfield sites. The promotion of PDL for housing development would therefore encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities. However, the Core Strategy will limit the number of settlements that will be designated for growth reducing the availability of PDL. Changes to PPS3 (June 2010) regarding garden land will further reduce the amount of PDL available for development. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The use of disused land in urban areas will reduce the impact of development in rural locations. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | The use of PDL can involve much higher cost to the developer (e.g. due the costs of dealing with contamination) and therefore may not improve affordability. Although it will contribute to the housing supply the housing will need to be supplied whether PDL or greenfield land is used. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | The promotion of PDL for housing development would encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Disused sites can be attractive for criminal activity. Their use for housing development can give opportunities for reducing this criminal activity and promoting greater surveillance of the area. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The use of PDL could lead to loss of employment sites. However as many sites are within the larger settlements they could increase accessibility to work, services and facilities, and promote town centre vitality in those settlements. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | PDL sites within main settlements could reduce the need to travel for employment, or to access services and facilities. However congestion within settlements could be exacerbated. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of sites and to provide new recreational open space. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of the historic environment. | + |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | The use of PDL for housing development will reduce the use of greenfield sites.. However pollution within a settlement could be increased. | + |

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: An average of 79% of new houses have been built on PDL in 2006-09, and would need to achieve about 45% each year for the remaining 17 years of that period to provide a 20-year average of 50% (the revoked RSS target). Monitoring information shows that approximately 33% of existing housing supply/ commitments/allocations as at April 2009 are on PDL. This illustrates the significant effect of the greenfield Local Plan allocations as the percentage on PDL is halved when they are taken into account. The residual housing required includes Yeovil's urban extension which will be 100% greenfield. However it is proposed to seek a minimum of 50% of the residual 2754 dwellings in Yeovil and 2282 dwellings in other settlements to be on PDL as per the RSS target. The total additional dwelling supply based on the 50% PDL target would result in a total of 5695 new dwellings on PDL over the whole period of the RSS, 29% of the total dwellings to be provided. However, if the greenfield urban extension for Yeovil is omitted from the figures this percentage rises to 39%. Although a target of 30% of new dwellings on PDL is lower than both the national and regional targets it is considered to be challenging for the remaining years of the RSS period and can be justified for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The predominantly rural nature (60% rural¹) of the District – urban areas of the South West are likely to over-achieve over the period of the RSS and will therefore compensate; • The over-achievement over the past few years, due to Local Plan housing allocation delays, will also partly compensate for this lower figure; • The greenfield urban extension for Yeovil will account for a large proportion of the District's growth. | | |

| Draft Policy HG4 – Provision of Affordable Housing | | |
|--|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. | + |

¹ Taunton and South Somerset Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) 2008

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | PPS 3: Housing (2006) states that the national indicative minimum site size threshold for the provision of affordable housing is 15 dwellings, however it also accepts that local planning authorities can set lower minimum thresholds where viable and practicable. The SHMA (2009) indicates that in light of the evidence gathered a case can be made on supply and viability grounds (SHLVA) for a general threshold of 10 dwellings in South Somerset. The evidence suggests that in rural areas thresholds should be set as low as possible however any threshold below 10 would require further economic appraisal. The Annex to the SHLVA shows that a threshold of 6 dwellings would be viable. This lower threshold means that an affordable housing contribution can be sought on more sites than if the national indicative minimum was adopted or even that suggested in the original SHLVA. This would result in the number of affordable homes in the District being increased and contribute towards reducing homelessness. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate to meet identified needs and will help to reduce homelessness. The SHMA identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset and this will contribute to meeting that need. The ability to take viability into account, whilst potentially leading to reduced provision in some instances, will help to ensure that at least some level of affordable housing is provided on qualifying developments whilst allowing for market conditions to be taken into account. | + + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | 35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: Whilst the impacts of any threshold lower than 15 would be positive, a threshold of 6 would lead to more sites being expected to contribute towards affordable housing provision than at present (currently the national indicative minimum threshold of 15 dwellings is being applied), this would have the positive impact of increasing the supply of affordable housing subject to viability and is supported by the evidence arising from the SHLVA Annex. The provision of 35% affordable housing will meet the need identified in the SHMA (taking viability into account). Additional affordable housing will help to reduce social exclusion. Viability will be taken into account and the policy allows for local authorities to respond to changes in the economic climate, but still ensure that some affordable housing is provided.</p> | | |

| Draft Policy HG5 – Achieving a mix of market housing | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | By stating that a range of housing types and sizes should be provided across the district and by directing specified percentages towards certain types of housing on strategic sites (based on evidence from the SHMA) the needs of the housing market will be most appropriately met and this will maximise opportunities for those who want to, to access the housing market. Whether or not this will benefit those from the most deprived areas will depend on where the growth is located (this is assessed elsewhere). The delivery of some small starter homes might provide additional opportunities. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Evidence in the SHMA (2009) indicates that the proportion of demand for detached houses, semi-detached houses and bungalows is in excess of the supply whereas in the case of terraced houses and flats/maisonettes supply is in excess of demand. The evidence also shows that demand is greatest for 2 and 3 bedroom detached or semi-detached homes. This evidence should however be addressed with a degree of caution, by looking at demand it masks householders aspirations to live in homes larger than those that meet their basic needs. But it does suggest that an approach encouraging more 2 and 3 bedroom semi-detached and detached homes should be taken in the Core Strategy. The preferred option ensures that a mix of all housing types and sizes is achieved across the district reflecting the most recent evidence and applies specific percentages to strategic sites which ensures that where the most significant growth is being delivered where it will most appropriately meet the needs of the market (the delivery of affordable housing is dealt with elsewhere). | ++ |
| 4. Improve health and well being | By ensuring that a mix of market housing is provided the residents of South Somerset should be able to have access to the type of housing that best meets their health needs e.g. by ensuring that a number of bungalows are built those who have difficulty using stairs might be better able of access housing that does not require them to climb stairs which will in turn will have overall health benefits. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Additional smaller dwellings within the housing market will contribute the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour. | + |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Whilst being at the mercy of the overall economic climate, the provision of a balanced supply of housing types and sizes is more likely to ensure a buoyant local housing market which would have a positive impact on the local economy generally although it is uncertain if this would occur. | ? |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: The Issues and Options explored the possibility of a percentage of 1 & 2 bedroom dwellings but that option does not address the needs of the whole market. This option presents a number of positive effects, it provides the opportunity for the delivery of the size and type of market housing that is required for the district based on the most recent evidence. By ensuring that a mix of market housing is provided the residents of South Somerset should be more able to have access to the type of housing that best meets their health needs. | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| Draft Policy HG6 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | | |
| As a result of consultation at the Issues and Options stage (March 2008) three further issues were suggested which were incorporated into the preferred policy: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the health and safety of residents • Need to make provision for Travelling Showpeople • Consider flood risk. | | |
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The inclusion of a criterion relating to accessibility to local services such as shops and schools will help to ensure that Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Showpeople are located where residents will have reasonable access to education and health facilities and shops that cater for their day to day needs. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The provision of additional Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites will contribute to reducing social exclusion by providing accommodation in appropriate locations that are well related to local facilities and therefore settlements so there will be increased opportunities for social integration. | ++ |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Option provides a positive policy context for the location of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites as required by Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007. The criteria can be used to assess planning applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites until such time as a Gypsy and Traveller/Travelling Showpeople Site Allocation DPD is produced to meet the need identified in the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the RSS, which will be updated by the Somerset GTAA which is ongoing. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | By requiring sites to be located within reasonable proximity to health facilities the opportunity for improved health and well being will be increased. Formal open space provision is not addressed however given that Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites are primarily located in rural areas it is likely that informal open space will be accessible. The criteria consider the health and safety of future occupants by addressing access to sites, noise pollution and flood risk. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | By requiring sites to be located within reasonable proximity to education facilities such as schools, the opportunities for improved education will be increased. There will also be greater opportunities for access to employment although this is not specified by the criterion. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Although there is little evidence to suggest that increasing the numbers of Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople in an authority will impact upon the crime baseline, there is the potential for baseline conditions in terms of fear of crime to be worsened. | - |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Uncertain effect. The degree to which the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities will impact on local economies is unknown. | ? |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The criteria may lead to reduced levels of travel by private car, as sites will be located in closer proximity to settlements with key services. | - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The inclusion of a criterion aimed at taking landscaping and visual amenity into consideration will help to protect against any negative impacts although landscape and townscape is unlikely to be enhanced. | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Not specifically mentioned in the option although partly covered by the landscaping and visual amenity criterion. | - |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | May lead to reduced travelling by Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople as sites will be located in closer proximity to settlements with key services and therefore the need to travel by car might be reduced. | ? |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Significantly contaminated land should be avoided. | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Option does not consider flood risk. It will depend on the location of the site. PPS25 should be applied, this directs development to areas at least risk from flooding. | + |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Option does not consider conserving or enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity and green infrastructure. This will depend on the location of the site, It will be necessary to ensure that bio and geodiversity interest is conserved and enhanced. | -- |

Conclusion: The Issues and Options document (March 2008) presented 2 options: the first considered a list of criteria including site access and parking, landscape and visual amenity, contaminated land and access to highways network; whilst the second option added a criterion on accessibility to local services including shops and schools. Through sustainability appraisal Option A presented a number of weaknesses in the policy most notably access to local services. Option B sought to address this issue and scored more positively than Option A. Through consultation comments a number of other criteria were suggested to inform the Council's preferred Option; these criteria included health and safety the omission of Travelling Showpeople and flood risk. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrated improvements to scoring. Negative effects still remain in sustainability objectives 6, 8, 10, and 14. It is considered that these effects will be mitigated by other Core Strategy policies on transport, biodiversity and historic environment.

| Draft Policy HG7 – Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Although this does not provide additional housing, it aims to preserve the most threatened types of housing, which have been identified as most needed in the countryside. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The inclusion of a criterion aimed at controlling excessive development of countryside properties will help to protect against any negative impacts although landscape and townscape is unlikely to be enhanced. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: PPS7 identifies that Local Authorities should set out in Local Development Documents policy criteria for replacement countryside buildings, which seeks to avoid dwellings which are disproportionate to the original dwelling and that is excessive in scale and massing and thereby physically and visually intrusive. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrated a benefit to the protection of traditional smaller properties in the countryside, which is what the policy seeks to achieve. | | |

| Draft Policy HG8 – Housing for Agricultural and Related Workers | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | PPS 7 provides policy to allow the erection of a dwelling to fulfil an identified need. However this policy aims to provide greater clarity and guidance as to what would be acceptable and as such is not applicable. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Providing accommodation for an agricultural or related worker in the countryside near to their place of employment would reduce their need to travel. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Although there is potential for a detrimental impact on the landscape due to the inherent rural location for this type of dwelling, the inclusion of a criterion relating to minimising the impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside should mitigate this effect | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | The erection of individual dwellings has the potential to increase CO2 production and contribute to climate change, although likely to be of limited scale of this type of dwelling. | - |

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | The erection of individual dwellings has the potential to increase pollution. Need to ensure this is assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. | ? |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The erection of individual dwellings dependent of location of the site has the potential to impact on biodiversity – need to ensure this would be assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. The HRA identified a potential adverse effect on the Somerset Levels and Moors due to potential close proximity to designated sites – mitigation measures are recommended to ensure no adverse impact. | ? / - |
| Conclusion: PPS7 identifies that Local Authorities should consider application for the erection of agricultural or related workers dwellings in the countryside where there is a justified need. This policy seeks to give greater clarity and guidance for what type of dwelling would be considered acceptable within the District and ensure that the proposed dwellings are affordable for rural employees. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates a benefit in reducing the need to travel for countryside workers. Negative effects still remain in sustainability objectives 11, 12 and 14. It is considered that these effects will be mitigated by other Core Strategy policies on climate change, design and biodiversity. | | |

| Draft Policy HG9 – Removal of Agricultural and other Occupancy Conditions | | |
|---|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | This policy aims to provide greater clarity and guidance as to what would be required to remove an occupational tie, thereby helping to preserve such housing for those employed in the rural economy. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to give greater clarity and guidance for what would need to be given to establish that the occupational tied dwelling is no longer required within that community. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates a benefit of the policy to provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of the community. | | |

'Economic Prosperity' chapter

Draft Policy EP1 – Strategic Employment Sites

All five sites have been carried forward from the South Somerset Local Plan and have been assessed as fit-for-purpose through the South Somerset Employment Land Review (ELR):

- Land off Bunford Lane, Yeovil (ME/WECO/1) is identified in Stage 1 of the ELR as a high quality, strategic site. It received planning permission in principle for B1 office and industrial use buildings on 5th August 2009. Permission was awarded for approximately 20 hectares of land, the net developable area for employment land being approximately 11.5 hectares, which according to the applicant could employ between 4-5,000 people.
- An application has been approved in principle on Saved Local Plan allocation KS/CREW/1 (CLR Key Site), which includes 525 dwellings along with the allocated employment land. The planning consent has not yet been issued as there are ongoing viability and ecological issues which need to be satisfactorily resolved. The saved allocation will provide long-term employment land provision.
- Planning permission was granted in November 2009 for 1.6 hectares on Saved Local Plan allocation ME/ILMI/3, leaving a residual 1.4 hectares. The permission was for a highways agency maintenance depot, comprising a range of traditional employment uses (B1, B2 & B8).
- Planning permission is actively being sought for Saved Local Plan allocation ME/ILMI/4 (12.9 hectares), the permission which includes the old cheese factory comprises 16.7 hectares for a mixed B1, B2 & B8 use, the details of which have yet to be determined.
- There has been a history of interest in Saved Local Plan allocation ME/ILMI/5 but at present remains allocated for 5.1 hectares of B1, B2 & B8 employment land, with no planning permission.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|--|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Not directly relevant, but providing enough jobs to meet the need in these settlements may result in less people travelling to locations outside of the District for work, thereby sustaining more services and facilities locally. This is however an unknown quantity. | ? |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | All sites will reduce poverty and social exclusion by providing opportunities to deliver employment land. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Not directly relevant to this objective, although as noted above KS/CREW/1 as a Key Site which includes 525 dwellings along with the employment land and generating wealth in an area will give developers greater confidence in the market and may assist them in bringing forward projects. | ? |
| 4. Improve health and well being | All sites may indirectly improve the health and well being of residents by providing sufficient employment land, leading to job creation - many studies illustrate the positive health benefits of working. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Providing sufficient jobs in Yeovil, Crewkerne and Ilminster (latter two in particular) may lead to the retention locally of the better-educated or more skilled residents. Yeovil college may also offer alternative courses and seek to develop skills related to 'growth' sectors in relation to the development of the high quality businesses park and research and development on the Bunford Lane site. | ++ |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Crewkerne is part of the Key Site, which has outline planning permission, and detailed design will have input from Secure by Design. All sites should seek to design out crime as much as possible. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | All sites will support strong, diverse and vibrant local economies by providing opportunities to deliver jobs and diversify the sites/premises on offer. The Bunford Lane site seeks to redress the lack of high quality sites/premises in Yeovil, diversifying the range and providing greater choice. The high quality business park establishes Yeovil as the economic driver for South Somerset. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | All sites will deliver more jobs locally, which will raise the settlement's level of self-containment and reduce the need to travel. Strategic employment sites also offer opportunities for public transport because of the potential number of employees, and will be required to address such issues, the Bunford Lane site for example requires an integrated transport strategy. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | All but one of the sites are Greenfield, however they will be landscaped, for example the Bunford Lane site will be an important gateway site and so the quality of development will be of the highest standard, it will include a safeguarding corridor to protect the specimen oaks. | - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | The Bunford Lane site will require a design and layout, which pays particular regard to the historic park and garden of Brympton d'Evercy. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | All sites should contribute to the reduction in the contribution to climate change (see point 8). | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | All Greenfield sites, will have an impact on light pollution and some by nature of resulting employment may have noise issues, but will reduce contribution to climate change. | - |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | The Ilminster sites are located in Flood Zone 3A and 3B, as the fall within the floodplain of the River Isle, mitigation measures will be required to manage and reduce any additional risk of flooding. All sites will address the use of SUDS and surface water attenuation. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Ecological surveys will be required to accompany the relevant sites and mitigation where appropriate, i.e. Dormice bridge over link road for Crewkerne site and safeguarding corridor to protect the specimen oaks on the Bunford Lane site. | + |
| Conclusion: All sites will deliver jobs, which will raise the level of self-containment in the relevant settlements. Whilst the majority are Greenfield sites, high quality development with appropriate mitigation measures will counter any negative impacts arising from development, and in balance, supporting local economies is the most sustainable option. | | |

| Draft Policy EP2 – Office Development | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| The ELR highlights that 44% of the District's office development between 2006-2009 has taken place on business parks and 56% elsewhere, not necessarily in the District's Town Centres. Offices as defined in PPS4 are a main Town Centre use and, as such, should be located in a Town Centre of edge of centre location. | | |
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Locating offices in Town Centres will improve access to essential services and facilities for office workers. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A. | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A. | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A. | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Locating offices in Town Centres supports the vitality and viability of those Town Centres, as office workers use the shops, services etc during their lunch hour or after work. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Locating offices in Towns Centres reduces the need to travel and increases opportunities for the use of public transport. | ++ |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A. | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Can reduce development's contribution to climate change through the greater use of public transport and reduced car use (see point 8). | + |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Minimised air pollution by focussing office development in town centres with best access to use alternatives to the private car. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A. | 0 |
| Conclusion: the draft policy will have positive impacts on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre by increasing footfall and the number of potential shoppers and service users. Locating office development in the Town Centre also enables more office workers to use public transport to get to work, as more bus services are available into Town Centres, thereby reducing the need to travel by private car, which has positive impacts on the environment. Adopting the sequential approach will mean that those positive impacts will still be felt, but the degree to which they are felt will reduce with distance from the Town Centre. | | |

| Draft Policy EP3 – Safeguarding Employment Land | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A. | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The retention of employment land and premises is important for job creation and the health of the economy, therefore has an impact on poverty and social exclusion. Second-hand premises are often cheaper, and so appeal to start-ups or businesses trying to keep rental costs low, having such business premises readily available will allow job creation, thereby increasing wealth and reducing social exclusion. Social exclusion is multifaceted and so requires a range of measures to address, providing jobs alone will not address the issue. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | A policy protecting employment land and premises may reduce the ability to redevelop old employment sites for housing. | - |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Indirectly the policy may have positive impacts on the education and skills of the population by retaining employment opportunities locally. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Preventing alternative uses coming forward on redundant/disused employment sites might lead to their blight if they are not reoccupied with alternative employment uses, which could lead to an increased perception of crime/vandalism. | - |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Preventing the loss of sites to alternative uses ensures a ready supply of sites that can be occupied 'immediately' which are usually cheaper and are very important for small-scale businesses, which are the majority of businesses in the District. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land – protecting the land reduces the amount of Greenfield sites required. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Minimises pollution by 'recycling' the building. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: The importance of providing a range of sites, by both type and cost is crucial for the economy, as set out in PPS4. The second-hand employment land/premises market is especially important for small businesses/self-employed who form a large part of the South Somerset economy. Allowing the loss of these sites/premises reduces their overall availability and this, coupled with the fact that allocated employment sites are not coming forward, would push up the cost of premises (based on economics of supply and demand) making running a business more expensive and stifling the market. Without putting a level of protection in place through including a policy in the Core Strategy, the economy and businesses would suffer as alternative, more profitable uses would occupy employment land. This would also increase unemployment and possibly encourage entrepreneurs to move outside of the District.</p> | | |

| Draft Policy EP4 – Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside | | |
|--|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Limiting the amount of residential development scattered throughout the countryside will improve people's access to essential services and facilities, as concentrating development in villages, service centres and towns establishes a more sustainable pattern of development. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Limiting the amount of residential development scattered throughout the countryside will reduce social exclusion, especially amongst the elderly – as people age they often require access to health and social care, concentrating development in villages, service centres and towns establishes a more sustainable pattern of development, and reduces the distances people have to travel to access such services and facilities. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Potential for additional housing supply from this source, but conversions tend to be expensive and unlikely to meet affordable housing need. | 0 |

| | | |
|---|--|-------|
| 4. Improve health and well being | Ensuring an economic activity prior to residential development may indirectly improve the health and well being of residents by providing economic development and hence job creation in the countryside - many studies illustrate the positive health benefits of working. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Providing job opportunities in the countryside may lead to the retention locally of the better-educated or more skilled residents. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Conversion for economic development purposes will of course support a strong and diverse rural economy, however residential redevelopment will not support this objective. | + / - |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The conversion of buildings for either economic development or residential use will generate the need to travel, so will have a negative impact on this criterion. However enabling businesses in rural areas may reduce distances traveled to work by rural residents as jobs are provided locally. | - / + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The policy requires any form of redevelopment to respect not only the historic or architectural value of the building, but also to have no adverse impact on the countryside. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | The policy requires any form of redevelopment to respect the historic or architectural value of the building. | + |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | This policy does not further this aim, the location of rural buildings is likely to generate a need to travel (see point 8). | - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Re-using a building minimises pollution and is more sustainable in energy terms, as it is better to reuse a building than demolish and rebuild it. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The policy requires any development to have regard to protected wildlife species and their habitats. | + |
| Conclusion: The policy is a positive one in that it favours an economic re-use prior to residential, which would support the economy and prevent the sporadic development of dwellings in the countryside. Residential redevelopment in the countryside makes the provision of services and facilities to residents difficult to deliver, especially as they age and may require state assistance. Both forms of development would generate travel, but the added value of economic development over residential re-use is that it benefits the wider community as opposed to the occupier of a house. | | |

| Draft Policy EP5 – New Build Live/Work Units | | |
|--|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | As live/work will be directed to Market Towns and Rural Centres there will be access to essential services and facilities. | ++ |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Allowing people to live and work 'together' will reduce poverty by providing opportunities to work. Social impacts can be great as commuters often lack day-to-day contact with neighbours, live/workers spend more time in their community and can devote more time on local activities. There are opportunities in larger live/work schemes to produce affordable live/work units which would help start-ups to incubate their business. | ++ |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Growing evidence that there is demand for live/work units in Market Towns and rural locations, so a policy allowing them will provide for that 'market'. There are opportunities in larger live/work schemes to produce affordable live/work units which would help start-ups to incubate their business. | + |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Less commuting, which can be stressful, costly and time wasting will improve health and well being. Live/workers can save the equivalent of up to one day a week by avoiding commuting. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Potentially reduce the fear of crime by increasing natural surveillance, having people present at the properties for a longer period of time than normal creates more 'social oversight' of neighbouring homes and public spaces. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Many people running a business from home lack space and a professional environment, live/work units provide this type of environment. Live/work clusters also provide economic advantages as businesses can share facilities, reducing costs. Alternative ways of working allows for diversification of the economy, live/work units tend to be occupied by professionals, or niche product providers. Could help start-up businesses as combined live/work space has lower costs. Additionally, live/workers stimulate the local daytime economy, and have a higher demand for local services as they spend locally rather than elsewhere. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Reduces the need to travel to and from work. Average UK worker commutes 2,960 miles a year, 1,622 miles of which are for business. Travel makes up a quarter of UK greenhouse gas emissions. ² Live/workers not only travel less but the number of trips they make are less, as are the trips at the most congested periods of the day. | ++ |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Reducing the need to travel. Only one property built instead of two (home and workplace) and only one property is fuelled. Live/work makes it possible to reduce carbon by encouraging the smarter use of fewer buildings in the first place and reducing the need to travel by car. | ++ |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Through use of fewer buildings, minimises pollution. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |

²Tomorrow's Property Today, April 2008.

Conclusion: Live/work units are beneficial from an economic, social and environmental perspective. Restricting their development to sustainable locations where standard housing is allowed will ensure that they do not 'spring up' all over the countryside, which would not be sustainable. Live/work reduces carbon usage and supports the local economy and should be encourage in appropriate locations, which is what the policy seeks to achieve.

| Draft Policy EP6 – Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A. | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The draft policy will reduce poverty and social exclusion by enabling established businesses to not be disadvantaged by their location and enabling rural residents to access jobs. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | The draft policy may indirectly improve the health and well being of residents by providing economic development and hence job creation in the countryside - many studies illustrate the positive health benefits of working. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Providing job opportunities in the countryside may lead to the retention locally of the better-educated or more skilled residents. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A. | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Enabling the expansion of established rural businesses will support a strong and diverse rural economy, it will prevent relocation, which may result in the loss of rural jobs and will assist the business by ensuring continuity and retention of staff. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Economic development in the countryside will generate the need to travel, so will have a negative impact on this criterion, however enabling businesses in rural areas may reduce distances traveled to work by rural residents as jobs are provided locally. | - / + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The sites will be Greenfield sites and are likely to require good design and landscaping as mitigation measures. | - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | This policy does not further this aim - the location of rural buildings will generate a need to travel (see point 8). | - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | This policy does not further this aim - the location of rural buildings will generate a need to travel and therefore increase air pollution from motor vehicles. Potential for adverse effect of noise and light pollution particularly given the rural location of this type of development. | - |

| | | |
|--|------|---|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A. | 0 |
| Conclusion: The policy has positive impacts on the economy and whilst it will generate the need to travel, in reality the distances travelled may be less than travelling to a town as opposed to a local countryside location. | | |

| Draft Policy EP7 – New Tourism Proposals | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Policy seeks to promote tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements within the district. As an exception to this approach small-scale tourism proposals will be allowed outside development boundaries and in the open countryside. Policy will promote development largely in the most sustainable locations and ensures tourism development is accessible by public transport, cycle and pedestrian networks. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | In directing tourism development towards the districts most sustainable settlements this policy will maximise opportunities for employment in the most deprived areas. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements will maximise opportunities for employment in the right locations, improving qualifications and skills and increasing the supply of skilled workers. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements will foster economic growth evenly across the District. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with an exception that allows proposals in rural locations subject to scale will allow some development to be permitted in unsustainable locations increasing the need to travel and generating road congestion. Policy will promote development largely in the most sustainable locations and ensures tourism development is accessible by public transport, cycle and pedestrian networks. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations and that proposals do not harm the District's environmental, cultural or heritage assets. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations and that proposals do not harm the District's environmental, cultural or heritage assets. | + |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its | This approach makes no allowances for incorporating climate change measures, although this issue is covered specifically by other core strategy policies. | - |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| effects | | |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Policy makes no allowance for minimising pollution. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan. | - |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Policy makes no allowance for flood risk. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan. | - |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Tourism development within open countryside must be relevant to and associated with the countryside location and be of a scale and nature not to conflict with the national policy for protection of the countryside. | + |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of tourism in the District. This preferred option is considered to have a significant positive effect in supporting a strong diverse and vibrant economy in respect of tourism applications. The policy is also considered to have a positive effect in terms of improving access to service and facilities, reducing social exclusion, improving education and skills of those employed, reducing effect on traffic, protecting landscape & townscape, conserving the historic environment and conserving biodiversity & geodiversity from tourism applications. Negative effects are experienced in respect of the policies failure to contribute to climate change, minimising pollution and reducing the risk of flooding. These issues will be dealt with in combination with other policies within the Draft Core Strategy. | | |

| Draft Policy EP8 – Major New Tourist Facilities | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Policy seeks to direct proposals near Yeovil or the District's Market Towns to ensure a local workforce that can access the attraction effectively and sustainable being well located to the national road route network. Major Tourism proposals must be readily accessible by non car means | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Policy seeks to direct proposals near Yeovil or the District's Market Towns to ensure a local workforce that can access the attraction effectively and sustainable being well located to the national road route network contributing significantly to the District's economy. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | NA | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | NA | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Policy seeks to direct proposals near Yeovil or the District's Market Towns to ensure a local workforce that can access the attraction effectively and sustainable being well located to the national road route network, improving qualifications and skills and increasing the supply of skilled workers. | + |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | NA | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Policy seeks to direct Major Tourism proposals near Yeovil or the District's Market Towns to ensure a local workforce that can access the attraction effectively and sustainable being well located to the national road route network contributing significantly to the District's economy. Policy seeks to enhance the overall quality of the Major new tourism offer in the District, increasing rather than just displacing visitors from other areas and attractions and developing new tourism markets. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on | Policy seeks to direct proposals near Yeovil or the District's Market Towns to ensure a local workforce that can | ++ |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| the environment | access the attraction effectively and sustainable being well located to the national road route network. Major Tourism proposals must be readily accessible by non car means. | |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Major new tourism facilities should be assessed in terms of overall sustainable development objectives. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the landscape and townscape of the district. | - |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Major new tourism facilities should be assessed in terms of overall sustainable development objectives. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the historic environment of the district. | - |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Policy makes no allowances for incorporating climate change measures, although this issue is covered specifically by other core strategy policies. | - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Major new tourism facilities should be assessed in terms of overall sustainable development objectives Policy makes no allowance for minimising pollution. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan. | - |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Major new tourism facilities should be assessed in terms of overall sustainable development objectives Policy makes no allowance for flood risk. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan. | - |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Major new tourism facilities should be assessed in terms of overall sustainable development objectives Policy makes no allowance for Biodiversity. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan. | - |
| Conclusion: Tourism Policy EP8 seeks to support Major New Tourism proposals within the District subject to sustainability objectives. This preferred option is considered to have a significant positive effect in respect of major new tourism applications in supporting a strong diverse and vibrant economy, improving access to essential services and reducing the effect of traffic. The preferred option is also considered to have a positive effect in reducing poverty and social exclusion through greater opportunities for local workforce employment and improving qualifications and skills of those employed. In isolation this policy may have a negative effect in respect of protecting the landscape & townscape, conserving the historic environment, contributing to climate change, minimising pollution and reducing the risk of flooding. These issues are considered by other policies within the Draft Core Strategy. | | |

| Draft Policy EP9 – Farm Diversification | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | It allows farm enterprises that may require financial support the opportunity to improve their economic circumstances | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Allowing further economic diversification has the potential to not only assist the individual enterprise but also support other local business. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The provision of additional business interests in rural areas is likely to create increased traffic movements. | - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Rural development has the potential to have a detrimental impact on landscape, but the first criterion of the policy should ensure mitigation measures protect the landscape. | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Rural development has the potential to have a detrimental impact on climate change, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. | - |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Rural development has the potential to have a detrimental impact on pollution, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. | - |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Rural development has the potential to have a detrimental impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. The HRA identified a potential adverse effect due to proximity of farms to the Somerset Levels and Moors and the types of potential diversification – mitigation measures are recommended to ensure no adverse impact. | - |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to give support to existing farm enterprises and their rural economies. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates an economic benefit. Negative effects still remain in sustainability objectives 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14. It is considered that these effects could be mitigated by other Core Strategy policies on travel, climate change, design and biodiversity. | | |

| Draft Policy EP10 – Retail Hierarchy | | |
|---|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Through identifying a retail hierarchy, it is clear what the retail role of settlements will be. The policy will improve access to essential services and facilities by supporting their development in the appropriate settlements. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Indirectly through providing a range of retail facilities and services in a range of settlements. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The policy will support a strong, diverse and vibrant economy by enabling Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres to be more sustainable by ensuring that a range of retail and leisure facilities, appropriate to the role and function of each settlement, are encouraged, and that not only do the right services and facilities develop in settlements, but that they promote self containment and do not harm the overall retail hierarchy. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The policy will reduce the need to travel by allowing the provision of facilities in a range of settlements. These settlements are more likely to be served by public transport facilities and so provide the opportunity for people to use modes other than the private car to undertake their shopping. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Indirectly through reducing car journeys. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: The retail hierarchy is based on evidence and reflects the current and future retail role of the settlements across the District. The policy seeks to make Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres more sustainable by ensuring that a range of retail and leisure facilities, appropriate to the role and function of the settlement in question, are encouraged, and that not only do the right services and facilities develop in settlements, but that they promote self containment and do not harm the overall retail hierarchy. The policy will support strong and vibrant local economies, encourage self-containment, reduce the need to travel and improve access to essential services and facilities thereby reducing exclusion.</p> | | |

| Draft Policy EP11 – Presumption against Major New Regional Shopping Facilities | | |
|--|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy will protect the retail hierarchy by only allowing major regional-scale retailing in Yeovil Town Centre. Protecting the hierarchy will ensure that access to essential services and facilities is retained, if not improved. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Indirectly through providing a range of retail facilities and services in a range of settlements. | + |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The policy will support a strong, diverse and vibrant economy by ensuring that a range of retail and leisure facilities, appropriate to the role and function of each settlement, are encouraged, and that not only do the right services and facilities develop in settlements, but that they promote self containment and do not harm the overall retail hierarchy. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Yeovil is the District's most sustainable settlement in terms of being able to reach it by public transport, and so major regional-scale retailing should be located in the most sustainable settlement. Ensuring that the development takes place in the Town Centre reinforces the transport sustainability. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Indirectly through reducing car journeys. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: The Policy protects the vitality and viability of existing centres by ensuring that any major retailing development would be directed to Yeovil Town centre, and as Yeovil is the most sustainable settlement, the policy will assist in the reduction of car usage. | | |

| Draft Policy EP12 – Retail Vitality and Viability | | |
|--|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy will improve access to essential services and facilities by supporting their development in the appropriate settlements. | ++ |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Indirectly through providing a range of retail facilities and services in a range of settlements. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The policy will support a strong, diverse and vibrant economy by enabling Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres to be more sustainable by ensuring that a range of retail and leisure facilities, appropriate to the role and function of each settlement, are encouraged, and that not only do the right services and facilities develop in settlements, but that they promote self containment and do not harm the overall retail hierarchy. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The Policy will reduce the need to travel by allowing the provision of facilities in a range of settlements. These settlements are more likely to be served by public transport facilities and so provide the opportunity for people to use modes other than the private car to undertake their shopping. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Indirectly through reducing car journeys. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| <p>Conclusion: This policy is very similar to draft Policy EP9: The Retail Hierarchy, it that it seeks to make Yeovil, the Market Towns and Rural Centres more sustainable by ensuring that a range of retail and leisure facilities, appropriate to the role and function of the settlement in question, are encouraged, and that not only do the right services and facilities develop in settlements, but that they promote self containment and do not harm the overall retail hierarchy. The policy will support strong and vibrant local economies, encourage self-containment, reduce the need to travel and improve access to essential services and facilities thereby reducing exclusion.</p> | | |

Draft Policy EP13 – Protection of Retail Frontages

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy is seeking to retain a core retail function in our Town Centres, indirectly this would support the retention and possibly improvement in essential services and facilities such as banks, post offices because it support a strong and vibrant Town Centre. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The policy will supports a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy by defining Primary Shopping Frontages, and where these have been defined, protecting A1 Uses (retailing) to ensure a dominant retail function. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: The policy defines Primary Shopping Frontages, locations where retail (A1 uses) should dominate, this will protect the retail function of the District's Town Centre and thereof the policy will support strong and vibrant local economies. | | |

Draft Policy EP15 – District and Local Centres

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|--|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy will improve access to essential services and facilities by supporting their development in the local centres in Yeovil's Urban Extension and on the Chard Key Site. These sites would otherwise not have such services and facilities locally. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Indirectly through providing a small range of retail facilities locally. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The policy will support a strong, diverse and vibrant economy by ensuring that any local services and facilities that develop in the suburbs of Yeovil and Chard do not harm the retail provision in the main Town Centres. | ++ |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The policy will reduce the need to travel for essential and top-up goods by allowing the provision of local facilities. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Indirectly through reducing car journeys for essential and top-up goods. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: The policy will support strong and vibrant local economies, reduce the need to travel and improve access to essential services and facilities thereby reducing exclusion by providing local shopping facilities to serve day-to-day need in Yeovil's Urban Extension and on the Chard Key Site. | | |

Draft Policy EP16 – Protection and provision of local shops, community facilities and services

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|--|---|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Across South Somerset there are many settlements where the last remaining shop, post office, public house or other service of facility is in danger of being closed. These services and facilities are vital to the communities that they serve and their loss can significantly affect the ability of local residents to access services – the draft policy seeks to protect these services and facilities from closure. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The protection of community facilities can help to foster social inclusion. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | 'Community facility' could incorporate health facilities so positive impact if these are protected. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Local shops make a vital contribution to the rural economy. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The retaining of local shops and services will help to reduce the need to travel to other settlements to access these facilities. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Reduction in need to travel to access services should minimise CO2 emissions. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Potential reduction in noise and air pollution as the need to travel is reduced through the protection of local services. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: The protection of local shops, community facilities and services would have several sustainability benefits across the range of social, economic and environmental effects. | | |

'Transport and Accessibility' chapter

Draft policy TA1 – Low Carbon travel

'Do Minimum' (Maintain current % modal shift)

All residential and employment developments in South Somerset should:

- i. Provide Smarter Travel Information Packs
- ii. Provide for the charging of electric vehicles
- iii. Provide a Green Travel Voucher for use on Local Buses including Demand Responsive Services
- iv. Include Transport Assessments, Transport Statements and Travel Plans commensurate with Draft Policy TA2
- v. Ensure that sustainable transport measures need to be in place and operational concurrent with first occupancy.

Additionally all residential developments should: vi. Enable ease of working from home by providing a designed in specific work area with Broadband and wi-fi connections and advice on best practice, benefits and information on ICT training.

'Do More' (Target to reduce single car occupancy car use in Market Towns & other villages from 66% to 60%) Low Carbon Travel

In addition to the policies that support generic modal shift above throughout the district (Draft Policy TA1), in respect of the Market Towns and other villages more robust policies would need to be in place if we are to achieve greater modal shift: Deliver improved public transport connections increasing accessibility through enhancements to either existing conventional bus routes or existing or new Demand Responsive Transport Schemes that enable good on-going connections with the public transport network; Ensure that bus stops, bus shelters and timetable information are provided within 400 metres of the development, dependent of the scale of the development and existing provision.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The policy should ensure a higher level of accessibility to key services by walking, cycling and public transport. However the 'Do-minimum' is not specific enough and there are also concerns on the robustness both in terms of ensuring developer sign up to and actual delivery. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Owning and running a car(s) can be a significant proportion of living costs for low-income families. Reducing the need to own a car, particularly a second car can reduce these costs and thereby has the potential to benefit these groups. Social inclusion through transport very reliant on public transport for those who have no access to a car. Increased walking and cycling potential to increase social interactivity – again concerns policy is not specific enough and robustness both in terms of ensuring developer sign up to and actual delivery. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up and delivery. Degree of positive effect will depend on the ability to provide better public transport through DRT schemes etc. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Possible easing of access to further education for those without a car. | ? |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Probability that the increased social interactivity delivered through walking and cycling could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. However this is likely to depend on other factors relating to location, proximity and type of services and facilities, general design and safety features such as lighting etc. Access by foot or cycle that's Safe & Secure by design should therefore be included in the policy. Potential negative effect that shelters often attract anti-social behaviour – good design which includes ensuring public spaces are overlooked should be incorporated. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Ensures access to work by walking, cycling and public transport. Increased opportunity to access employment, social and tourism facilities, although this will be dependent on the level & frequency of service that could be delivered. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities than those travelling by car. Increased walking and cycling can also assist in the delivery of leisure and sustainable tourism opportunities. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Positive impacts, although the Do-Minimum scenario may not deliver to the full potential - should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Green corridors should arise from increased provision of cycle paths and footways. However the Do-minimum policy is unlikely to deliver any noticeable difference and again policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | In some locations there may be an opportunity to enhance the historic environment through giving more sustainable access to the site or through preserving our industrial heritage through a different use e.g. using an old railway line as a cycle path. However these opportunities are likely to be rare and therefore of little significant positive effect. | + |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes need to adapt to climate change. Policy should be more specific and robust to ensure sign up & delivery. Degree of contribution from electric cars will be dependent on how electricity generated. Potential benefits of Home Working needs to take account of possible increased CO ₂ emission in the home. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Improves air quality and minimises noise pollution, although for public transport a criteria for modern low emission/hybrid type vehicles would need to be in place. A stronger policy is needed to reflect this. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths – primarily a management issue. | 0 |

Conclusion: This policy will have a positive effect through improved modal shift. However the degree of modal shift will have a direct bearing on the degree of effect on the SA objectives. The 'Do-minimum' may not prove specific enough or sufficiently robust to ensure developer sign-up and actual delivery. Given the anticipated growth, it may well struggle to even maintain the current % of modal shift. However they form a good starting point for encouraging alternative travel to the car across the district. **These criteria should therefore be included in draft policy TA1.** Whilst in theory the 'Do-more' policy will have a positive effect on modal shift, the cost involved of delivery against the anticipated scale of development in our Market Towns and villages means it may be difficult to achieve significant service improvements and new services especially would only be appropriate for significant sites. Such improvements should therefore be proportionate to the size of development. Recommend that threshold for these policies are set at major developments (>10 dwellings/1000sq m) and commensurate with the scale of development. Similarly the requirement for bus shelters to be within 400 metres of the development is considered too onerous for the smaller Market Towns and villages. **Subject to these amendments these criteria should be included in draft policy TA1.**

| Draft Policy TA2 – Travel Plans | | |
|---|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Travel Plan measures provide the mechanisms for raising awareness and enabling a choice of modes. E.g. the provision of cycle parking and showers can encourage the user to cycle. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Easier access and/or raising awareness will increase social inclusion. Potential for walking and cycling to reduce travel costs. Increased walking, cycling and use of public transport is also likely to increase social interactivity. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Increase awareness of public transport availability and walking and cycling may well enable easier access to further education for those without a car. | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Probability that the increased social interactivity delivered through walking and cycling could lead to reduced anti-social behaviour. However this is likely to depend on other factors relating to location, proximity and type of services and facilities, general design and safety features such as lighting etc. Access by foot or cycle that's Safe & Secure by design should therefore be included in the policy. | ? |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Promotes travel to work by walking, cycling and public transport. This in turn will have a knock-on effect on the town and local centre vitality and viability both in terms of reducing congestion and those walking and cycling are more likely to choose to use local facilities or 'pop in to the local shop' en route than those travelling by car. Counter argument often voiced that enhanced business competitiveness is dependent on free and unrestrained access by car, although this can be offset by reduced costs to the business of not having to provide extensive and costly (both in terms of land use and construction and maintenance) parking facilities. Additionally can enhance the company's 'green credentials'. | + |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Positive effect on reducing the effect of traffic on the environment. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes needed to adapt to climate change. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Increased travel by public transport walking and cycling initiatives will reduce pollution. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | In theory sustainable travel should promote green infrastructure although this has to be balanced against possible damage by walkers and cyclist failing to keep to designated paths. Primarily a management issue. | 0 |
| Conclusion: Generally Travel Plans are a useful tool in raising awareness, however the degree of effectiveness is dependent on the choice of modes available and therefore are usually complimentary to other measures within modal shift policy. | | |

Draft Policy TA3 – Transport Impact of New Development

- All new development shall be required to address its own transport implications designed to maximise the potential for sustainable transport through:
- i. Safeguarding existing and new transport infrastructure, which is important to an efficient and sustainable transport network from development that would prejudice their transport use
 - ii. Securing inclusive, safe and convenient access on foot, cycle, and by public and private transport that addresses the needs of all;
 - iii. Ensuring that the expected nature and volume of traffic and parked vehicles generated by the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character or amenity of the area and would not compromise the safety and/or function of the local or strategic road networks in terms of both volume and type of traffic generated;
 - iv. Ensuring that proposals, which specifically require a location with direct access to the strategic road network due to the volumes and quality of traffic generated, are well located on these networks. There is a presumption against direct access from the strategic road network. Exemptions will only be made where the type of development is such that it requires a high order (of route hierarchy) route location, such as roadside service stations or freight transfer facilities;
 - v. Assessing the transport impact of development and ensuring delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure for the proposal and requiring larger schemes to prepare Transport Assessments.
 - vi. Requiring car parking and vehicle servicing at levels appropriate to the development and its location, in accordance with the approved/adopted standards identified in Policy TA4.

| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | At least maintains access & mitigates impacts that may otherwise occur from developments. In best cases potential to really improve access. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Easier access and/or raising awareness will increase social inclusion. Potential for walking and cycling to reduce travel costs. Increased walking, cycling and use of public transport are also likely to increase social interactivity. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Positive health benefits of increased walking & cycling with ease of including regular exercise into daily route. Additionally physical activity is known to increase as walking to bus stops or cycling to train stations often forms part of longer journeys by public transport. However, wherever there is provision of car parking there is always the potential to discourage the use of sustainable travel modes. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Whilst there is perhaps a tenuous link in providing improved access to educational facilities, little direct benefit is likely to occur from these policies. Very difficult to predict therefore uncertain effect. | ? |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | The existing infrastructure may not be conducive to reducing the fear of crime. Although securing safe sustainable transport with consequential increased social interactivity should reduce fear of crime and similarly new design should also have a positive effect on motor related crime & general ambience to area. Overall likely to have a neutral effect. | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | A good overall transport infrastructure should achieve this. Generally these policies will deliver the desired positive effect and in the urban areas this should be significant. However the rural nature of the district and its associated problems mean that it's more likely to be positive overall than significant. | + |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Overall effect positive given the need to secure safe & Convenient access on foot, cycle & public transport but some issues relating to car parking, necessary in a rural area will run contra to this. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | 21% of emissions come from personal transport, mostly arising from the use of the car. Sustainable transport modes reduce carbon emissions and also contribute to lifestyle changes needed to adapt to climate change. Again the rural necessity of car travel runs contra. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Increased travel by public transport walking and cycling initiatives will reduce pollution. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Should certainly conserve although doubtful if enhancement would occur. | + |
| Conclusion: There is a need for cars in a rural district. The balance between achievable sustainable transport measures and ensuring economic viability is delicate and will be challenging to achieve. Generally it is felt that these policies will deliver. This policy has been included as draft policy TA6. | | |

| Draft Policy TA4 – Parking standards | | |
|---|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | The provision of sufficient levels of parking should ensure good accessibility to services and facilities. In particular, recommend that good quality secure cycle parking is provided to improve sustainability. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Minimum levels of parking for people with disabilities will be provided. Minimum levels of cycle parking will be provided which will help provide travel opportunities for those without access to a car. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Not directly relevant to this objective. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Lower levels of car parking provision at accessible locations should encourage walking/cycling, as will minimum cycle parking standards. Particular opportunities at Yeovil given its high levels of accessibility. | ? |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Not directly related to this objective. | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Not directly related to this objective. | 0 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The effects of parking standards on the local economy are difficult to ascertain – adequate levels of good quality secure parking in town centres should be provided to encourage investment and maintain their vitality and viability. | ? |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Lower levels of off-street car parking provision at accessible locations should increase the proportion of non-car journeys at these places, and reduce the growth of traffic congestion. This is particularly important at Yeovil where substantial growth is planned. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The policy supports high design standards by stating that parking provision should be “design-led.” | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Not directly related to this objective. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Lower levels of off-street car parking provision at accessible locations should increase the proportion of non-car journeys at these places, and therefore minimise carbon dioxide emissions emitted from cars. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | More stringent car parking standards at Yeovil should minimise air pollution in the Air Quality Management Area. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Not directly related to this objective. | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Not directly related to this objective. | 0 |
| Conclusion: Several positive effects associated with ensuring appropriate parking provision based upon site characteristics, location and accessibility. Secure cycle parking in particular should be encouraged. Several benefits with promotion of lower car parking levels at accessible locations, specifically Yeovil, including minimise air pollution, encourage use of alternative travel modes, and potentially reduce the growth of traffic congestion. | | |

‘Health and well being’ chapter

| Draft Policy HW1 – Provision of Open Space and Outdoor Playing Space in New Development | | |
|---|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | When considering facilities that should be provided, PPG17 allows that any identified deficiencies in existing facilities can also be considered and be provided through developer contributions, thereby not only providing facilities for the new housing but enhancing the accessibility to provision by existing nearby housing. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The provision of play and community facilities with the aim to bring social cohesion within that community could help to reduce social exclusion. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 4. Improve health and well being | The provision of adequate open space and outdoor playing space enables everyone the opportunity to participate in play and leisure activities, which is beneficial to the health and well being of the population. | ++ |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A. | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A. | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A. | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The provision of pleasant, well presented and maintained play and open space will enhance the character and appearance of the townscape | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Provision of open space especially in conjunction with tree planting, can contribute to flood mitigation proposals and reduce CO2 levels. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Trees act as carbon filters and reduce pollution levels | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Provision of open space especially in conjunction with tree planting, can contribute to flood mitigation proposals. | + |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Provision and maintenance of open space within the townscape help to maintain areas which promote biodiversity. | + |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to ensure the provision of adequate open space and outdoor playing space in new developments. The appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates several positive effects such as improvements to facilities, the health of the population and the natural environment. | | |

| Draft Policy HW2 – Provision of Sports, Cultural and Community Facilities in New Development | | |
|--|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | When considering facilities that should be provided, PPG17 allows that any identified deficiencies in existing facilities can also be considered and be provided through developer contributions, thereby not only providing facilities for the new housing but enhancing the accessibility to provision by existing nearby housing. | ++ |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The provision of sports, cultural and community facilities with the aim to bring social cohesion within that community could help to reduce social exclusion. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 4. Improve health and well being | The provision of adequate local and strategic sports facilities enables everyone the opportunity to participate in sport and leisure activities, which is beneficial to the health and well being of the population. | ++ |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The provision of suitable facilities may have an impact on the landscape and townscape, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other policies. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | The provision of new built facilities could have a potentially detrimental impact on pollution, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. | ? |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | The provision of suitable facilities may have an impact on potential flood risk, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other policies. | ? |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The provision of suitable facilities may have an impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other policies. | ? |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to ensure the provision of adequate additional local and strategic sports, cultural and community facilities/provisions in new developments. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates a benefit of the policy in its ability to improve facilities and the health of the population. Although currently uncertain, there is potential for negative effects for sustainability objectives 9, 12, 13 and 14. It is considered that these effects will be mitigated by other Core Strategy policies. | | |

| Draft Policy HW3 – Sports Zone | | |
|--|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Preference would be given to a site within Yeovil or failing this a strategic site on the edge of Yeovil well served by public transport | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The provision of a strategic sports facility within the community could help to reduce social exclusion. | + |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | The provision of adequate local and strategic sports facilities enables everyone the opportunity to participate in sport and leisure activities, which is beneficial to the health and well being of the population. | ++ |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The provision of a strategic sports provision could result in increased traffic generation bringing people from Yeovil and elsewhere to use the facilities – sustainable travel modes should be encouraged to reduce this negative effect. | - |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The provision of suitable facilities may have in impact on the landscape and townscape, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other policies. | ? |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | The provision of new built facilities could have a potentially detrimental impact on pollution, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other Development Management policies. | ? |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | The provision of suitable facilities may have in impact on potential flood risk, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other policies. | ? |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The provision of suitable facilities may have in impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, however this will be assessed and mitigated through other policies. | - |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to ensure the provision of strategic sports provisions in South Somerset. The sustainability appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates a benefit of the policy in its ability to improve facilities and the health of the population. Although currently uncertain, there is potential for negative effects for sustainability objectives 8, 9, 12, 13 and 14. It is considered that these effects will be mitigated by other Core Strategy policies. | | |

| Draft Policy HW4 – Protection of Play Spaces and Youth Provision | | |
|--|--|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | This policy aims to ensure existing provision is retained or suitable alternatives provided, thereby ensuring access to services is at least maintained. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | The policy should have a positive impact on the health and well being of the population by protecting existing facilities, but not necessarily make provision for improvement of the facilities. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to ensure the retention or provision of alternative equivalent provision of play spaces and youth provision. The appraisal of this policy demonstrates benefits to health and well being and access to services through the protection of existing play spaces and youth provision. | | |

'Environmental Quality' chapter

| Draft Policy EQ1 – Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset | | |
|--|------------|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A. | 0 |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | Fuel poverty could be reduced due to improved energy efficiency of new dwellings and therefore lower costs involved in running a home. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | Construction cost increase of achieving the Code for Sustainable Homes could potentially inhibit delivery of housing development. However most of the cost of meeting the Code is due to the energy requirements, which are being implemented through the Building Regulations separately of planning policies. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes are included in the Code for Sustainable Homes. Design measures to help adapt to climate change are incorporated. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | Education and skills of homeowners/occupiers could potentially be improved by inclusion of a 'Home User Guide' to improve understanding and operation of their home efficiently. | ? |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Security credits for complying with 'Secured by Design New Homes' are likely to be required in order to achieve the higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes. | ? / + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | Potential negative effect of increase in constructions costs with the requirement for renewable technologies. Additional cost of achieving BREEAM 'excellent' is around 7%, which could potentially inhibit delivery of economic development, but zero carbon will be required by 2019 for non-residential development through the Building Regulations. The Code for Sustainable Homes encourages use of locally sourced materials and new building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewable energy technologies), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Bicycle use is encouraged through credits for adequate and secure cycle storage facilities which are likely in order to achieve higher Code for Sustainable Homes levels. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Seeks to avoid significant adverse effects on the landscape and townscape, although some potential for negative effects through encouraging decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy technologies. | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | Seeks to avoid significant adverse effects to historical features, although some potential for negative effects through encouraging decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy technologies. | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Positive effects of encouraging CO2 reductions, incorporating sustainable construction methods, and climate adaptation measures. Recommend the earlier introduction of the higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes and renewable energy requirement in order to achieve significant positive effect. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction construction waste is mandatory at all levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Policy seeks to avoid medium-high flood risk and requires incorporation of SUDS. | ++ |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Aims to ensure biodiversity is more resilient to climate change, although no detail is given on how this can be achieved. Recommend including further detail on how to ensure biodiversity interests are more resilient to climate change. The HRA identifies a potential adverse effect of this policy upon bird species on the Somerset Levels and Moors from wind turbines – mitigation required to ensure no adverse impact. | 0 |
| Conclusion: This policy performs very well across most objectives, with numerous sustainability benefits associated with this policy. The earlier introduction of the Code for Sustainable Homes / BREEAM would help the policy scored higher on objective 11. No negative effects identified, but some uncertainty or potential for a negative effect on the landscape, historic environment, housing supply and impact on the local economy. | | |

| Draft Policy EQ2 – Design | | |
|--|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | The policy aims to ensure that development contributes to social sustainability, reducing social exclusion. | + |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Creating quality places as part of the design process. Combating heart disease, respiratory problems and mental illness for example, relies on factors such as healthy exercise, air quality, fresh food and local social networks, all of which are influenced by the physical nature of localities. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | Good design should have consideration for designing out crime through the creation of safe environments that benefit from natural surveillance, well overlooked streets and open spaces, appropriate lighting and other security measures. | + |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The policy aims to ensure that development contributes to economic sustainability. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | Effective design that improves connectivity and reduces the need to travel by car will help to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment. | + |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Development proposals are expected to create quality places, and complement and consolidate the landscape character of the area, whilst reinforcing local distinctiveness and respecting local context | ++ |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | There is a requirement to protect and enhance the unique historic environment of the area. All designated heritage assets that contribute positively to the significance of the historic environment shall be protected from inappropriate development that affects the asset or it's setting. | + |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | The policy aims to ensure that development contributes to environmental sustainability and aim to achieve Building for Life objectives and criteria. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |

Conclusion: This policy seeks to ensure that development will be designed to achieve a high quality, which promotes South Somerset's local distinctiveness and preserves the character and appearance of the district. The appraisal demonstrates numerous sustainability benefits consistent with the aim of preserving and enhancing the built environment of the area.

| Draft Policy EQ3 – Biodiversity | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Sites with biodiversity interest can also provide recreational opportunities e.g. walking and cycling on the Somerset Levels and Moors. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Likely to be a positive impact on landscape through measures to protect and enhance biodiversity sites e.g. trees, planting, landscaping to accommodate species. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | The protection and enhancement of biodiversity sites can help protect species by giving them more opportunities to adapt to the effects of climate change. Measures such as increased tree planting can help to collect CO2 and therefore reduce contribution to climate change. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Measures such as tree planting can help to minimise air pollution by collecting airborne particles. | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Potential for additional flood storage areas as part of biodiversity sites e.g. Somerset Levels and Moors. | + |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Requirements to protect biodiversity value of land and buildings and prevent fragmentation of habitats. Maximise opportunities to restore, enhance and connect natural habitats and incorporate beneficial biodiversity conservation features. | ++ |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to promote and protect biodiversity in South Somerset. The appraisal demonstrates several sustainability benefits of adopting this policy, with no negative effects. | | |

| Draft Policy EQ4 – Green Infrastructure | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | Green Infrastructure aims to bring together all aspects of open space, linked by green corridors and providing greater connectivity within the urban environment. | + |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Create access to open space, parks, playing fields and provision for children and young people provides opportunities for recreation, walking and cycling which is clearly beneficial to the health and sense of well-being of the local community. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Creation of open space, parks, playing fields and other green corridors, provides a quality space within the built environment, enhancing the landscape and townscape. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Provision of a network of green spaces, including green corridors, with improved tree planting contribute to flood mitigation proposals and reduce CO2 levels. | + |
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Trees act as carbon filters and reduce pollution levels. | + |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Provision and management of open space, provides larger permeable areas of land for water storage, also flood plains and creation of attenuation ponds alleviating problems especially in times of peak flow. In conjunction, tree planting can contribute to flood mitigation proposals as they filter rainwater and slow down surface run off, which helps to reduce soil erosion as well as reducing costs for drainage infrastructure. | ++ |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Requirements to protect existing open space (including natural and formal open space) as well the provision of additional open space in conjunction with new development, plus green corridors to links such areas has a positive impact on biodiversity. Maximise opportunities to restore, enhance and connect natural habitats and incorporate beneficial biodiversity conservation features. | ++ |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to promote green infrastructure in South Somerset, and is likely to ensure numerous sustainability benefits are achieved, with no negative effects identified. | | |

| Draft Policy EQ5 – Woodlands and Forest | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Woodlands and forest provide areas for encouraging healthy lifestyles. | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | The provision of woodlands and forests can enhance the quality of the landscape. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | Trees filter rainwater and slow down surface run off, which helps to reduce soil erosion and reduce CO2 levels in the atmosphere | ++ |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Trees act as carbon filters and reduce air pollution levels. | ++ |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | Trees can contribute to flood mitigation proposals as they filter rainwater and slow down surface run off, which helps to reduce soil erosion. | ++ |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | Provision and protection of woodlands and forests has a beneficial impact on biodiversity and natural habitats. | ++ |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to promote and protect woodlands and forests in South Somerset. The appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates a benefit to biodiversity and geodiversity and help in mitigating against climate change. | | |

| Draft Policy EQ6 – Air Quality | | |
|--|---|-------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | Improvement in air quality and reduction of pollution levels will benefit health, especially respiratory problems | + |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | N/A. | 0 |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | N/A | 0 |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | Giving consideration to the potential impact of development on air quality, allowing the opportunity for minimal impact and mitigation | + |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | N/A | 0 |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to give consideration for the impact of development on air quality and ensure that it will not exacerbate air quality problems in existing and potential AQMAs. The appraisal of the preferred option demonstrates a benefit of the policy to prevent exacerbation of air quality problems. | | |

| Draft Policy EQ7 – Equine Development | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| SA objective | Commentary | Score |
| 1. Improve access to essential services and facilities | N/A | 0 |
| 2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion | N/A | 0 |
| 3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community | N/A. | 0 |
| 4. Improve health and well being | N/A | 0 |
| 5. Improve education and skills of the population | N/A | 0 |
| 6. Reduce crime and fear of crime | N/A | 0 |
| 7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy | The encouragement of equestrian enterprises should support the rural economy. | + |
| 8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | N/A | 0 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape | Suitably located and well-designed equine development will provide a positive framework to facilitate sustainable development that supports traditional land-based activities, whilst also maintaining environmental quality and the quality and character of the wider countryside. | + |
| 10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment | N/A | 0 |
| 11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects | N/A | 0 |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production | N/A | 0 |
| 13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding | N/A | 0 |
| 14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity | The HRA identifies potential adverse impact on the Somerset Levels and Moors due to potential for close proximity to the designated sites – mitigation required to ensure no adverse impact. | 0 |
| Conclusion: This policy seeks to ensure that equine development maintains environmental quality and respects the countryside character. The appraisal of this policy demonstrates the benefits of maintaining the character of the area, and supporting the rural economy. | | |