

Inspector's Preliminary Findings: Implications and prospective Timetable

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Sustainability Appraisal (SA) – Council's Sustainability Objectives | No detailed explanation of how the SA objectives have been drawn up or their relationship with guidance on delivering sustainable development in the NPPF. Reference to national policy is included in a single paragraph (5.2.2). | Disagree. Sections 4.1 – 4.4 of the SA report [CD16a] outline the sustainability context, baseline and issues, with further detail in Appendices 1 and 2 [CD16c] and the SA Scoping Report [CD31]. This information has informed the development of the SA objectives, as explained in para 4.5.1 of the SA report. The NPPF is also referenced in para 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 in this section, with other references where appropriate such as in para 1.1.1, 5.5.9, and 6.2.1. There is further detail on the implications of the (then draft) NPPF for the SA in Appendix 1 [CD16c] (on the 55 th page) – the description of the three principles of sustainable development did not | None – it is considered that the SA objectives have considered national policy and remain valid. | N/A. | N/A. |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | 3. Do in-house with a peer review by consultants. | <p>months to consider responses and report to PMB. 1 month to go through DX and Full Council.</p> <p>3. Same as 2 above with 2 weeks extra for peer review.</p> |
| Sustainability Appraisal – landscape impact | Lack of substantive evidence to demonstrate there are significant differences in terms of landscape impact between several of the options – the landscape study did not substantively assess mitigation measures and has not been re-appraised for the smaller urban extension now proposed. | The primary aim of the landscape study was a capacity assessment [CD680, para 1.1), regardless of the level of growth being proposed. This study did consider mitigation measures [see CD680 paras 8.3-4, 8.6, 8.11, 8.15]. However agree that it would be useful to provide an addendum to reflect the proposal for 2,500 dwellings (and associated development) in the SUE that applies the smaller area required to the landscape capacities identified. | Do an addendum to the Peripheral Landscape study to reflect 2,500 dwellings now being proposed (specifically updating chapter 8 and figure 6 of this study). Use this to inform revision of Yeovil options SA. | 1. SSDC Landscape Architect to prepare addendum to the Peripheral Landscape study, and use this to inform the revised SA. | 1. 1 month to prepare Landscape study addendum, to inform the revised Yeovil options SA set out above. |
| Sustainability Appraisal – | Lack of consistency regarding the | Agree that the Yeovil SA scoring should be | As part of the wider review of the Yeovil | 1. As per 3 options under | 1. As per 3 options under agricultural |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| historic environment | consideration of protecting and enhancing the historic environment. | reconsidered on this issue. | options SA, reconsider the effects upon the historic environment. 2. Prepare an addendum to the Yeovil Historic Environment Assessment to reflect 2,500 dwellings now being proposed either in-house or using consultants that applies the smaller area required to the historic environment capacity identified | agricultural land quality above. | land quality above. 2. 1 month to approach Chris Blandford Associates and for them to carry out the addendum. |
| Sustainability Appraisal – biodiversity and geodiversity | Lack of clarity regarding the scoring for objective 14 – biodiversity and geodiversity. | Agree that insufficient justification is given on this issue. | As part of the wider review of the Yeovil options SA, reconsider the effects upon biodiversity and geodiversity. | 1. As per 3 options under agricultural land quality above. | 1. As per 3 options under agricultural land quality above. |
| Sustainability Appraisal – additional work regarding secondary school provision | Only the equivalent of 0.5 secondary school provision would be required (SA Appendix 5C) and there is no substantive evidence that such provision could not be provided by increasing capacity on existing school sites. | Subsequent evidence indicates that 1 secondary school is required [CD36 – Report in Infrastructure Planning], but the Inspector's reasoning needs to be assessed in a new SA in light of capacity on existing sites and the expectation to deliver a secondary school in | Liaison with the Education Authority on the points identified. | N/A. | 1 month within the timescale of re-doing the SA. |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| counter to NPPF para 154 | give certainty about what will or will not be permitted in these settlements (in terms of scale) | 2. To present requirement figures for employment land (as a minimum) derived from application of the Employment Topic Paper 11 methodology for the Market Towns and Rural Centres without an employment land provision figure in the amended policy SS3. Assess the resultant figure against the availability of the existing land | land requirement for each of the named market towns and rural centres (with sites to follow via sites allocation DPD as proposed with housing allocations. Present figures in a Proposed Modification within a Revision Document and reconsult 2. Represent the employment land figures in Topic paper 11 assessed against the known availability of existing land supply | | week minimum). 2 months to consider responses and report to PMB. 1 month to go through Area West and DX and Full Council. 2 1 month to calculate the figures and assess existing supply availability and the rest as per 1. above. |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| | | supply. This would be allied to the promise of a more detailed approach as set out in 1 above to be undertaken as part of the site allocations DPD as an effective early review of the Local Plan in this regard (as accepted by the Inspector at the recent Eastbourne Borough Council Examination | | | |
| Employment – Policy SS3 as proposed for amendment - Lack of specific job target for each rural centre | The 1013 job target for the six rural centres in total doesn't give an indication where the jobs should be distributed | .Accept. Need to undertake an assessment of individual rural centres job target | Distribute the job target for the rural centres on the basis of their current and past share of job growth as per methodology applied to market towns – given small numbers in some settlements there will be a need for qualitative adjustment.. Present figures in a proposed Modification within a Revision Document and reconsult | | 2 weeks to prepare the figures and 1 month to gain Council endorsement via PMB and DX. 2 months to prepare and consult (for 6 week minimum). 2 months to consider responses and report to PMB. 1 month to go through Area Cttes and DX and Full Council. |
| Policy SS5 Directions of | Concern about provision of certainty through the | Need to provide further certainty for the interim | Redrafting text of PM 217 and reconsult with a | | 1 day to redraft PM 217 in a revision |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| Housing growth | Local plan process prior to adoption of the site allocations DPD. New para proposed (Proposed Modification 217) is welcome but Inspector still concerned about how requirements of NPPF for certainty will be met in interim esp. regarding relationship between each DOG and the decision making process | by expanding reference to "other local plan development management policies" in PM 217. Need to make clear that level of growth for each DOG prior to publication of Site Allocation DPD will be within context of Local Plan policy SS5 and esp the appropriate scale of growth identified for each settlement by that Policy. (thereby considered that paras 154, 157 and 17 are met – nb 157 refers to broad locations of growth's identification and the DOGs comply) | Revision Document consisting of proposed Amendments | | document. 1 month to gain Council endorsement via PMB and DX. 2 months to prepare and consult (for 6 week minimum). 1 week to consider responses and report to PMB. 1 month to go through Area Cttes and DX and Full Council. |
| Wincanton | Proposed Modification 234 is a main amendment and needs to be consulted upon | Accept and reconsult | Present Proposed Modification 234 within a Revision Document and reconsult | | 1 day to redraft PM 217 in a revision document. 1 month to gain Council endorsement via PMB and DX. 2 months to prepare and consult (for 6 week minimum). 1 week to consider responses and report to PMB. 1 month to |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|--|---|----------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | | go through Area Cttes and DX and Full Council. |
| References to non-statutory documents in PMT2, HW1 and HG5 | Concern that documents referred to in policy have no statutory basis. | Accept | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For PMT 2 amend last para of policy to make clear that any proposal doesn't compromise delivery of the rest of the allocation and present the reference to the Chard Regeneration Framework in the supporting text as an example as suggested by Inspector. Present in list of Proposed Minor Modifications for Inspector's final approval 2. For HW 1 delete reference in the policy to "in accordance with the standards set out in South Somerset District Council's published adopted standards and needs strategies" and replace with "as appropriate". Furthermore insert | | For all three 1 week (and no need to reconsult) |

| Issue | Inspector's concerns | Response | Work required to address concerns | Options (if applicable) | Anticipated timescale |
|-------|----------------------|----------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>in supporting text para 11.7 clarifying reference to the Council's current published adopted assessments and needs strategies and to their being updated from time to time. Present in list of Proposed Minor Modifications for Inspector's final approval</p> <p>3. For HG5 delete reference to "the SHMA or successor document" from policy and refer in supporting text. Present in list of proposed Minor Modifications for Inspector's final approval</p> | | |

It is considered most appropriate for the proposed amendments to address the soundness issues raised by the Inspector (and the clarifications sought also given that 2 are in any event considered main amendments by the Inspector.) to be presented in the 1 amendments document which presents the proposed modifications and their justification.

The timeline for this work requires further detailed consideration however and (particularly should Consultants be employed to undertake a review of the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension Sustainability Appraisal) as the work on the individual elements can be undertaken concurrently the prospective timetable for the most time consuming element will set the overall timescale for all the work. This is considered to be the review of the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension Sustainability Appraisal and the prospective timeline for this work is shown below.

Review of Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension Sustainability Appraisal

| 12/7 → | 17/7 → | 31/7 → | 1/8 → | 7/8 → | 15/8 → | 6 weeks | 18/9 → | 3/10 → | 17/10 → |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Brief for a Review of SA advertised | Bids considered | | Consultant appointed (subject to Full Council confirmation) | | To undertake review starting o 7/8n | Review received by PMB | Review considered by DX | Review considered by FC |
| <i>Response letter to Inspector presenting Council's approach (subject to Full Council endorsement)</i> | | | <i>Response Letter & approach considered by DX</i> | | <i>Response Letter & approach considered by FC</i> | | | | |

| 24/10 → | 6 weeks | 6/12 → | 2 months | 6/2 → | 6/3 → | 20/3 → | 24/3 |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Start of Consultation | Consultation | End of Consultation | Consideration of Representations | Representations Report considered by PMB | Representations Report considered by DX | Representations Report considered by FC | Submission of Amendments Proposal to Inspector |
| | | | | | | | |