

**Appendix II: SA of Strategic Growth Options for Yeovil****Key:**

Categories of Significance		
Symbol	Meaning	Sustainability Effect
--	Major Negative	Problematical and improbable because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive
-	Minor negative	Potential sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible
+	Minor positive	No sustainability constraints and development acceptable
++	Major Positive	Development encouraged as would resolve existing sustainability problem
?	Uncertain	Uncertain or Unknown Effects
0	Neutral	Neutral effect
+	-	The SA Objectives 1, 4, 8, 11 & 12 consider more than one topic such that there could be different effects. For example, Objective 12 includes pollution (air, land, water, light, noise, waste, and protection of soil quality). An option could have a negative effect through loss of agricultural land but also have a neutral effect on pollution through adequate protection mechanisms – thus resulting in two symbols being shown.

<b>Area B - Coker</b>				
<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects and Potential Mitigation</b>		<b>Key recommendations for lower level planning (Masterplans/ Planning Briefs)</b>	
	<b>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/ negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/ temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic), including mitigation provided by plan policies</b>			<b>Residual Effects</b>
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	<p>The northern east boundary of this option area is within 1.6 km (walking distance<sup>1</sup>) of the Town Centre, 2.2km from Yeovil District Hospital and approx 2.4 km from Yeovil College. It is also within 1km of a major supermarket and leisure centre and just over 1km from a police station.</p> <p>Development has the potential to increase pressure on existing facilities and services and taking into account their distance from this option area, along with the topographical constraints, there is the potential for a minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. It is assumed that the level of development proposed could provide some form of new local facilities and services as well as contribute to the extension/upgrade of existing services and facilities where necessary.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2012) Policy EP15 (Protection and Provision of Local Shops, Community Facilities and Services) supports the provision of new community facilities and services. Policy HW1 requires provisions/contributions from new development if it generates a need for additional open space, local and strategic sports and cultural and community facilities. Policy S6 (Infrastructure Delivery) seeks to secure the provision of financial contributions to infrastructure, which includes community facilities.</p>		?	It is recommended that the Council clearly sets out the requirements for the provision of or contribution to new services and facilities for any proposal for development in this option area for 1,565 dwellings or above.

<sup>1</sup> Google Maps - Walking distance from Dorchester Road/A37 to St John's Church. Available online: <https://maps.google.co.uk/maps?hl=en&tab=w/>

	<p>The policy mitigation proposed along with a coordinated approach to delivering housing, employment, community facilities and improvements to public transport, could help to mitigate the potential minor negative effects resulting in a neutral residual effect; however, at this stage there is uncertainty with regard to positive effects as the scale and scope of facilities and services to be provided as part of development are not known.</p> <p>This option is slightly closer to the Town Centre compared to the other options; however, this is not considered to be of significance when considered alongside the potential provision of services/facilities. Compared to the other options, this option does not perform significantly better or worse in terms of access to facilities and services.</p>		
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	<p>Yeovil West, Central and East Wards are identified as being the most deprived areas within the Town<sup>2</sup>. Development in this area will be within the Coker Ward, adjacent to the Yeovil South Ward, which is identified as being one of the lesser deprived areas in Somerset. Development in this area could benefit the deprived wards within the Town but this is unlikely to be significant. Potential for indirect minor medium to long-term positive effects on this SA objective.</p> <p>There is the potential for enhanced positive effects if development provides improved pedestrian links between the Town Centre and Yeovil Country Park as set out against SA Objective 4, however this is still uncertain. It is considered that all of the Options will have a similar effect against this SA objective.</p>	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• seek improvements to pedestrian links (walking, cycling and disabled access) between the Country Park and Town Centre.</li> </ul>
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	<p>All of the Options would have a significant long-term positive effect on the provision of housing within the district. Based on the PLS Addendum<sup>3</sup> this option has the potential to accommodate between approximately 2,800 and 3,600 dwellings (based on a density of 35 - 45dph). This option could therefore have longer-term positive effects after the life of the Plan through potentially being able to accommodate significantly more dwellings than the identified objectively assessed need of 1,565 dwellings<sup>4</sup> (depending on the density of development). Compared to</p>	++	

<sup>2</sup> Somerset Intelligence (accessed on 10/09/13) Indices of Multiple Deprivation. Available online: <http://www.somersetintelligence.org.uk/imd/>

<sup>3</sup> South Somerset District Council (30 August 2013) Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum Draft 2.

<sup>4</sup> South Somerset District Council Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2012) Policy SS5 and YV1.

	options C and D, this option has the potential to accommodate further development after the life of the Plan.			
4. Improve health and well being	<p>All of the Options have the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health through the provision of housing and employment. They also all have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on health during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is provided through Local Plan policies and is also available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects on health during construction. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that development proposals use sustainable construction principles.</p> <p>A development of 1,565 dwellings is unlikely to deliver new local health services or facilities; however, it could contribute to the extension or upgrade of existing facilities/services, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health. The northern boundary of this option area is within 2km from the Yeovil District Hospital, which lies to the north of the Town Centre. Goldenstones Leisure Centre is just under 1km from the north east boundary of the option area.</p> <p>The topography of the area makes walking and cycling difficult as the routes into the Town Centre, Hospitals and Leisure Centre are steep, particularly along Hendford Hill. People would also have to travel across the town centre to reach the Yeovil District Hospital. There are opportunities to link to existing cycle routes on Watercombe Lane to the north and Dorchester Road to the east.</p> <p>There are also opportunities to provide links to the adjacent Yeovil Country Park, which has the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health. There is the potential for significant long-term positive effects on health for the wider Town if development could also contribute to improvements to pedestrian links (including walking, cycling and disabled access) between the Country Park and Town Centre. Particularly if this is implemented in a way that makes the topography easier to manage for the public to walk and cycle between the Country Park and Town Centre. There are also opportunities to provide new and improve existing walking and cycling links to the north of the site.</p> <p>There is the potential for enhanced positive effects if the development of a single</p>	+	?	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction Management Plan.</li> <li>• provide pedestrian links to the Yeovil Country Park.</li> <li>• seek improvements to pedestrian links (walking, cycling and disabled access) between the Country Park and Town Centre.</li> </ul> <p>The Council should seek the opportunity to link the potential development of a sports zone as set out in Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy HW2 to a Yeovil urban extension.</p>

	<p>Yeovil Urban Extension could be linked to the development of a Sports Zone as set out in Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy HW2.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		
<p>5. Improve education and skills of the population</p>	<p>The closest secondary school (Preston) is approximately 2km away from the northern boundary of this area to the north off Larkhill Road and Yeovil College is approximately 2.4 km away. As for all the options, the scale of development (1,565 dwellings) is unlikely to result in the provision of any significant new education facilities, such as a secondary school; however, there is the potential for the provision of a new primary school as well as contributions to the upgrade of existing facilities. There is the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective; however, there is also uncertainty as the precise details of what will provided in terms of new education facilities is not known.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>	<p><b>?</b></p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide a new primary school and contribute to the upgrade of existing education facilities to accommodate the increased demand generated as a result of new development.</li> </ul>
<p>6. Reduce crime and fear of crime</p>	<p>None of the Options are likely to have a significant effect against this SA objective. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks development proposals to create safe environments and address crime prevention and community safety. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 states that development will need to demonstrate a commitment to designing out crime through the creation of safe environments (both private and public) that benefit from natural surveillance, well overlooked streets and open spaces, appropriate lighting and other security</p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	

	measures.			
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	<p>All of the options have the potential to deliver 5ha of employment land as set out in Local Plan Policy SS3. There is therefore the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA objective.</p> <p>This area is also within 1 km of the Lynx Trading Estate and Augusta Westlands, which are major employment areas. There is the potential for improvements to public transport and pedestrian links to these existing employment areas.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <p>Seek improvements to public transport and pedestrian links to existing employment areas.</p>	
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	<p>Development in this area has the potential to exacerbate current congestion issues within the existing road network, with the potential for a significant long-term negative effect on this SA Objective unless appropriate mitigation is provided.</p> <p>The potential impacts of growth around Yeovil on the existing highway network were considered through a transport report and subsequent addendums<sup>5,6,7</sup>. It should be noted that the areas considered in that report do not precisely correspond with the current strategic growth options being considered and that the level of proposed growth has also been reduced. However, the study still provides a useful indication of how growth in particular locations around Yeovil may affect the existing road network. The most recent report addendum<sup>8</sup> (Jan 2012) concludes that there is little difference in terms of traffic impact between the potential sites and that background</p>	-	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide pedestrian links (walking, cycling and disabled access) to the Yeovil Country Park and between the Country Park and Town Centre as part of an overall integrated GI Strategy.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Somerset County Council (Feb 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Report (Final v2a) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>6</sup> Somerset County Council (June 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>7</sup> Somerset County Council (Jan 2012) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

	<p>traffic growth is the major contributor to deterioration of highway network performance. The addendum also states that all option locations have similar levels of traffic impacts across the whole Yeovil network, but do cause some localised impacts in the vicinity of the individual site.</p> <p>Key roads and junctions likely to be affected by development in this option area include the A30 (W Coker Road &amp; Hendford Hill in particular) and the A37 as well as Watercombe Lane Junction, Hendford Hill Junction and Horsey Roundabout.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy TA5 (Transport Impact of New Development) requires all new development to address its own transport implications and be designed to maximise the potential for sustainable transport. This includes safeguarding existing and new transport infrastructure as well as ensuring that the nature and volume of traffic and parked cars generated by the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character or amenity of the area, and would not compromise the function of the local or strategic road networks in terms of both volume and type of traffic generated. The policy also requires new development to assess their transport impact and ensure delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure. The level of development proposed in this option area would mean that any proposal would be required to prepare Transport Assessments (Policy TA5) as well as a Travel Plan (Policy TA1).</p> <p>There are also policies that seek to encourage sustainable and low carbon modes of travel. Proposed Submission Policy TA1 (Low Carbon Travel) seeks all new development to ensure sustainable transport measures are in place and operational concurrent with first occupancy and to enable ease of working from home. The policy also seeks planning obligations to deliver improved public transport connections (commensurate with the scale of development) and provide bus stops and pedestrian routes (including cycling). Policy TA3 (Sustainable Transport at Chard and Yeovil) also seeks development to contribute to the sustainable transport interchange within the town and contribute to either the improvement of existing public transport services or new services.</p> <p>It is considered that this policy mitigation along with potential mitigation available at</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>the project level to address localised transport impacts, will mitigate the potential significant negative effect on transport as a result of development in this option area. This would result in residual minor long-term negative effects on this SA Objective.</p> <p>It should be noted that in response to the Proposed Submission Local Plan the Highways Agency stated that it has consistently been of the view that a southern urban extension is preferable, as it is further from the A303 and is better related to existing facilities and hence provides more opportunities for walking and cycling and public transport use to reduce short trips<sup>9</sup>.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the transport studies for growth around Yeovil identified this option area, to the south of Yeovil, as having the best potential to provide realistic opportunities for non car based travel. As identified against SA Objective 4, the topography of the area makes walking and cycling difficult as the routes into the Town Centre are steep. However, there are still opportunities to provide new and enhance existing walking and cycling routes. Potential opportunities to provide links to the adjacent Yeovil Country Park as part of an overall integrated GI Strategy, which has the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective. There is also the potential for significant long-term positive effects for the wider Town if development could also contribute to improvements to pedestrian links (including walking, cycling and disabled access) between the Country Park and Town Centre. Particularly if this is implemented in a way that makes the topography easier to manage for the walking and cycling public between the Country Park and Town Centre. There are also opportunities to link to existing cycle routes on Watercombe Lane to the north and Dorchester Road to the east.</p> <p>There are existing bus routes (N8 Lakefields, 212 Dorchester (Mon - Sat Hourly), 99 Chard/ Crewkerne (Mon - Sat Hourly) &amp; 47 Beaminster/ Bridport (Mon - Sat 4 journeys per day, Sun 3 journeys per day)) that pass through this option area as well as along its boundary. Compared to the other options this site is better served as there are existing bus routes that run through as well as adjacent to the option area.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

<sup>9</sup> Letter (09 Aug 2012) Highways Agency (Andrew Roberts) to South Somerset District Council (Andy Foyne) - South Somerset District Council July 2012 Proposed Submission Plan 2006 - 2028.

	<p>Compared to Options C and D, this Option has less uncertainty with regard to potentially having a positive effect on this SA Objective through improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>			
<p>9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape</p>	<p>The Peripheral Landscape Study (PLS) Addendum (Aug 2013)<sup>10</sup> identified that development in this area could have significant impacts on the rural character of the site. The significant effects are identified as potentially being development within the area's small valley forms, particularly that of North Coker-Nash, and the Coker Brook.</p> <p>As for all the options, the PLS Addendum (Aug 2013) makes it clear that there is the potential for development to have a significant negative long-term effect on landscape. The Addendum sets out a range of mitigation measures to address these effects, which firstly focused on avoidance (screening out the areas with the highest sensitivity) and then reduction and then remediation. These should help to address the identified long-term significant negative effects resulting in minor long-term negative effects. Proposed mitigation includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precluding development from the vicinity of Burton, North Coker, North Coker Park and Naish Priory. Sensitive skylines above Barwick Historic Park &amp; Garden and by Freebarrow should remain free of development;</li> </ul>	<p>-</p>		<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that it has taken into account the findings and mitigation set out in the Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (August 2013), in particular precluding development from the vicinity of Burton, North Coker, North Coker Park and Naish Priory as</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> South Somerset District Council (30 August 2013) Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum Draft 2.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mature trees and the site's few robust hedgerows should be retained;</li> <li>• Open space can be utilised to intervene between development and sensitive areas, in particular the faces to North Coker and the Coker Brook, with tree planting included where visual sensitivities are noted;</li> <li>• Breaking up the built-form by used of local open space within the development and street orientation; and</li> <li>• Breaking up development areas to avoid the steeper slopes and create separation by incorporation of open space and tree planting.</li> </ul> <p>The Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (Aug 2013) concludes that this option area has the capacity to accommodate approximately 80ha of built development. Assuming a density of between 35 - 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) this implies that the landscape has the potential to accommodate between 2,800 and 3,600 dwellings in this area.</p> <p>Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development), which seeks to ensure that development is designed to achieve a high quality that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the district. Development proposals will be considered by the Council if they conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area. Policy EQ 5 (Green Infrastructure) promotes the provision of GI and aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces. The policy also seeks all residential development to at least meet Natural England 'Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard' (ANGSt) or otherwise appropriately contribute to improving access to natural greenspace such that the overall aims are met.</p> <p>Despite the mitigation provided by Local Plan Policies and available at the project level, it is still considered that there is the potential for a residual minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective.</p> <p>It is considered that after appropriate mitigation has been taken into account all of the single site options have the potential for a similar effect on this SA Objective. Compared to the Multi-site option the single site options could potentially have a more significant effect during the life of the plan as development will be within an individual landscape setting. However, in the years extending further beyond this</p>	<p>well as sensitive skylines above Barwick HP&amp;G and by Freebarrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the setting of the town.</li> <li>• include appropriate planting and GI provision to minimise impacts on the landscape.</li> <li>• include 40% open space.</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that the Council produces a GI Strategy to optimise potential possibilities for GI at this site and ensure that it contributes to a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces.</p>
---	---

	<p>plan period, the potential development areas within a multi-site option are likely to come forward for development, and if this happens in piecemeal stages rather than as a single masterplanned form, then the resultant growth may lack the cohesion and appropriate mitigation that a larger site can deliver.</p>		
<p>10. Conserve and where appropriate</p>	<p>There is one Scheduled Monument (Roman Villa North of Dunnock's Lane) and a number of Listed Buildings within this option area. There is also a Scheduled Monument (Chessels Roman Villa) adjacent to the boundary of this option area to</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>? It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p>

<p>enhance the historic environment</p>	<p>the west and the North Coker Conservation Area to the south west<sup>11</sup>.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (July 2010)<sup>12</sup> identified this area (study area 3 &amp; 4)<sup>13</sup> as having a moderate to high historic landscape sensitivity and moderate to high historic asset sensitivity. The study concluded that the capacity of this area to accommodate new development without loss or damage to key historic landscape sensitivities and historic assets is moderate to low. The majority of the area identified within the PLS Addendum as having the potential to accommodate development falls within study area 3 of the HEA (July 2010), which is assessed as having moderate capacity to accommodate potential new development.</p> <p>English Heritage (EH) has noted<sup>14</sup> the importance of the Roman Villa, stating that it “clearly contributes to the areas identity, its local distinctiveness and is an important part of the area's cultural heritage - its history”. EH recognise that there is scope for some development in the area but it would need to be subject to a large area being drawn around the villa site at Dunnock's Lane to safeguard it's setting. According to an EH assessment<sup>15</sup> of the Roman Villa (Dunnock's Lane) there could be opportunities to enhance the immediate setting of the monument and achieve some gains through placing interpretation and encouraging community involvement in the management of the Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Based on existing constraints and current evidence it is considered that development in this area has the potential for a significant medium to long-term negative effect on this SA objective. Key mitigation will include an appropriate buffer between any proposed development and the Roman Villa, including adjacent heritage assets (Chessels Roman Villa and the North Coker Conservation Area). Potential negative effects on landscape will also need to be addressed to ensure that there are no significant negative effects on the setting of important heritage (Please refer to the</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by an archaeological assessment.</li> <li>• seek opportunities to enhance the setting of, accessibility to and community involvement with the Roman Villa North of Dunnock's Lane.</li> <li>• contribute to the production of a Conservation Management Plan for the Roman Villa North of Dunnock's Lane.</li> </ul>
---	--	--	--	--

<sup>11</sup> The National Heritage List for England (Accessed 13/09/13) Map Search. Available online: <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>

<sup>12</sup> Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (2010) Prepared by Chris Blandford Associates on behalf of South Somerset District Council.

<sup>13</sup> This option is predominantly contained in study areas 3 & 4, as well as small parts of study areas 6 & 7.

<sup>14</sup> Letter (06 Dec 2012) English Heritage (Caroline Power) to South Somerset District Council (Mr Foyne) - South Somerset Proposed Submission Plan: English Heritage's Response to Outstanding Matters relating to Assessment wok regarding the proposed urban extension in Yeovil.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

	<p>appraisal for SA Objective 9).</p> <p>Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment), which expects all new development to safeguard and enhance the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of heritage assets. The Council also seeks to produce a Heritage Strategy to provide comprehensive advice to ensure high standards of development at the development management level.</p> <p>It is considered that suitable mitigation is available through the Local Plan and at the project level to address the potential significant negative effects, with minor residual negative effects. There is also an element of uncertainty until further until project level surveys and assessments have been completed. Any proposal for development in this area should also seek opportunities to enhance the setting of the Roman Villa (Dunnock's Lane) and achieve gains through placing interpretation and encouraging community involvement in the management of the Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Compared to Options C and D, this Option has more designated heritage at risk from being affected by development.</p>			
<p>11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects</p>	<p>All of the options have the potential to increase levels of carbon emissions through increased traffic and embodied energy in providing development (materials and construction methods used). Potential for a minor long-term negative effect on this SA objective.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where they have demonstrated how climate change mitigation and adaptation will be delivered, through inclusion of a variety of measures, which includes minimising carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures and low carbon and renewable</p>	-	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meet the zero carbon standard through either providing on-site measures or the use of 'Allowable Solutions'.</li> <li>• seek opportunities for</li> </ul>

	<p>energy. The policy also requires Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 from 2013 and level 5 from 2016 as well as BREEAM rating of 'excellent' for non-domestic buildings, which set standards for energy and water efficiency. The development of renewable and low carbon energy generation will also be encouraged. This along with other Local Plan mitigation provided by Policies TA1, TA3 and TA5 to minimise the impacts of development on traffic should help to reduce the significance of potential negative effects. However, it is still considered that a minor residual negative long-term effect will remain.</p> <p>The south facing slopes of this option area offer opportunities for passive solar gain. All of the options have the potential to incorporate some form of on-site renewable or low carbon energy generation, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective. A larger scale of development as proposed for this option area could potentially lead to a greater choice of on-site renewable and low carbon technologies through increased viability than for the multi-site option. However, this does not mean that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could not meet the zero carbon standard. The government has recognised that it is not always possible (cost-effective, affordable, technically feasible) for development to incorporate on-site measures to reduce carbon emissions and is currently proposing that development can achieve the zero carbon standard by mitigating remaining emissions off-site<sup>16</sup>. The introduction of 'Allowable Solutions' means that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could abate carbon emissions off-site to achieve the zero carbon standard.</p>			<p>passive solar gain.</p>
<p>12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production</p>	<p>All of the Options have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on this SA objective during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects during construction.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that development proposals use sustainable construction principles. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 also notes that South Somerset has published a range of</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction Management Plan.</li> <li>• be accompanied by a</li> </ul>

<sup>16</sup> DCLG (Aug 2013) Next step to zero carbon homes - Allowable Solutions.

	<p>Development Management advice guides to give guidance on how design should complement local architectural traditions and how sustainable construction techniques can be incorporated within the context of the existing built heritage.</p> <p>There is also the potential for all of the options to have negative effects on air, water, land, light and noise pollution in the medium to long-term. Mitigation provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan policies EQ2 and EQ7 (Pollution Control) along with mitigation available at the project level should ensure that effects are not significant.</p> <p>This option predominantly contains Grade 1 agricultural land<sup>17</sup>, which is identified as 'excellent' in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales<sup>18</sup>. Development within this option area would lead to a significant loss of the highest grade agricultural land, which has the potential for permanent significant long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. Compared to the other options, this option has the potential for the greatest loss of the highest grade of agricultural land.</p>			site waste management plan.
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	There are no significant areas of flood risk on this site <sup>19, 20</sup> . Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where it directs development away from medium and high flood risk areas and reduces and manages the impact of flood risk by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems, and through appropriate layout, design, and choice of materials.	<b>0</b>		
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The area is predominantly arable land with some improved grassland. There are also some mature trees and hedgerows. There are no statutory designated sites for biodiversity within or adjacent to the area <sup>21</sup> . The Hardington Moor SSSI and National Nature Reserve is approximately 1.5-2 km from the area, to the south of West Coker. However, given the distance of the SSSI/NNR it is unlikely that development at this site would result in significant effects.	<b>?</b>		<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a bat survey and assessment.</li> </ul>

<sup>17</sup> Defra - Magic Map (Accessed on 11/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

<sup>18</sup> Ministry of agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Oct 1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales.

<sup>19</sup> South Somerset District Council (Aug 2008) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

<sup>20</sup> Environment Agency (Accessed on 09/09/13) What's in your Backyard. Available online: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37793.aspx>

<sup>21</sup> Defra - Magic Map (Accessed on 06/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

	<p>The Strategic Ecological Assessment of Potential Housing Sites (Nov 2009) identified that this area could potentially contain/support Serotine and/or Pipistrelle Bats. The study assessed that the area was not significant in terms of importance but that the likelihood of an impact is probable. The study identifies that there is a Serotine roost in the Helena Road area, in the North West area of this option. Bats from this roost are likely to be feeding over the pastures towards North Coker, to the north west of the A30 and around Constitution Hill to the east. Two large Pipistrelle maternity roosts are identified in the Southwood area so bats could be using the area to the west of the A37 for foraging. However, the study notes that this option area is predominantly arable fields and is therefore of limited prey potential.</p> <p>Mitigation proposed by the study to address negative effects on the Serotine Bat includes allowing for semi natural greenspace corridors to run to North Coker and along the northern boundary of this option area and this should consist of tree planting with unimproved grassland. Similarly for the Pipistrelle Bat the study proposes the inclusion of semi natural greenspace to the west of the A37.</p> <p>Any proposal for development in this area should take account of the potential presence of the Serotine and Pipistrelle Bats and seek to minimise impacts. Mature trees and hedgerows should be maintained where possible along with any other habitats that provide a link to the surrounding area. Careful planning and design will help to mitigate potential effects on any important biodiversity or geodiversity. Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ4 (Biodiversity), which requires all proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity and minimise fragmentation of habitats.</p> <p>It is considered that significant effects are unlikely given the mitigation available at the project level and provided by Local Plan policies. However, there is still an element of uncertainty until project level surveys and assessments have been completed.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• incorporate semi natural greenspace corridors (consisting of tree planting with unimproved grassland) that run to North Coker, along the northern boundary and west of the A37, as part of an overall integrated GI Strategy.</li> <li>• Retain mature trees and hedgerows where possible.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

**Summary of Key Negative & Positive Effects for Sustainable Development:**

This Option extends out from the south of the town and is within 2km of the Town Centre. As for all the options the key positive effects relate to the provision of housing and employment with associated benefits for communities, through improved public transport and pedestrian links (walking and cycling). For this Option topography is the main barrier to improving pedestrian movement as there is a steep gradient to the north into the town centre and existing services and facilities. There is the potential for enhanced positive effects for this Option if pedestrian links can be made to the adjacent Yeovil Country Park as well as improvements to pedestrian links between the town centre and Country Park.

As for all the options there is the potential for negative effects on the landscape as well as transport through increased traffic, which has the potential for negative effects on climate change through increased carbon emissions. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be no significant effects. Key negative effects for this particular option relate to the historic environment and the loss of agricultural land. There is one Scheduled Monument (Roman Villa North of Dunnock's Lane) and a number of Listed Buildings within this option area as well as a Scheduled Monument (Chessels Roman Villa) adjacent to the boundary to the west and the North Coker Conservation Area to the south west<sup>22</sup>. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available through the Local Plan and at the project level to address the potential significant negative effects, with minor residual negative effects. As for all the options, there is also an element of uncertainty until further until project level surveys and assessments have been completed. It should also be noted that there are potential opportunities to enhance the setting of the Roman Villa (Dunnock's Lane) and achieve gains through placing interpretation and encouraging community involvement in the management of the Scheduled Monument.

This option predominantly contains Grade 1 agricultural land<sup>23</sup>, which is identified as 'excellent' in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales<sup>24</sup>. Development within this option area would lead to a significant loss of the highest grade agricultural land, which has the potential for permanent significant long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. Compared to the other options, this option has the potential for the greatest loss of the highest grade of agricultural land.

---

<sup>22</sup> The National Heritage List for England (Accessed 13/09/13) Map Search - Available online: <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>

<sup>23</sup> Defra - Magic Map (Accessed on 11/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

<sup>24</sup> Ministry of agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Oct 1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales

<b>Area C - Middle Yeo Valley &amp; Dorset Hillside</b>				
<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects and Potential Mitigation</b>		<b>Key recommendations for lower level planning (Masterplans/ Planning Briefs)</b>	
	<b>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/ negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/ temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic), including mitigation provided by plan policies</b>			<b>Residual Effects</b>
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	<p>The south west boundary of this option area is within 2.1km (walking distance<sup>25</sup>) from the Town Centre is within 2 km from Yeovil District Hospital and approx. 2.2 km from Yeovil College. It is also within 2km of a sports centre and a secondary school. This site is also within 500 metres of Yeovil Pen Mill Station.</p> <p>Development has the potential to increase pressure on existing facilities and services and taking into account their distance from this option area, along with the topographical constraints, there is the potential for a minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. It is assumed that the level of development proposed could provide some form of new local facilities and services as well as contribute to the extension/upgrade of existing services and facilities where necessary.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EP15 (Protection and Provision of Local Shops, Community Facilities and Services) supports the provision of new community facilities and services. Policy HW1 requires provisions/contributions from new development if it generates a need for additional open space, local and strategic sports and cultural and community facilities. Policy S6 (Infrastructure Delivery) seeks to secure the provision of financial contributions to infrastructure, which includes community facilities.</p> <p>The policy mitigation proposed along with a coordinated approach to delivering housing, employment, community facilities and improvements to public transport, could help to mitigate the potential minor negative effects resulting in a neutral</p>		?	It is recommended that the Council clearly sets out the requirements for the provision of or contribution to new services and facilities for any proposal for development in this option area for 1,565 dwellings or above.

<sup>25</sup> Google Maps - Walking distance from Sherborne Road/A30 to St John's Church. Available online: <https://maps.google.co.uk/maps?hl=en&tab=w/>

	<p>residual effect; however, at this stage there is uncertainty with regard to positive effects as the scale and scope of facilities and services to be provided as part of development are not known.</p> <p>This option is slightly further from the Town Centre compared to Option B and has less topographical barriers; however, there are other barriers to movement that need to be considered, such as the River Yeo, railway, golf course and existing industrial development. There is currently only one crossing point into the town across the River Yeo along Sherborne Road (A30). It is possible that providing additional crossing points over the River Yeo and railway may not be feasible. The site also lies within another Local Planning Authority area, so would not be subject to the same planning policies and contributions as Options B and D. This option is the closest to a railway station.</p>		
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	<p>Yeovil West, Central and East Wards are identified as being the most deprived areas within the Town<sup>26</sup>. Development in this area would be adjacent the Yeovil East Ward, which is identified as being the most deprived ward in South Somerset. Development in this area could benefit this Ward with improved access to employment, housing, community facilities and enhanced pedestrian links with the wider countryside. However, given that there is currently only one crossing point into the town across the River Yeo it is unlikely that the effects would be significant. It is considered that all of the Options will have a similar effect against this SA objective.</p>	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• seek improvements to pedestrian links (walking, cycling and disabled access) between the site and Yeovil East Ward.</li> </ul>
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	<p>All of the Options would have a significant long-term positive effect on the provision of housing within the district. Based on the PLS Addendum<sup>27</sup> this option has the potential to accommodate between approximately 1,575 and 2,025 dwellings (based on a density of 35 - 45dph). It should be noted that nearby Wyndham Park development has a density of 35 dph. This option could have longer-term positive effects after the life of the Plan through potentially being able to accommodate more dwellings than the identified objectively assessed need of 1,565 (depending on the density of development). Compared to Option B and the multi-site option, this Option has less potential to accommodate further development after the life of the Plan, beyond the identified need of 1,565 dwellings.</p>	++	

<sup>26</sup> Somerset Intelligence (accessed on 10/09/13) Indices of Multiple Deprivation. Available online: <http://www.somersetintelligence.org.uk/imd/>

<sup>27</sup> South Somerset District Council (August 2013) Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum Draft 2.

<p>4. Improve health and well being</p>	<p>All of the Options have the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health through the provision of housing and employment. They also all have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on health during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is provided through Local Plan policies and is also available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects on health during construction. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that development proposals use sustainable construction principles.</p> <p>The south west boundary of this option area is approximately 2 km from the Yeovil District Hospital, which lies to the north of the Town Centre. Bucklers Mead Sports Centre is less than 2km from the western boundary of the option area.</p> <p>A development of 1,565 dwellings is unlikely to deliver new local health services or facilities; however, it could contribute to the upgrade of existing facilities/services, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health. Compared to the other options, this area is slightly closer to the main hospital and Town Centre and also has less topographical barriers; however, there are other barriers to movement that need to be considered, such as the River Yeo, railway, golf course and existing industrial development. There is good pedestrian and cycling access to the town centre to the south of the site along the old railway through the Country Park. However, to access this there is currently only one crossing point across the River Yeo along Sherborne Road (A30). Compared to the other Options there is a greater level of uncertainty for this Option as providing additional crossing points over the River Yeo may not be feasible. The site also lies within another Local Planning Authority area, so would not be subject to the same planning policies and contributions as Options B and D.</p> <p>There are still opportunities to provide improved pedestrian links to the surrounding countryside and open space for existing residents in the Yeovil East Ward. There is the potential to connect to an existing cycle route that passes the train station and the potential to improve pedestrian routes along the River Yeo. Taking account of existing barriers to pedestrian movement, providing new and/ or improvements to</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction Management Plan.</li> <li>• provide/improve pedestrian links from existing development to the west of this option area to the wider countryside.</li> <li>• provide/improve pedestrian links to the Town Centre and Yeovil District Hospital.</li> <li>• be accompanied by an odour assessment.</li> </ul> <p>The Council should seek the opportunity to link the potential development of a sports zone as set out in Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy HW2 to a Yeovil urban extension.</p>
---	---	----------	----------	--

	<p>existing pedestrian links could potentially be costly and would need to be carefully planned and designed.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ5 (Green Infrastructure) aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces that improve recreational opportunities and support physical health and mental wellbeing as well as ensure that all children and young people have reasonable access to a range of play and leisure opportunities. The policy also aims to provide opportunities for enhanced, attractive walking and cycling routes linking urban areas and the wider countryside.</p> <p>Flushing Meadows Sewage Treatment Works lies adjacent to this Option in the south east. There is existing residential development in close proximity (within 50m) to Flushing Meadows so it is considered unlikely that there would be significant effects. It is recommended that any proposal for development within this option area is accompanied by an odour assessment.</p> <p>There is the potential for enhanced positive effects if the development of a single Yeovil Urban Extension could be linked to the development of a Sports Zone as set out in Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy HW2.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		
<p>5. Improve education and skills of the population</p>	<p>The closest secondary school is approximately 1.9 km away from the western boundary of this area and Yeovil College is approximately 2.2 km away. This option has similar access to existing education facilities in terms of distance as Option B. As for all the options, the scale of development (1,565 dwellings) is unlikely to result in the provision of any significant new education facilities, such as a secondary school; however, there is the potential for the provision of a new primary school as well as contributions to the upgrade of existing facilities. There is the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective; however, there is also uncertainty as the precise details of what will provided in terms of new education facilities is not known.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide a new primary school and contribute to the upgrade of existing education facilities to accommodate the increased demand generated as a result of new development.</li> </ul>

	worse against this SA Objective.		
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	None of the Options are likely to have a significant effect against this SA objective. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks development proposals to create safe environments and address crime prevention and community safety. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 states that development will need to demonstrate a commitment to designing out crime through the creation of safe environments (both private and public) that benefit from natural surveillance, well overlooked streets and open spaces, appropriate lighting and other security measures.	0	
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	All of the options have the potential to deliver 5ha of employment land as set out in Local Plan Policy SS3. There is therefore the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA objective.  This option is the closest to an existing employment area as the Pen Mill Trading Estate is within 300m of the western boundary. However, it should be noted that there is currently only one crossing point into the town across the River Yeo along Sherborne Road (A30) so no direct link to the Pen Mill Trading Estate. Despite this, there is still the potential for improvements to public transport and pedestrian links although these might be costly and would need to be carefully planned and designed.  Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.	+	
8. Reduce the effect of	Development in this area has the potential to exacerbate current congestion issues within the existing road network, with the potential for a significant long-term	-	?

<p>traffic on the environment</p>	<p>negative effect on this SA Objective unless appropriate mitigation is provided.</p> <p>The potential impacts of growth around Yeovil on the existing highway network were considered through a transport report and subsequent addendums<sup>28,29,30</sup>. It should be noted that the areas considered in that report do not precisely correspond with the current strategic growth options being considered and that the level of proposed growth has also been reduced. However, the study still provides a useful indication of how growth in particular locations around Yeovil may affect the existing road network. The most recent report addendum<sup>31</sup> (Jan 2012) concludes that there is little difference in terms of traffic impact between the potential sites and that background traffic growth is the major contributor to deterioration of highway network performance. The addendum also states that all option locations have similar levels of traffic impacts across the whole Yeovil network, but do cause some localised impacts in the vicinity of the individual site.</p> <p>Key roads and junctions likely to be affected by development are predominantly the A30 and Lyde Road as well the Lyde Road Mini roundabout and hospital roundabout. It should be noted that there is currently only one crossing into the town over the River Yeo and that traffic impacts would be focused in this area unless appropriately mitigated is provided.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy TA5 (Transport Impact of New Development) requires all new development to address its own transport implications and be designed to maximise the potential for sustainable transport. This includes</p>			
-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--

<sup>28</sup> Somerset County Council (Feb 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Report (Final v2a) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>29</sup> Somerset County Council (June 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>30</sup> Somerset County Council (Jan 2012) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

	<p>safeguarding existing and new transport infrastructure as well as ensuring that the nature and volume of traffic and parked cars generated by the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character or amenity of the area, and would not compromise the function of the local or strategic road networks in terms of both volume and type of traffic generated. The policy also requires new development to assess their transport impact and ensure delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure. The level of development proposed in this option area would mean that any proposal would be required to prepare Transport Assessments (Policy TA5) as well as a Travel Plan (Policy TA1).</p> <p>There are also policies that seek to encourage sustainable and low carbon modes of travel. Proposed Submission Policy TA1 (Low Carbon Travel) seeks all new development to ensure sustainable transport measures are in place and operational concurrent with first occupancy and to enable ease of working from home. The policy also seeks planning obligations to deliver improved public transport connections (commensurate with the scale of development) and provide bus stops and pedestrian routes (including cycling). Policy TA3 (Sustainable Transport at Chard and Yeovil) also seeks development to contribute to the sustainable transport interchange within the town and contribute to either the improvement of existing public transport services or new services.</p> <p>It is considered that this policy mitigation along with potential mitigation available at the project level to address localised transport impacts, will mitigate the potential significant negative effect on transport as a result of development in this option area.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>This would result in residual minor long-term negative effects on this SA Objective.</p> <p>The transport studies for growth around Yeovil identified the eastern option (which includes this option area) as being constrained by the railway line in the north in terms of potential opportunities for non car based travel. It should be noted that the area considered through the transport study was larger than this option area and extended further to the south and north.</p> <p>As identified against SA Objective 4, this area is slightly closer to the main hospital and Town Centre than the other options and the topography is less of an issue in terms of pedestrian movement. There is good pedestrian and cycling access to the town centre to the south of the site along the old railway through the Country Park. However, there are other barriers to pedestrian movement that also need to be considered, such as the River Yeo, railway, golf course and existing industrial development. There is currently only one crossing point into the town across the River Yeo and railway along Sherborne Road (A30). It is possible that providing additional crossing points over the River Yeo and railway may not be feasible. The site also lies within another Local Planning Authority area, so would not be subject to the same planning policies and contributions as Options B and D. This could restrict the provision of new pedestrian links between the site and the town centre and existing employment. Providing new and/ or improvements to existing pedestrian links could potentially be costly and would need to be carefully planned and designed. With this in mind it is considered that there is some uncertainty with regard to the potential for this option to deliver improvements to pedestrian links as identified for Options B and D.</p> <p>Similar to Option D, this option area has no bus routes currently running through the site. There are a number of existing bus routes that run along the A30 to the south of this option area, these include the 57 Sherborne (Mon - Sat Hourly), 58 Wincanton Stalbridge (Mon - Sat Hourly), 368 Blandford/ Sturminster (Mon - Sat 3 times a day) and 216 Sherborne/ Cerne Abbas/ Dorchester (Mon - Fri 6 journeys per day &amp; Sat 4 journeys). This option is closest to a railway station.</p> <p>Compared to Options B and D, there is a greater level of uncertainty with regard to the potential for positive effects for this Option through the provision of new walking</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>and cycling routes. Providing additional crossing points over the river and railway could prove costly and ultimately may not be feasible.</p>			
<p>9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape</p>	<p>The Peripheral Landscape Study (PLS) Addendum (Aug 2013)<sup>32</sup> identified that development in this area could have significant landscape and visual effects, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the potential massing and dominance of urban form upon the local village edges</li> <li>ii. the potential adverse imprint of development upon the small-field system and meadow combe northwest of the Compton Road; and</li> <li>iii. the loss of the distinctive character of the open ridgetops and upper hillsides above the Yeo valley.</li> </ul> <p>As for all the options, the PLS Addendum (Aug 2013) makes it clear that there is the potential for development to have a significant negative long-term effect on landscape. The Addendum sets out a range of mitigation measures to address these</p>	<p>-</p>		<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that it has taken into account the findings and mitigation set out in the Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (August 2013), in particular precluding development from the vicinity of</li> </ul>

<sup>32</sup> South Somerset District Council (30 August 2013) Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum Draft 2.

	<p>effects, which firstly focused on avoidance (screening out the areas with the highest sensitivity) and then reduction and then remediation. These should help to address the identified long-term significant negative effects resulting in minor long-term negative effects. Proposed mitigation includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing the potential scale of development to avoid a clear visual correspondence with the villages and placing it below the skyline;</li> <li>• Developed a linked network of GI;</li> <li>• Integration with the current townscape is proposed by visual linkage of open space across river, running from Birchfield Park, crossing the Yeo and following the combe above old Mill farm; and</li> <li>• Locate employment buildings on the lower, shallower ground with housing extending onto rising ground to mirror the Town.</li> </ul> <p>The Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (Aug 2013) concludes that this option area has the capacity to accommodate approximately 45ha of built development. Assuming a density of between 35 - 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) this implies that the landscape has the potential to accommodate between 1,575 and 2,025 dwellings in this area.</p> <p>Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development), which seeks to ensure that development is designed to achieve a high quality that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the district. Development proposals will be considered by the Council if they conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area. Policy EQ 5 (Green Infrastructure) promotes the provision of GI and aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces. The policy also seeks all residential development to at least meet Natural England 'Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard' (ANGSt) or otherwise appropriately contribute to improving access to natural greenspace such that the overall aims are met.</p> <p>Despite the mitigation provided by Local Plan Policies and available at the project level, it is still considered that there is the potential for a residual minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective.</p> <p>It is considered that after appropriate mitigation has been taken into account all of</p>		<p>Mudford and Up Mudford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the setting of the town.</li> <li>• include appropriate planting and GI provision to minimise impacts on the landscape.</li> <li>• include 40% open space.</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that the Council produces a GI Strategy to optimise potential possibilities for GI at this site and ensure that it contributes to a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>the single site options have the potential for a similar effect on this SA Objective. Compared to the Multi-site option the single site options could potentially have a more significant effect during the life of the plan as development will be within an individual landscape setting. However, in the years extending further beyond this plan period, the potential development areas within a multi-site option are likely to come forward for development, and if this happens in piecemeal stages rather than as a single masterplanned form, then the resultant growth may lack the cohesion and appropriate mitigation that a larger site can deliver.</p>		
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the potential boundary of the site; however, there a number of Listed Buildings in close proximity to the boundary in the south west and east<sup>33</sup>. There is a Scheduled Monument (Roman villa SE of East Farm) approximately 1.5 km away to the south east of this option area.</p>	?	<p>As for all the options it is recommended that the Council requires any proposal for development in this area</p>

<sup>33</sup> The National Heritage List for England (Accessed 13/09/13) Map Search. Available online: <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>

historic environment	<p>This option falls into two areas considered by the Historic Environment Assessment of the Yeovil periphery (July 2010)<sup>34</sup>. The majority of this option falls within study area 17, which is much larger than this option and was assessed as having a high historic landscape sensitivity (presence of a patchwork of piecemeal enclosure fields, patches of coppiced woodland and irregular, anciently enclosed fields) and low historic asset sensitivity (other than the Scheduled Monument and its setting, which is approx 1.5 km away from this option area, there are few historic assets of high sensitivity). The northern portion of this option falls within study area 16, which is again much larger than the area proposed for this option. Study area 16 was assessed as having a moderate historic landscape sensitivity (presence of planned medieval and piecemeal enclosure fields) and high historic asset sensitivity (presence of Trent Conservation Area and its setting, which is outside this proposed option area).</p> <p>The study concluded that the capacity of the areas to accommodate new development without loss or damage to key historic landscape sensitivities and historic assets is moderate for area 17 and moderate to low for area 16.</p> <p>The impact of development will be dependent on implementation; however, based on available evidence it is considered that there is unlikely to be any significant effects as long as the potential significant negative effects on landscape, set out against SA Objective 9, are suitably mitigated. Any potential negative effects on listed buildings or other heritage assets can be mitigated at the lower level of planning. Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment), which expects all new development to safeguard and enhance the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of heritage assets. The Council also seeks to update the Heritage Strategy to provide comprehensive advice to ensure high standards of development at the development management level. Mitigation provided by Local Plan policies along with mitigation available at the project level should ensure that effects are not significant.</p> <p>Given existing constraints and evidence it is considered that this option has less</p>		to be accompanied by an archaeological assessment.
----------------------	--	--	--

<sup>34</sup> Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (2010) Prepared by Chris Blandford Associates on behalf of South Somerset District Council.

	<p>potential for negative effects on designated heritage than Option B and the Multi-site Option. However, there is still an element of uncertainty for all options until detailed proposals and project level assessments have been carried out.</p>		
<p>11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects</p>	<p>All of the options have the potential to increase levels of carbon emissions through increased traffic and embodied energy in providing development (materials and construction methods used). Potential for a minor long-term negative effect on this SA objective.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where they have demonstrated how climate change mitigation and adaptation will be delivered, through inclusion of a variety of measures, which includes minimising carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures and low carbon and renewable energy. The policy also requires Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 from 2013 and level 5 from 2016 as well as BREEAM rating of 'excellent' for non-domestic buildings, which set standards for energy and water efficiency. The development of renewable and low carbon energy generation will also be encouraged. This along with other Local Plan mitigation provided by Policies TA1, TA3 and TA5 to minimise the impacts of development on traffic should help to reduce the significance of potential negative effects. However, it is still considered that a minor residual negative long-term effect will remain.</p> <p>All of the options have the potential to incorporate some form of on-site renewable or low carbon energy generation, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective. A larger scale of development as proposed for this option area could potentially lead to a greater choice of on-site renewable and low carbon technologies through increased viability than for the multi-site option. However, this does not mean that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could not meet the zero carbon standard. The government has recognised that it is not always possible (cost-effective, affordable, technically feasible) for development to incorporate on-site measures to reduce carbon emissions and is currently proposing that development can achieve the zero carbon standard by mitigating remaining emissions off-site<sup>35</sup>. The introduction of 'Allowable Solutions' means that</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>+</p> <p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>meet the zero carbon standard through either providing on-site measures or the use of 'Allowable Solutions'.</li> </ul>

<sup>35</sup> DCLG (Aug 2013) Next step to zero carbon homes - Allowable Solutions.

	<p>smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could abate carbon emissions off-site to achieve the zero carbon standard.</p>			
<p>12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production</p>	<p>All of the Options have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on this SA objective during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects during construction.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that development proposals use sustainable construction principles. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 also notes that South Somerset has published a range of Development Management advice guides to give guidance on how design should complement local architectural traditions and how sustainable construction techniques can be incorporated within the context of the existing built heritage.</p> <p>There is also the potential for all of the options to have negative effects on air, water, land, light and noise pollution in the medium to long-term. Flushing Meadows Sewage Treatment Works (STW) lies adjacent to this Option in the south east. There is existing residential development in close proximity (within 50m) to Flushing Meadows STW so it is considered unlikely that there would be significant effects. Mitigation provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan policies EQ2 and EQ7 (Pollution Control) along with mitigation available at the project level should ensure that effects are not significant. It is recommended that any proposal for development within this option area is accompanied by an odour assessment.</p>	0	--	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction Management Plan.</li> <li>• be accompanied by a site waste management plan.</li> </ul>

	This option predominantly contains Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land <sup>36</sup> , which is identified as 'excellent' and 'very good' respectively in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales <sup>37</sup> . Development within this option area would lead to the significant loss of both Grade 1 and 2, which has the potential for permanent significant long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. This option is likely to have a slightly reduced effect compared to Option B as it is not all Grade 1 agricultural; however, it is still considered significant.		
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	There are some areas of significant flood risk within this option as the River Yeo runs along the western boundary <sup>38, 39</sup> . Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where it directs development away from medium and high flood risk areas and reduces and manages the impact of flood risk by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems, and through appropriate layout, design, and choice of materials. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be no significant effects. This could include avoiding development in the areas of high flood risk. Potential for a minor negative effect.	-	
14. Conserve	The area is predominantly arable land with some mature trees and hedgerows.	?	It is recommended that the

<sup>36</sup> ALC maps supplied by Natural England (September 2009)

<sup>37</sup> Ministry of agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Oct 1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales.

<sup>38</sup> South Somerset District Council (Aug 2008) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

<sup>39</sup> Environment Agency (Accessed on 09/09/13) What's in your Backyard. Available online: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37793.aspx>

<p>and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</p>	<p>There are no statutory designated sites for biodiversity within the site; however, Babylon Hill SSSI lies to the south east of this option area adjacent to the A30<sup>40</sup>. Development would be unlikely to have a significant effect on the SSSI as the main threat to the conservation of the cuttings is development that obscures the geological features<sup>41</sup>. Given that the SSSI is situated outside the Option area and at a higher elevation, negative effects are unlikely to occur.</p> <p>The Distribution of European Protected Species in South Somerset Report (Nov 2009) identified that this area could potentially contain/support Daubenton, Serotine and/or Pipistrelle Bats. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ4 (Biodiversity) requires all proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity and minimise fragmentation of habitats.</p> <p>It will be important to minimise disturbance to the River Yeo and riparian habitats along the eastern boundary of the site. Mature trees and hedgerows should be maintained where possible along with any other linear habitats that provide a link the surrounding area. Site level surveys and assessments should ensure that there are no significant negative effects on the bat species as a result of development. Careful planning and design will also help to mitigate potential effects on any important biodiversity or geodiversity.</p> <p>It is considered that significant effects are unlikely given the mitigation available at the project level and provided by Local Plan policies. However, there is still an element of uncertainty until project level surveys and assessments have been completed.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		<p>Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a bat survey and assessment.</li> <li>• incorporate semi natural greenspace corridors (consisting of tree planting with unimproved grassland), particularly along the western edge towards the River Yeo, as part of an overall integrated GI Strategy.</li> <li>• Consider the impact of lighting on the River Yeo.</li> <li>• Retain mature trees and hedgerows where possible.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

<sup>40</sup> Magic Map (Accessed on 06/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

<sup>41</sup> Natural England - SSSI Information (Accessed on 12/09/13) Views about management. Available online: [http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/sssi\\_details.cfm?sssi\\_id=1002345](http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/sssi_details.cfm?sssi_id=1002345)

**Summary of Key Negative & Positive Effects for Sustainable Development:**

This Option extends out from the east of the town and is within 2.1km of the Town Centre. As for all the options the key positive effects relate to the provision of housing and employment with associated benefits for communities, through improved public transport and pedestrian links (walking and cycling). For this Option, the River Yeo and railway are the main barriers to improving pedestrian movement as there is currently only one crossing point into the town along Sherborne Road (A30). It may be possible to provide additional crossing points but this could be costly and ultimately may not be feasible. It should also be noted that this Option lies within another Local Planning Authority area, so would not be subject to the same planning policies and contributions as the other Options. This adds an element of uncertainty that is not present for the other single site options.

As for all the options there is the potential for negative effects on the landscape as well as transport through increased traffic, which has the potential for negative effects on climate change through increased carbon emissions. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be no significant effects. Key negative effects for this option include flooding and the loss of agricultural land. There are some areas of significant flood risk within this option as the River Yeo runs along the western boundary<sup>42, 43</sup>. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be no significant effects, which could include avoiding development in the areas of high flood risk.

This option predominantly contains Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land<sup>44</sup>, which is identified as 'excellent' and 'very good' respectively in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales<sup>45</sup>. Development within this option area would lead to the significant loss of both Grade 1 and 2, which has the potential for permanent significant long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. This option is likely to have a slightly reduced effect compared to Option B as it is not all Grade 1 agricultural; however, it is still considered significant.

---

<sup>42</sup> South Somerset District Council (Aug 2008) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

<sup>43</sup> Environment Agency (Accessed on 09/09/13) What's in your Backyard. Available online: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37793.aspx>

<sup>44</sup> ALC maps supplied by Natural England (September 2009)

<sup>45</sup> Ministry of agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Oct 1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales.

<b>Area D - Upper Mudford</b>				
<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects and Potential Mitigation</b>		<b>Residual Effects</b>	<b>Key recommendations for lower level planning (Masterplans/ Planning Briefs)</b>
	<b>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/ negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/ temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic), including mitigation provided by plan policies</b>			
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	<p>The southern boundary of this option area is within 3km (walking distance<sup>46</sup>) from the Town Centre and Yeovil District Hospital and approx 2km from Yeovil College. It is also approx 1.4km from a major supermarket, within 1km of a sports centre and approximately 700 metres from a secondary school.</p> <p>Development has the potential to increase pressure on existing facilities and services and taking into account their distance from this option area, along with the topographical constraints, there is the potential for a minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. It is assumed that the level of development proposed could provide some form of new local facilities and services as well as contribute to the extension/upgrade of existing services and facilities where necessary.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EP15 (Protection and Provision of Local Shops, Community Facilities and Services) supports the provision of new community facilities and services. Policy HW1 requires provisions/contributions from new development if it generates a need for additional open space, local and strategic sports and cultural and community facilities. Policy S6 (Infrastructure Delivery) seeks to secure the provision of financial contributions to infrastructure, which includes community facilities.</p> <p>The policy mitigation proposed along with a coordinated approach to delivering</p>		?	It is recommended that the Council clearly sets out the requirements for the provision of or contribution to new services and facilities for any proposal for development in this option area for 1,565 dwellings or above.

<sup>46</sup> Google Maps - Walking distance from Lyde Road to St John's Church. Available online: <https://maps.google.co.uk/maps?hl=en&tab=wl>

	<p>housing, employment, community facilities and improvements to public transport, could help to mitigate the potential minor negative effects resulting in a neutral residual effect; however, at this stage there is uncertainty with regard to positive effects as the scale and scope of facilities and services to be provided as part of development are not known.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this Option does not perform significantly better or worse in terms of access to facilities and services.</p>		
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Yeovil West, Central and East Wards are identified as being the most deprived areas within the Town <sup>47</sup> . Development in this area will be predominantly in the Ivelchester Ward, adjacent to the Yeovil Without Ward, which is identified as being some of lesser deprived areas in Somerset. Development in this area could benefit the deprived wards within the Town but this is unlikely to be significant. Potential for indirect minor medium to long-term positive effects on this SA objective. It is considered that all of the Options will have a similar effect against this SA objective.	+	
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	All of the Options would have a significant long-term positive effect on the provision of housing within the district. Based on the PLS Addendum this option has the potential to accommodate between approximately 1,575 and 2,025 dwellings (based on a density of 35 - 45dph). It should be noted that nearby Wyndham Park development has a density of 35 dph. This option could have longer-term positive effects after the life of the Plan through potentially being able to accommodate more dwellings than the identified objectively assessed need of 1,565 (depending on the density of development). Compared to Option B and the multi-site option, this Option has less potential accommodate more development beyond the identified need of 1,565 dwellings over the life of the Plan.	++	
4. Improve health and well being	All of the Options have the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health through the provision of housing and employment. They also all have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on health during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is provided through Local Plan policies and is also available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects on health during construction. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that	+	?
			<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction Management Plan.</li> </ul>

<sup>47</sup> Somerset Intelligence (accessed on 10/09/13) Indices of Multiple Deprivation. Available online: <http://www.somersetintelligence.org.uk/imd/>

	<p>development proposals use sustainable construction principles.</p> <p>A development of 1,565 dwellings is unlikely to deliver new local health services or facilities; however, it could contribute to the upgrade of existing facilities/services, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health. The southern boundary of this option area is approximately 2.2km from Yeovil District Hospital, which lies to the north of the Town Centre. Bucklers Mead Sports Centre is less than 800m from the south west boundary of the option area.</p> <p>The distance to the Hospital and town centre is slightly further than Options B and C for this site; however, topography is potentially less of a barrier to walking and cycling. However, people living in the northern section of this option area would need to walk up hill to get over the northern escarpment. There are opportunities to provide improved pedestrian links to the surrounding countryside and open space for existing residents in the north east of Yeovil. Pedestrian links with the Wyndham Park Development and wider countryside should also be sought.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ5 (Green Infrastructure) aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces that improve recreational opportunities and support physical health and mental wellbeing as well as ensure that all children and young people have reasonable access to a range of play and leisure opportunities. The policy also aims to provide opportunities for enhanced, attractive walking and cycling routes linking urban areas and the wider countryside.</p> <p>There is the potential for enhanced positive effects if the development of a single Yeovil Urban Extension could be linked to the development of a Sports Zone as set out in Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy HW2.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide/improve pedestrian links from existing development to the south of this option area to the wider countryside.</li> <li>• provide/improve pedestrian links to the Town Centre and Yeovil District Hospital.</li> <li>• provide/improve pedestrian links with the Wyndham Park Development and wider countryside.</li> </ul> <p>The Council should seek the opportunity to link the potential development of a sports zone as set out in Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy HW2 to a Yeovil urban extension.</p>
<p>5. Improve education and skills of the</p>	<p>The closest secondary school is approximately 700m away from the southern boundary of this area and Yeovil College is approximately 2km away. This option has slightly better access to existing education facilities than the other options. The scale of proposed development is unlikely to result in the provision of any significant new</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p>

<p>population</p>	<p>education facilities, such as a secondary school; however, there is the potential for it to provide a new primary school and contribute to the upgrade of existing facilities. There is the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective; however, there is also uncertainty as the precise details of what will be provided in terms of new education facilities is not known.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide a new primary school and contribute to the upgrade of existing education facilities to accommodate the increased demand generated as a result of new development.</li> </ul>
<p>6. Reduce crime and fear of crime</p>	<p>None of the Options are likely to have a significant effect against this SA objective. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks development proposals to create safe environments and address crime prevention and community safety. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 states that development will need to demonstrate a commitment to designing out crime through the creation of safe environments (both private and public) that benefit from natural surveillance, well overlooked streets and open spaces, appropriate lighting and other security measures.</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p>7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy</p>	<p>All of the options have the potential to deliver 5ha of employment land as set out in Local Plan Policy SS3. There is therefore the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA objective.</p> <p>The Pen Mill Trading Estate is approx 700 metres away from the southern boundary of the site. This option isn't as close to existing employment as Option C. There is the potential for improvements to public transport and pedestrian links to this existing employment area.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>	<p>+</p>	
<p>8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</p>	<p>Development in this area has the potential to exacerbate current congestion issues within the existing road network, with the potential for a significant long-term negative effect on this SA Objective unless appropriate mitigation is provided.</p> <p>The potential impacts of growth around Yeovil on the existing highway network were</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>+</p>

	<p>considered through a transport report and subsequent addendums<sup>48,49,50</sup>. It should be noted that the areas considered in that report do not precisely correspond with the current strategic growth options being considered and that the level of proposed growth has also been reduced. However, the study still provides a useful indication of how growth in particular locations around Yeovil may affect the existing road network. The most recent report addendum<sup>51</sup> (Jan 2012) concludes that there is little difference in terms of traffic impact between the potential sites and that background traffic growth is the major contributor to deterioration of highway network performance. The addendum also states that all option locations have similar levels of traffic impacts across the whole Yeovil network, but do cause some localised impacts in the vicinity of the individual site.</p> <p>Key roads and junctions likely to be affected by development in this option area include the A359 and Lyde Road as well as Coombe Street Lane Junction, Hospital roundabout and potentially Lyde Road Mini roundabout.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy TA5 (Transport Impact of New Development) requires all new development to address its own transport implications and be designed to maximise the potential for sustainable transport. This includes safeguarding existing and new transport infrastructure as well as ensuring that the nature and volume of traffic and parked cars generated by the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character or amenity of the area, and would not compromise the function of the local or strategic road networks in terms of both volume and type of traffic generated. The policy also requires new development to assess their transport impact and ensure delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure. The level of development proposed in this option area would mean that any proposal would be required to prepare Transport Assessments (Policy TA5) as well as a Travel Plan (Policy TA1).</p> <p>There are also policies that seek to encourage sustainable and low carbon modes of</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

<sup>48</sup> Somerset County Council (Feb 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Report (Final v2a) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>49</sup> Somerset County Council (June 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>50</sup> Somerset County Council (Jan 2012) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<p>travel. Proposed Submission Policy TA1 (Low Carbon Travel) seeks all new development to ensure sustainable transport measures are in place and operational concurrent with first occupancy and to enable ease of working from home. The policy also seeks planning obligations to deliver improved public transport connections (commensurate with the scale of development) and provide bus stops and pedestrian routes (including cycling). Policy TA3 (Sustainable Transport at Chard and Yeovil) also seeks development to contribute to the sustainable transport interchange within the town and contribute to either the improvement of existing public transport services or new services.</p> <p>It is considered that this policy mitigation along with potential mitigation available at the project level to address localised transport impacts, will mitigate the potential significant negative effect on transport as a result of development in this option area. This would result in residual minor long-term negative effects on this SA Objective.</p> <p>The transport studies for growth around Yeovil identified the northern option (which includes this option area) as having reasonable opportunities for non car based travel but is hampered by a number of factors including the gradient and fragmented site layout. It should be noted that the area considered through the transport study was larger than this option area and extended much further to the west along the northern boundary of the Town. As identified against SA Objective 4, the topography could make walking and cycling difficult but that this is perhaps less of an issue for this option as for Option B. There are opportunities to provide new and enhance existing walking and cycling routes. Potential to provide improved pedestrian links to the surrounding countryside and open space for existing residents in the north east of Yeovil. Pedestrian links with the Wyndham Park Development and wider countryside should also be sought.</p> <p>Similar to Option C, this option area has no bus routes currently running through the site. There are three existing bus routes 1 Abbey manor/ Milford (Mon - Sat every 15 mins), 1 Shepton Mallet/ Castle Cary (Mon - Fri Hourly, Sat 5 journeys) &amp; 68 Barwick/ Stoford (Mon - Sat Hourly &amp; Yeovil Junction, Pen Mill, Lyde Mon - Sat 30 mins) to the south of this area along Lyde Road.</p> <p>Compared to Options C and D, this Option has less uncertainty with regard to</p>	
---	--

	<p>potentially having a positive effect on this SA Objective through improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>		
<p>9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape</p>	<p>The Peripheral Landscape Study (PLS) Addendum (Aug 2013)<sup>52</sup> identified that development in this area could have significant landscape and visual effects, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. potential built form against the village settlement edges;</li> <li>v. massing impacts over the escarpment face</li> <li>vi. change upon the general rural character of the outer scarp face.</li> <li>vii. the conservation of traditional field patterns adjacent Up Mudford; relic</li> </ul>	<p>-</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that it has taken into account the findings and mitigation set</li> </ul>

<sup>52</sup> South Somerset District Council (30 August 2013) Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum Draft 2.

	<p>orchards; specimen trees; and the area's more robust and intricate hedgerow networks is necessary - the effect arising from the removal of any of these features has the capacity to be adverse.</p> <p>As for all the options, the PLS Addendum (Aug 2013) makes it clear that there is the potential for development to have a significant negative long-term effect on landscape. The Addendum sets out a range of mitigation measures to address these effects, which firstly focused on avoidance (screening out the areas with the highest sensitivity) and then reduction and then remediation. These should help to address the identified long-term significant negative effects resulting in minor long-term negative effects. Proposed mitigation includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precluding development from the vicinity of Mudford and Up Mudford;</li> <li>• Development should be held back from the line of the A359, which would help to mitigate negative visual effects from the central Yeo vale;</li> <li>• Mature trees and robust hedgerows should be retained;</li> <li>• Breaking up development areas to avoid the steeper and highly visible slopes and create separation by incorporation of open space and tree planting;</li> <li>• Use the 40% allocation of green space within the most prominent faces of the site;</li> <li>• Developed a linked network of GI; and</li> <li>• Sensitive integration of street patterns, correspondence of open space and tree planting areas will enable assimilation with the town.</li> </ul> <p>The Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (Aug 2013) concludes that this option area has the capacity to accommodate approximately 45ha of built development. Assuming a density of between 35 - 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) this implies that the landscape has the potential to accommodate between 1,575 and 2,025 dwellings in this area. Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development), which seeks to ensure that development is designed to achieve a high quality that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the district. Development proposals will be considered by the Council if they conserve and enhance the landscape character</p>		<p>out in the Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (August 2013), in particular precluding development from the vicinity of Mudford and Up Mudford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the setting of the town.</li> <li>• include appropriate planting and GI provision to minimise impacts on the landscape.</li> <li>• include 40% open space.</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that the Council produces a GI Strategy to optimise potential possibilities for GI at this site and ensure that it contributes to a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>of the area. Policy EQ 5 (Green Infrastructure) promotes the provision of GI and aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces. The policy also seeks all residential development to at least meet Natural England 'Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard' (ANGSt) or otherwise appropriately contribute to improving access to natural greenspace such that the overall aims are met.</p> <p>Despite the mitigation provided by Local Plan Policies and available at the project level, it is still considered that there is the potential for a residual minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective.</p> <p>It is considered that after appropriate mitigation has been taken into account all of the single site options have the potential for a similar effect on this SA Objective. Compared to the Multi-site option the single site options could potentially have a more significant effect during the life of the plan as development will be within an individual landscape setting. However, in the years extending further beyond this plan period, the potential development areas within a multi-site option are likely to come forward for development, and if this happens in piecemeal stages rather than as a single masterplanned form, then the resultant growth may lack the cohesion and appropriate mitigation that a larger site can deliver.</p>		
<p>10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment</p>	<p>There is a Grade II Listed Building adjacent to Primrose Lane to the west and another three Grade II Listed Buildings to the north of the area<sup>53</sup>.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (July 2010)<sup>54</sup> identified the area<sup>55</sup> as having a high historic landscape sensitivity (presence of predominantly anciently enclosed fields) and low historic asset sensitivity (no Scheduled Monuments or Historic parks and Gardens). The study concluded that the capacity of this area to accommodate new development without loss or damage to key historic landscape sensitivities and historic assets is moderate.</p> <p>The impact of development will be dependent on implementation; however, based on available evidence it is considered that there is unlikely to be any significant</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>As for all the options it is recommended that the Council requires any proposal for development in this area to be accompanied by an archaeological assessment.</p>

<sup>53</sup> The National Heritage List for England (Accessed 13/09/13) Map Search. Available online: <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>

<sup>54</sup> Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (2010) Prepared by Chris Blandford Associates on behalf of South Somerset District Council.

<sup>55</sup> It should be noted that the area considered in the study is larger than the area proposed by this Option.

	<p>effects as long as the potential significant negative effects on landscape, set out against SA Objective 9, are suitably mitigated. Any potential negative effects on listed buildings or other heritage assets can mitigated at the lower level of planning. Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment), which expects all new development to safeguard and enhance the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of heritage assets. The Council also seeks to update the Heritage Strategy to provide comprehensive advice to ensure high standards of development at the development management level. Mitigation provided by Local Plan policies along with mitigation available at the project level should ensure that effects are not significant.</p> <p>Given existing constraints and evidence it is considered that this option has less potential for negative effects on designated heritage than Option B and the Multi-site Option. However, there is still an element of uncertainty for all options until detailed proposals and project level assessments have been carried out.</p>			
<p>11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects</p>	<p>All of the options have the potential to increase levels of carbon emissions through increased traffic and embodied energy in providing development (materials and construction methods used). Potential for a minor long-term negative effect on this SA objective.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where they have demonstrated how climate change mitigation and adaptation will be delivered, through inclusion of a variety of measures, which includes minimising carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures and low carbon and renewable energy. The policy also requires Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 from 2013 and level 5 from 2016 as well as BREEAM rating of 'excellent' for non-domestic buildings, which set standards for energy and water efficiency. The development of renewable and low carbon energy generation will also be encouraged. This along with other Local Plan mitigation provided by Policies TA1, TA3 and TA5 to minimise the impacts of development on traffic should help to reduce the significance of potential negative effects. However, it is still considered that a minor residual negative long-</p>	-	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>meet the zero carbon standard through either providing on-site measures or the use of 'Allowable Solutions'.</li> </ul>

	<p>term effect will remain.</p> <p>All of the options have the potential to incorporate some form of on-site renewable or low carbon energy generation, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective. A larger scale of development as proposed for this option area could potentially lead to a greater choice of on-site renewable and low carbon technologies through increased viability than for the multi-site option. However, this does not mean that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could not meet the zero carbon standard. The government has recognised that it is not always possible (cost-effective, affordable, technically feasible) for development to incorporate on-site measures to reduce carbon emissions and is currently proposing that development can achieve the zero carbon standard by mitigating remaining emissions off-site<sup>56</sup>. The introduction of 'Allowable Solutions' means that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could abate carbon emissions off-site to achieve the zero carbon standard.</p>			
<p>12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production</p>	<p>All of the Options have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on this SA objective during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects during construction.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that development proposals use sustainable construction principles. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 also notes that South Somerset has published a range of Development Management advice guides to give guidance on how design should complement local architectural traditions and how sustainable construction techniques can be incorporated within the context of the existing built heritage.</p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p>-</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction Management Plan.</li> <li>• be accompanied by a site waste management plan.</li> </ul>

<sup>56</sup> DCLG (Aug 2013) Next step to zero carbon homes - Allowable Solutions.

	<p>There is also the potential for all of the options to have negative effects on air, water, land, light and noise pollution in the medium to long-term. Mitigation provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan policies EQ2 and EQ7 (Pollution Control) along with mitigation available at the project level should ensure that effects are not significant.</p> <p>This option predominantly contains Grade 3a and 3b agricultural land<sup>57</sup>, which is identified as 'good to moderate' in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales<sup>58</sup>. The Option area also contains small proportions of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. Development within this option area would predominantly lead to the loss of both Grade 3a and 3b, which has the potential for permanent minor long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. This option is considered to have a reduced negative effect compared to the other Options as it does not have the potential to lead to a significant loss of Grade 1 and 2.</p>			
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	There are no significant areas of flood risk on this site <sup>59, 60</sup> . Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where it directs development away from medium and high flood risk areas and reduces and manages the impact of flood risk by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems, and through appropriate layout, design, and choice of materials.	<b>0</b>		
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The area is predominantly arable land with some mature trees and hedgerows. There are no statutory designated sites for biodiversity within or adjacent to the area <sup>61</sup> . There is a Local Wildlife Site (Green Acres Farm) within the area to the north but given the landscape constraints it is unlikely that development would extend to the site and result in the loss of habitat. However, development should avoid the Local Wildlife Site and any proposal should ensure that suitable mitigation is in provided.	<b>?</b>		<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a bat survey and assessment.</li> <li>• incorporate semi natural</li> </ul>

<sup>57</sup> Defra - Magic Map (Accessed on 11/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

<sup>58</sup> Ministry of agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Oct 1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales.

<sup>59</sup> South Somerset District Council (Aug 2008) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

<sup>60</sup> Environment Agency (Accessed on 09/09/13) What's in your Backyard. Available online: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37793.aspx>

<sup>61</sup> Magic Map (Accessed on 06/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

	<p>The Strategic Ecological Assessment of Potential Housing Sites (Nov 2009) identified that this area could potentially contain/support Otters and/or Daubenton's Bats. The study assessed that the importance of the site for Otters was not significant and that an impact was extremely unlikely. For the Daubenton's Bats the site is considered significant and impacts probable. Mitigation proposed by the study to address negative effects on the Daubenton's Bat includes directional street lighting (low-pressure sodium) away from the River Yeo as well as the planting of trees along the eastern boundary. However, the area considered in the study extends much further east than the area proposed through this strategic option, which does not include the River Yeo. Despite this any proposal in this area should take account of the potential presence of the Daubenton's Bat and seek to minimise the loss and fragmentation of linear habitat features, such as hedgerows.</p> <p>Mature trees and hedgerows should be maintained where possible along with any other habitats that provide a link the surrounding area. Careful planning and design will help to mitigate potential effects on any important biodiversity or geodiversity. Mitigation is also provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ4 (Biodiversity), which requires all proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity and minimise fragmentation of habitats.</p> <p>It is considered that significant effects are unlikely given the mitigation available at the project level and provided by Local Plan policies. However, there is still an element of uncertainty until project level surveys and assessments have been completed.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		<p>greenspace corridors (consisting of tree planting with unimproved grassland), particularly along the eastern edge towards the River Yeo, as part of an overall integrated GI Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain mature trees and hedgerows where possible.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

**Summary of Key Negative & Positive Effects for Sustainable Development:**

This Option extends out from the north east of the town and is within 3km from the Town Centre. As for all the options the key positive effects relate to the provision of housing and employment with associated benefits for communities, through improved public transport and pedestrian links (walking and cycling). Similarly to Option B, topography is the main barrier to improving pedestrian movement for this option as the site rises towards the northern escarpment.

As for all the options there is the potential for negative effects on the landscape as well as transport through increased traffic, which has the potential for negative effects on climate change through increased carbon emissions. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be no significant effects. The key negative effect for this particular option relates to the loss of agricultural land. This option predominantly contains Grade 3a and 3b agricultural land<sup>62</sup>, which is identified as 'good to moderate' in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales<sup>63</sup>. The Option area also contains small proportions of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. Development within this option area would predominantly lead to the loss of both Grade 3a and 3b, which has the potential for permanent minor long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. This option is considered to have a reduced negative effect compared to the other Options as it does not have the potential to lead to a significant loss of Grade 1 and 2.

---

<sup>62</sup> Defra - Magic Map (Accessed on 11/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

<sup>63</sup> Ministry of agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Oct 1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales

<b>Multi-Site Option, which could consist of any combination of the following sites:</b> <b>Area A (Brympton D'Evercy)</b> <b>Area B (Coker)</b> <b>Area C (Middle Yeo Valley &amp; Dorset Hillsides)</b> <b>Area D (Up Mudford)</b>			
<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects and Potential Mitigation</b>		<b>Key recommendations for lower level planning (Masterplans/ Planning Briefs)</b>
	<b>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/ negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/ temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic), including mitigation provided by plan policies</b>		
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	<p>This option consists of four potential areas for development to the south, south west, north east and east of the Town. In terms of distance, all of the areas have relatively similar levels of accessibility to services and facilities and all have some form of barrier to pedestrian movement be it topography or existing development, such as the railway. Option A is 2.7km (walking distance<sup>64</sup>) from the Town Centre from the south east corner of the area.</p> <p>Development over all or some of these areas has the potential to increase pressure on existing facilities and services and taking into account their distance from these areas along with the barriers to pedestrian movement there is the potential for a minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. While dispersed, smaller scale developments are less likely to provide any significant new facilities and services they can still provide contributions to extend/upgrade existing facilities that may be in close proximity.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EP15 (Protection and Provision of Local Shops, Community Facilities and Services) supports the provision of new community facilities and services. Policy HW1 requires provisions/contributions from new development if it generates a need for additional open space, local and strategic sports and cultural and community facilities. Policy S6 (Infrastructure Delivery) seeks to secure the provision of financial contributions to infrastructure,</p>		<p><b>Residual Effects</b></p> <p>?</p>
			<p>It is recommended that the Council clearly sets out the requirements for the provision of or contribution to new services and facilities for any proposals for development as part of this Option if it is selected as the preferred option.</p>

<sup>64</sup> Google Maps - Walking distance from Watercombe Ln/A3088 to St John's Church. Available online: <https://maps.google.co.uk/maps?hl=en&tab=w>

	<p>which includes community facilities.</p> <p>The policy mitigation proposed along with improvements to sustainable transport modes, including public transport, could help to mitigate the potential minor negative effects resulting in a neutral residual effect; however, at this stage there is uncertainty with regard to positive effects as the scale and scope of facilities and services to be provided as part of development are not known.</p> <p>Compared to the options, this Option does not perform significantly better or worse in terms of access to facilities and services.</p>		
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Yeovil West, Central and East Wards are identified as being the most deprived areas within the Town <sup>65</sup> . The only area with the potential to directly affect one of these wards is C as development would be directly adjacent to the Yeovil East Ward, which is identified as being the most deprived ward in South Somerset. As for the other Options, development could benefit the deprived wards within the Town but this is unlikely to be significant. Potential for indirect minor medium to long-term positive effects on this SA objective. It is considered that all of the Options will have a similar effect against this SA objective.	+	
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	All of the Options would have a significant long-term positive effect on the provision of housing within the district. As for the other options, this option could also have longer-term positive effects after the life of the Plan through potentially being able to accommodate more dwellings than the identified objectively assessed need of 1,565 dwellings. Compared to options C and D, this option has the potential to accommodate a significantly higher level of development than the identified need of 1,565 dwellings.	++	
4. Improve health and well being	All of the Options have the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health through the provision of housing and employment. They also all have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on health during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is provided through Local Plan policies and is also available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects on health during construction. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that	+	<p>?</p> <p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposals as part of this option to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a Construction</li> </ul>

<sup>65</sup> Somerset Intelligence (accessed on 10/09/13) Indices of Multiple Deprivation. Available online: <http://www.somersetintelligence.org.uk/imd/>

	<p>development proposals use sustainable construction principles.</p> <p>A multi-site development of 1,565 dwellings is unlikely to deliver new local health services or facilities; however, it could contribute to the upgrade of existing facilities/services, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on health. The four potential development areas all have fairly similar distances to the Yeovil District Hospital. Area C is the closest at approximately 2 km with Area D the furthest away at 3 km. Area A, which hasn't been considered individually through the SA as a single site option, is within 3km from Yeovil District Hospital.</p> <p>Topography, the River Yeo and railway line are some of the barriers to walking and cycling to existing health services. However, there is still the potential to provide new or enhance existing pedestrian links from the sites to the hospital and Town Centre. This option could potentially provide improvements over a wider area than the other single site options but are likely to be less significant locally in terms of their positive effects. Compared to the other Options, there is a greater level of uncertainty for the Multi-site Option as dispersed, smaller scale developments offer less potential for a coordinated approach to development and associated improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ5 (Green Infrastructure) aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces that improve recreational opportunities and support physical health and mental wellbeing as well as ensure that all children and young people have reasonable access to a range of play and leisure opportunities. The policy also aims to provide opportunities for enhanced, attractive walking and cycling routes linking urban areas and the wider countryside.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		<p>Management Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide/improve pedestrian links from existing development to the wider countryside.</li> </ul>
5. Improve education and skills of the population	<p>Area C to the north east has the best access to existing education facilities, which includes a secondary school and Yeovil College. Similar to the other options this one is unlikely to provide any significant new education facilities; however, as for the other options there is the potential to provide a new primary school or contribute to the extension/upgrade of existing facilities.</p>	?	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposals as part of this option to:</p>

	Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contribute to the upgrade of existing education facilities to accommodate the increased demand generated as a result of new development.</li> </ul>
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	None of the Options are likely to have a significant effect against this SA objective. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks development proposals to create safe environments and address crime prevention and community safety. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 states that development will need to demonstrate a commitment to designing out crime through the creation of safe environments (both private and public) that benefit from natural surveillance, well overlooked streets and open spaces, appropriate lighting and other security measures.	0	
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	<p>All of the options have the potential to deliver 5ha of employment land as set out in Local Plan Policy SS3. There is therefore the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA objective. It should be noted that there is a flight safety zone (Local Plan Policy YV5) that extends into Area A that controls and limits development to allow Augusta Westland's Aerodrome to continue operating.</p> <p>This option has good access to existing employment sites. Areas A &amp; B have good access to the existing major employment areas of the Lynx Trading Estate and Augusta Westlands and Areas C and D has good access the Pen Mill Trading Estate. A multi-site option consisting of a number of smaller scale developments has less potential for a coordinated approach to the delivery of new employment alongside housing and community facilities compared to a single site option. Despite this, this Option still has the potential for a positive effect on the economy.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>	+	
8. Reduce the effect of	All of the options have the potential to exacerbate current congestion issues within the existing road network, with the potential for a significant long-term negative	-	?

<p>traffic on the environment</p>	<p>effect on this SA Objective unless appropriate mitigation is provided.</p> <p>The potential impacts of growth around Yeovil on the existing highway network were considered through a transport report and subsequent addendums<sup>66,67,68</sup>. It should be noted that the areas considered in that report do not precisely correspond with the current strategic growth options being considered and that the level of proposed growth has also been reduced. However, the study still provides a useful indication of how growth in particular locations around Yeovil may affect the existing road network. The most recent report addendum<sup>69</sup> (Jan 2012) concludes that there is little difference in terms of traffic impact between the potential sites and that background traffic growth is the major contributor to deterioration of highway network performance. The addendum also states that all option locations have similar levels of traffic impacts across the whole Yeovil network, but do cause some localised impacts in the vicinity of the individual site.</p> <p>A more dispersed pattern of development consisting of a number of smaller sites is likely to have less significant localised impacts than a single site option. However, there will also be less scope for significant improvements to existing transport infrastructure, including public transport.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy TA5 (Transport Impact of New Development) requires all new development to address its own transport implications and be designed to maximise the potential for sustainable transport. This includes safeguarding existing and new transport infrastructure as well as ensuring that the nature and volume of traffic and parked cars generated by the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character or amenity of the area, and would not compromise the function of the local or strategic road networks in terms of both</p>			
-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--

<sup>66</sup> Somerset County Council (Feb 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Report (Final v2a) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>67</sup> Somerset County Council (June 2011) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>68</sup> Somerset County Council (Jan 2012) Non-Technical Forecasting Addendum Report (Final) - Review of Yeovil Eco-Urban Extension.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

	<p>volume and type of traffic generated. The policy also requires new development to assess their transport impact and ensure delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure. The level of development proposed in this option area would mean that any proposal would be required to prepare Transport Assessments (Policy TA5) as well as a Travel Plan (Policy TA1).</p> <p>There are also policies that seek to encourage sustainable and low carbon modes of travel. Proposed Submission Policy TA1 (Low Carbon Travel) seeks all new development to ensure sustainable transport measures are in place and operational concurrent with first occupancy and to enable ease of working from home. The policy also seeks planning obligations to deliver improved public transport connections (commensurate with the scale of development) and provide bus stops and pedestrian routes (including cycling). Policy TA3 (Sustainable Transport at Chard and Yeovil) also seeks development to contribute to the sustainable transport interchange within the town and contribute to either the improvement of existing public transport services or new services.</p> <p>It is considered that this policy mitigation along with potential mitigation available at the project level to address localised transport impacts, will mitigate the potential significant negative effect on transport as a result of development in these areas. This would result in residual minor long-term negative effects on this SA Objective.</p> <p>The key difference between this option and the other single site options is that a dispersed pattern of development consisting of smaller scale sites limits the scope for the delivery of new public transport infrastructure/pedestrian (walking &amp; cycling) links and/ or significant improvements to existing public transport infrastructure/pedestrian (walking &amp; cycling) links. While there is the potential for contributions to enhance existing public transport and pedestrian links, these are less likely to be significant considering the reduced scale and dispersed nature of development. There is also less potential for a coordinated approach to the delivery of new public transport/pedestrian links alongside housing and potential employment uses, which means this option is less likely to reduce the need to travel and encourage more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Compared to Options B and D, there is a greater level of uncertainty with regard to</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>the potential for positive effects for this Option through improvements to public transport and pedestrian links (walking and cycling).</p>			
<p>9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape</p>	<p>The Peripheral Landscape Study (PLS) Addendum (Aug 2013)<sup>70</sup> identified that development in any of these areas could have significant effects on landscape. The lower scale of development at each of the sites contained in this option means that the significance of the localised negative effect is likely to be less than for the single site options for those areas. However, there is still the potential for a significant long-term negative effect on landscape. The PLS Addendum sets out a range of mitigation measures to address these effects, which firstly focused on avoidance (screening out the areas with the highest sensitivity) and then reduction and then remediation. These should help to address the identified long-term significant negative effects resulting in minor long-term negative effects.</p> <p>The Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (Aug 2013) concludes that all these areas have the capacity to accommodate varying totals of built development. Areas B, C and D each individually have the potential to accommodate the</p>	<p>-</p>		<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within these area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrate that it has taken into account the findings and mitigation set out in the Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum (August 2013).</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that the Council produces a GI</p>

<sup>70</sup> South Somerset District Council (30 August 2013) Yeovil Peripheral Landscape Study Addendum Draft 2.

	<p>identified need of 1,565 dwellings or higher in the case of Areas B and D. The Addendum identified that Area A has limited capacity for growth; hence any development here will need to be small-scale. It is identified as having the capacity to accommodate 15ha of built development. Assuming a density of between 35 - 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) this implies that the landscape has the potential to accommodate between 525 and 675 dwellings in Area A.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of a number of smaller scale developments on the landscape is difficult to determine as each area that forms part of the Multi-site Option is within a different landscape setting. With this in mind you could potentially assume that the impact of a number of smaller sites would be less than a larger site within an individual landscape setting. However, in the years extending further beyond this forthcoming plan period, the potential development areas within Areas A to D identified by the Addendum, are likely to come forward for development, and if this happens in piecemeal stages rather than as a single masterplanned form, then the resultant growth may lack the cohesion and appropriate mitigation that a larger site can deliver.</p> <p>Mitigation is provided in the PLS Addendum as well as in Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development), which seeks to ensure that development is designed to achieve a high quality that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the district. Development proposals will be considered by the Council if they conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area. Policy EQ 5 (Green Infrastructure) promotes the provision of GI and aims to provide a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces. The policy also seeks all residential development to at least meet Natural England 'Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard' (ANGSt) or otherwise appropriately contribute to improving access to natural greenspace such that the overall aims are met.</p> <p>Despite the mitigation provided by Local Plan Policies and available at the project level, it is still considered that there is the potential for a residual minor medium to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective. Compared to the other Options, this Option has less potential for a significant effect during the life of the plan but could have a greater negative effect on landscape in the long-term, after the life of the Plan.</p>	<p>Strategy to optimise the potential possibilities for GI at these sites and ensure that they contribute to a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces.</p>
--	---	--

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the	The key heritage assets relating to Areas B, C and D are identified within the individual appraisals for the single site options. The historic park and garden of Brymton d'Evercy is adjacent to the western boundary of Area A <sup>71</sup> . The Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (July 2010) <sup>72</sup> identified Area A <sup>73</sup> as having	-	?	
--	--	---	---	--

---

<sup>71</sup> The National Heritage List for England (Accessed 13/09/13) Map Search. Available online: <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>

<sup>72</sup> Historic Environment Assessment of Yeovil Periphery (2010) Prepared by Chris Blandford Associates on behalf of South Somerset District Council.

<sup>73</sup> It should be noted that the Area 7 considered in the study is much larger than Area A considered in this Option.

<p>historic environment</p>	<p>a high historic landscape sensitivity (presence of Brympton d'Evercy Historic Park and Garden) and high historic asset sensitivity (presence of Brympton d'Evercy Historic Park and Garden and its setting). The study concluded that the capacity of this area to accommodate new development without loss or damage to key historic landscape sensitivities and historic assets is low.</p> <p>Based on existing constraints and current evidence it is considered that development in Area A and B (please refer to the individual appraisal for Option B) have the potential for a significant long-term negative effect on the historic environment.</p> <p>Key mitigation will include a significant buffer between any proposed development and important heritage, which includes the Roman Villa within Area B and Brympton d'Evercy adjacent to Area A. Potential negative effects on landscape will also need to be addressed to ensure that there are no significant negative effects on the setting of important heritage (Please refer to the appraisal for SA Objective 9).</p> <p>Mitigation is provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment), which expects all new development to safeguard and enhance the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of heritage assets. The Council also seeks to update the Heritage Strategy to provide comprehensive advice to ensure high standards of development at the development management level.</p> <p>Given existing constraints and evidence it is considered that despite available mitigation there is still the potential for a minor long-term negative effect on heritage. Compared to Options C and D, this Option has more designated heritage at risk from being affected by development. The effect of the multi-site option is will be dependent on the combination of sites selected and scale of development for each area. There is an element of uncertainty for all options until detailed proposals and project level assessments have been carried out.</p>			
<p>11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability</p>	<p>All of the options have the potential to increase levels of carbon emissions through increased traffic and embodied energy in providing development (materials and construction methods used). Potential for a minor long-term negative effect on this SA objective.</p>	-	+	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meet the zero carbon</li> </ul>

<p>to its effects</p>	<p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where they have demonstrated how climate change mitigation and adaptation will be delivered, through inclusion of a variety of measures, which includes minimising carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures and low carbon and renewable energy. The policy also requires Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 from 2013 and level 5 from 2016 as well as BREEAM rating of 'excellent' for non-domestic buildings, which set standards for energy and water efficiency. The development of renewable and low carbon energy generation will also be encouraged. This along with other Local Plan mitigation provided by Policies TA1, TA3 and TA5 to minimise the impacts of development on traffic should help to reduce the significance of potential negative effects. However, it is still considered that a minor residual negative long-term effect will remain.</p> <p>All of the options have the potential to incorporate some form of on-site renewable or low carbon energy generation, with the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on this SA Objective. Smaller scale developments as would occur through this option area could potentially offer less choice of on-site renewable and low carbon technologies than for a larger scale single site option. However, this does not mean that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could not meet the zero carbon standard. The government has recognised that it is not always possible (cost-effective, affordable, technically feasible) for development to incorporate on-site measures to reduce carbon emissions and is currently proposing that development can achieve the zero carbon standard by mitigating remaining emissions off-site<sup>74</sup>. The introduction of 'Allowable Solutions' means that smaller developments as part of a multi-site option could abate carbon emissions off-site to achieve the zero carbon standard.</p>			<p>standard through either providing on-site measures or the use of 'Allowable Solutions'.</p>
<p>12. Minimise pollution (including air, water,</p>	<p>All of the Options have the potential for temporary short-term negative effects on this SA objective during construction as waste, noise and dust pollution may be created. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to ensure that there are no significant effects during construction.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>--</p>	

<sup>74</sup> DCLG (Aug 2013) Next step to zero carbon homes - Allowable Solutions.

land, light, noise) and waste production	<p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ2 (General Development) seeks that development proposals use sustainable construction principles. The supporting text of Policy EQ2 also notes that South Somerset has published a range of Development Management advice guides to give guidance on how design should complement local architectural traditions and how sustainable construction techniques can be incorporated within the context of the existing built heritage.</p> <p>There is also the potential for all of the options to have negative effects on air, water, land, light and noise pollution in the medium to long-term. Mitigation provided by Proposed Submission Local Plan policies EQ2 and EQ7 (Pollution Control) along with mitigation available at the project level should ensure that effects are not significant.</p> <p>Development through this option has the potential to result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The significance of this effect is dependent on the distribution of development across the areas as the grade of the agricultural land varies. Area A, B and C are predominantly Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land, whereas Area D is predominantly Grade 3a and 3b, with small proportions of Grade 1 and 2.</p> <p>As the combination of sites and distribution of development across them is unknown there is an element of uncertainty. Despite this there is still the potential for development to have a permanent significant long-term negative effect through the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>			
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	<p>Only Area C has portions of the site that are at significant risk of flooding as the River Yeo runs along the eastern boundary of Area C<sup>75, 76</sup>. Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) supports proposals for new development where it directs development away from medium and high flood risk areas and reduces and manages the impact of flood risk by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems, and through appropriate layout, design, and choice of materials. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be</p>	-	?	

<sup>75</sup> South Somerset District Council (Aug 2008) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

<sup>76</sup> Environment Agency (Accessed on 09/09/13) What's in your Backyard. Available online: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37793.aspx>

	no significant effects. This could include avoiding development in the areas of high flood risk in area C. Given that the distribution of development across the sites is not known it is considered that there is also an element of uncertainty.		
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	<p>The sites considered through this option are predominantly arable land and generally have some mature trees and hedgerows. None of the areas have any statutory designated sites for biodiversity within them.</p> <p>There is a Local Wildlife Site (Green Acres Farm) within Area D to the north but given the landscape constraints it is unlikely that development would extend to the site and result in the loss of habitat. Babylon Hill SSSI lies to the south east of option area C adjacent to the A30<sup>77</sup>. Development at this site would be unlikely to have a significant effect on the SSSI as the main threat to the conservation of the cuttings is development that obscures the geological features<sup>78</sup>. Given that the SSSI is situated outside the Area C and at a higher elevation, negative effects are unlikely to occur.</p> <p>The Distribution of European Protected Species in South Somerset Report (Nov 2009) and the Strategic Ecological Assessment of Potential Housing Sites (Nov 2009) identify that the sites included in this option could potentially contain/support a variety of different bat species, which includes the Daubenton, Serotine, Pipistrelle, Lesser Horseshoe and Brown Long-eared bats. There is therefore the potential for a minor short to long-term negative effect on this SA Objective.</p> <p>Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2012) Policy EQ4 (Biodiversity) requires all proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity and minimise fragmentation of habitats. Any proposals for development will need to be accompanied by surveys and ecological assessments that will consider potential impacts on biodiversity, including the bat species listed above. Site level mitigation could include the retention of mature trees and hedgerows as well as the planting of trees as part of wider strategy for GI. Light pollution will also be a key consideration, particularly for development in Area C as the River Yeo runs along the western boundary.</p>	?	<p>It is recommended that the Council requires any proposal within this area to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be accompanied by a bat survey and assessment.</li> <li>• incorporate semi natural greenspace corridors (consisting of tree planting with unimproved grassland) as part of an overall integrated GI Strategy.</li> <li>• Retain mature trees and hedgerows where possible.</li> </ul>

<sup>77</sup> Magic Map (Accessed on 06/09/13) Available online: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

<sup>78</sup> Natural England - SSSI Information (Accessed on 12/09/13) Views about management. Available online: [http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/sssi\\_details.cfm?sssi\\_id=1002345](http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/sssi_details.cfm?sssi_id=1002345)

	<p>It is considered that significant effects are unlikely given the mitigation available at the project level and provided by Local Plan policies. However, there is still an element of uncertainty until project level surveys and assessments have been completed.</p> <p>Compared to the other Options, this one does not perform significantly better or worse against this SA Objective.</p>		
<p><b>Summary of Key Negative &amp; Positive Effects for Sustainable Development:</b></p> <p>This Option consists of four potential areas for development to the south, south west, north east and east of the Town. In terms of distance, all of the areas have relatively similar levels of accessibility to services and facilities and all have some form of barrier to pedestrian movement be it topography or the River Yeo and railway. As for all the options the key positive effects relate to the provision of housing and employment with associated benefits for communities, through improved public transport and pedestrian links (walking and cycling). The key difference between the multi-site and single site options is that a dispersed pattern of development consisting of smaller scale sites limits the scope for the delivery of new and improved public transport infrastructure/pedestrian (walking &amp; cycling) links. While there is the potential for contributions to enhance existing public transport and pedestrian links, these are less likely to be significant considering the reduced scale and dispersed nature of development. There is also less potential for a coordinated approach to the delivery of new public transport/pedestrian links alongside housing and potential employment uses, which means this option is less likely to reduce the need to travel and encourage more sustainable modes of transport. It is still considered that a multi-site option can provide improvements through contributions but the potential for positive effects is slightly more uncertain than for the larger scale single site options. However, this is obviously dependent on the distribution of development across the sites.</p> <p>As for all the options there is the potential for negative effects on the landscape as well as transport through increased traffic, which has the potential for negative effects on climate change through increased carbon emissions. It is considered that appropriate mitigation is provided through plan policies and available at the project level to ensure that there would be no significant effects. Key negative effects for this particular option relate to the historic environment and the loss of agricultural land. There are a number of historic designations that have the potential to be affected by development in Areas A and B. These include the historic park and garden of Brymton d'Evercy which is adjacent to the western boundary of Area A and a Scheduled Monument (Roman Villa North of Dunnock's Lane) and a number of Listed Buildings within Area B. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available through the Local Plan and at the project level to address the potential significant negative effects, with minor residual negative effects. As for all the options, there is also an element of uncertainty until further until project level surveys and assessments have been completed. It should also be noted that as the combination of sites and distribution of development across them is unknown there is an element of uncertainty.</p> <p>Development through this option has the potential to result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Area A, B and C are</p>			

predominantly Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land, whereas Area D is predominantly Grade 3a and 3b, with small proportions of Grade 1 and 2. Given this, there is the potential for development to have a permanent significant long-term negative effect through the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. It should be noted that the significance of this effect is dependent on the distribution of development across the areas as the grade of the agricultural land varies.