

South Somerset District Council: Local Plan 2006 – 2028

Resumed Independent Examination

South Somerset District Council Hearing Statement

Issue 2: Ilminster Direction of Growth (PMM3)

May 2014

Issue 2: Ilminster Direction of Growth (PMM3)

| Contents | Page |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Question 2.1 | 3 |
| Question 2.2 | 4 |
| Question 2.3 | 5 |
| Question 2.4 | 11 |
| Appendix | 12 |

Question 2.1: Has the public consultation with regard the Ilminster Direction of Growth followed the requirements of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement?

- 2.1.1 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (July 2007) [CD 131] sets out how the Council will involve and engage with the community on the Local Plan. A key objective of the SCI is to encourage continuous community involvement in the planning process and to provide opportunities for involvement and participation in planning matters for those who wish to be involved. The Council believes that the public consultation carried out in Ilminster has followed the requirements of the SCI.
- 2.1.2 The Inspector has previously requested written confirmation that the South Somerset Local Plan had been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures, including the Council's SCI (Question 2 for Council: Statutory Procedures, February 2013). The Council confirmed then that the SCI had been complied with.
- 2.1.3 Additionally, with regard to Ilminster, the Inspector previously questioned the Council's approach towards further public consultation with regard the change to the Ilminster Direction of Growth (Question 3 for the Council: Ilminster). In response (18.03.13) the Council outlined the methods of consultation carried out in Ilminster and also noted that the Spatial Policy Manager had met with Andrew Seaman, Senior Housing and Planning Inspector on 16th August 2012. Mr Seaman in acting as critical friend to the Council was asked about the reasonableness of the consultation process in Ilminster following the amended Direction of Growth, as there was concern locally. Mr Seaman concluded that in his opinion the terms of the Council's SCI had been met.
- 2.1.4 Since the Examination Hearing Sessions in May/June 2013 further consultation has occurred in Ilminster and this is set out in the Proposed Main Modifications Consultation Statement Addendum (March 2014) [CD 9e].
- 2.1.5 An additional meeting with Ilminster Town Council and members of the public was provided for on the 6th January 2014. This demonstrates commitment from the Council to outline the Main Modifications and to understand the local issues and concerns relating to the proposal.
- 2.1.6 It is the Council's belief that the requirements outlined in the SCI have been satisfied and that the consultation process in Ilminster (as well as the rest of the District) has been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) England Regulations 2012.

Question 2.2: Is the vision for growth and change in this area justified and based on an appropriate sustainability appraisal? Does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances?

- 2.2.1 The Council's Hearing Statement for Issue 9: Ilminster (May 2013) sets out the Council's justification for the scale of growth in Ilminster (496 dwellings, 23.05 hectares of employment land, 419 jobs over the plan period).
- 2.2.2 The Inspector's Preliminary Findings (3rd July 2013) raised a significant issue of concern in relation to the proposed Direction of Growth for Ilminster. At paragraph 55 it is stated that "the proposed direction of growth at Ilminster appears to be not sound".
- 2.2.3 To address the Inspector's concerns, the Council reviewed and revised the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of all of the options for growth in Ilminster informed by new evidence. Importantly, this used the same methodology and SA Framework as has been used throughout the Local Plan making process. Independent consultants Enfusion provided quality assurance and advice on the revised appraisals produced by the Council to improve consistency. As a consequence of this process and alongside the consideration of other plan-making criteria (deliverability and viability for housing, market capacity, infrastructure deliverability, provision of services and facilities, mitigation potential and added opportunities and benefits) the Main Modifications have identified a Direction of Growth for Ilminster to the South West (Canal Way).
- 2.2.4 The justification for the change is clearly set out in the Proposed Main Modifications [CD 159], Soundness Issue 2: Direction of Growth for Ilminster - Background Report [CD 166] and Full Council report (13th March 2014). In summary, the SA appraised three options and found that there were some key differentiators between the options. These relate to the provision of housing, landscape, historic environment, and the loss of agricultural land.
- 2.2.5 The findings of the revised SA [CD 161.c] as well as the reasons for the selection and rejection of alternatives have been subject to consultation with statutory consultees and the public, the responses received and how they have been addressed through the SA process are presented in Appendix I of the SA Addendum Report (March 2014) [CD 161.d.1.].
- 2.2.6 The Council is satisfied that the vision for growth and change for Ilminster as set out in the Main Modifications is the most appropriate strategy, it is fully justified by evidence and based on an appropriate and sound SA.

Question 2.3: Have the implications of a direction of growth to the south west of the town been appropriately addressed with regard to:

Overview

- 2.3.1 The Council believes that the implications of a Direction of Growth to the South West of the town (Canal Way) have been appropriately assessed through the plan making process. When the revised Sustainability Appraisal for the Ilminster Direction of Growth is considered in its entirety, the South West option represents the option most likely to deliver the required housing growth whilst avoiding any significant negative effects of that growth, whereas the other two options have the potential for significant negative effects.
- 2.3.2 The SA is a systematic tool used to consistently appraise potential options, it is not a decision making tool in its own right and therefore, when considered alongside the other criteria for determining the preferred option for growth (deliverability and viability for housing, market capacity, infrastructure deliverability, provision of services and facilities, mitigation potential and added opportunities and benefits) results in the preferred direction of growth being the South West of the town as presented through the Proposed Main Modifications to the South Somerset Local Plan.

Landscape and topography

- 2.3.3 The Ilminster Peripheral Landscape Study [CD 68f] (hereon referred to as landscape study) considers the capacity of each of the options for growth in Ilminster to accommodate built development. This was used to identify options at the start of the plan making process and has been used as evidence to inform the Main Modifications to the South Somerset Local Plan.
- 2.3.4 The landscape study identifies that most of the land at Canal Way is of low to medium landscape and visual sensitivity, with a high to moderate capacity to accommodate built development. It also identifies that whilst most of the land in the Shudrick Valley option is also of low to medium landscape and visual sensitivity, with a high to moderate capacity to accommodate built development, there are small but significant areas of landscape with a moderate to low capacity to accommodate built development within the Shudrick Valley option. The landscape study identifies that Canal Way could potentially accommodate 10.5ha of residential development and Shudrick Valley 6.0ha of residential development. The Northern option contains land with a moderate to low and low capacity to accommodate built development.
- 2.3.5 The revised Sustainability Appraisal [CD 166] uses the landscape study as evidence to consider the ability for each option to protect and enhance the landscape and townscape (Objective 9 of the SA). This work identifies that mitigation, including the avoidance of the steeper, more attractive southern slopes will limit the impact of proposed development in Canal Way, whilst the pockets of high landscape sensitivity (along with a number of Tree Preservation Orders) means there is potential for a significant medium to long term negative effect on the landscape and townscape if development were to occur in the Shudrick Valley option. A landscape study has also

been undertaken by Persimmon/Pegasus which identifies that the Canal Way site has sufficient capacity to deliver the Local Plan housing growth for Ilminster.

- 2.3.6 In summary, the potential significant adverse impact on the landscape for the south east and northern options are major disadvantages to their development, whereas on the basis of evidence it is considered that there is the potential to mitigate any adverse impact of development on the landscape in the south west option.

Biodiversity and geodiversity

- 2.3.7 The Distribution of European Protected Species in South Somerset: Guidance for Spatial Planning [CD 72] was used to inform the Directions of Growth for Ilminster. This identifies that some parts of the south west option are within foraging areas for Pipistrelle Bats. Additionally the District Ecologist was also consulted, he identified that badgers may be present on site but that mitigation measures could be put in place should development occur in this direction, this is presented in PMB Workshop Paper 4 "Direction of Growth for Ilminster" [CD 115].
- 2.3.8 Following the Preliminary Findings the District Ecologist was further consulted regarding biodiversity for the Ilminster Direction of Growth options and this evidence is presented in the Ilminster Further Evidence Compendium [CD 170]. Appendix II: Revised SA of Ilminster Direction of Growth [CD 161.d.ii] uses this evidence to consider the ability for each option to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity (Objective 14 of the SA). In summary there are no national wildlife or geodiversity designations within or in close proximity to the south western option. The option may contain Pipistrelle Bats (a relatively common species associated with urban environments), Dormice, badgers and other common wildlife species, but this is common across all three options and can be mitigated as part of future planning applications.
- 2.3.9 Respondents to the Main Modifications consultation raised the proximity of the south west option to Herne Hill as an issue. Herne Hill is a Local Site of Nature Conservation importance (a County Wildlife Site - ancient woodland). For all three options, there is a locally designated wildlife site within 300 to 500 metres and the District Ecologist states "*I don't consider these designations alone are likely to be sufficiently different in their respective levels of biodiversity importance to justify any significant influence on the decision between the three options*" (8 August 2013). Furthermore, local designations such as these are not legally protected and carry less weight in terms of assessment and decision making. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "*Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks*". There are no national, statutory designations at the south west option and therefore development in this location would not result in significant harm to wildlife or geodiversity designations.

2.3.10 In summary, it is considered that there are unlikely to be significant effects as a result of development given the potential mitigation available at the project level and provided through policies contained within the Local Plan.

Historic assets

2.3.11 The historic environment has been considered throughout the plan making process but following receipt of the consultation responses, additional historic environment assessment work was undertaken to inform the Council's decision making process (see the Appendix of this issue statement). In summary, the additional work makes the following points regarding the south west option - the Direction of Growth is 150m away from the south western edge of the Conservation Area and 175m from the Area of High Archaeological Potential. In terms of archaeology it is considered that development of this option could have a slight/moderate effect on assets. The option is also a valley with land behind forming the skyline (Herne Hill) when seen from the western extent of the Conservation Area along Station Road which here contains a high proportion of listed buildings. The valley is a less significant part of the setting of these assets with less inter-visibility because of distance and the gentler topography. Existing Canal Way development also intervenes and forms part of the existing setting which as a result will be less changed by further building within the valley. Particular harm would only occur if development encroached higher up the slopes of Herne Hill.

2.3.12 The SA has been updated in light of the consultation responses and additional evidence. Given that there is the potential to have an impact upon archaeology and the historic environment, the previous neutral scoring for the south west option appears unjustified hence a change to a minor negative scoring as illustrated in the SA.

2.3.13 It is considered that suitable mitigation is available through Local Plan policies and at a project/planning application level to address potential significant effects on historic assets. There is the potential for minor residual negative effects remaining, but this is equally the case for development of the northern option. Development of the south east option has the potential to radically alter the setting from a rural one to a substantially urban one, which would be substantial and cause harm to the settings of both the Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings. Given the potential for development to have a harmful effect upon the setting of designated heritage assets and the potential negative impact on archaeology, development of this option has the potential to have a significant negative impact on the Shudrick Valley (see the Appendix of this statement).

2.3.14 The potential impact on historic assets is one of the key differentiators between the three options for growth and has been adequately considered through the decision making process regarding the Main Modifications.

Flood risk

- 2.3.15 Flood risk has been considered throughout the plan making process and the Environment Agency has not objected to development to the south west of the town. Evidence of local surface water flooding is recognised, but the Environment Agency considers that there will be an engineering solution to such surface water run-off.
- 2.3.16 The revised Sustainability Appraisal considers each option's ability to manage and reduce the risk of flooding. In summary development to the south west affords the opportunity to resolve an existing issue with regard to local surface water flooding and therefore it is considered that development will have a minor positive effect. Further detail on specific mitigation would be expected through a planning application.

Highway safety

- 2.3.17 The Direction of Growth for Ilminster - Background Report [CD 166] notes that Peter Brett Associates (on behalf of Persimmon) undertook a detailed Transport Assessment of the south west option which was presented as evidence during the initial Examination Hearing sessions in May/June 2013. The evidence found the south west option to be fully and reasonable accessible.
- 2.3.18 SSSDC officers met with representatives from Somerset County Council (SCC) as the Highways Authority and the Highways Agency on 14th February 2014, as detailed in the Proposed Main Modifications Duty to Co-operate Report [CD 160]. At the meeting strategic highway matters in relation to Ilminster were discussed and the Highways Authority agreed to undertake some additional work at the request of SSSDC to enable the Highways Agency to take an informed view on the potential impact of the development on Southfields roundabout. The Highways Agency has since confirmed that the calculations provided by SCC show that additional trips onto the Southfields Roundabout arising from potential development at Canal Way will be fairly small and do not unduly concern the Agency at this stage (see the Appendix for this issue statement for calculations undertaken and correspondence from the Highways Agency).
- 2.3.19 Both the Highways Authority and Highways Agency has confirmed that further detailed Transport Assessments would be required at a planning application stage, including an assessment of any potential impact on the trunk road. Therefore at a strategic level highway safety has been adequately addressed and shows that there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the south west option.
- 2.3.20 Additionally, objective 8 of the revised SA has been amended in light of consultation because whilst there is the potential for a new road at Shudrick Valley, there is no current evidence to indicate that it would be required, or that the development would facilitate the delivery of a road. Discussions with the Highways Authority have not indicated that a road is a pre-requisite or a desirable aspect of development at Shudrick Valley, and therefore it should not feature as prominently as it currently does within the appraisal. Objective 8 for Shudrick Valley changes from “++ / -“to “+ / -“.

Sustainable travel

2.3.21 The District Strategic Transport Officer was consulted regarding sustainable transport possibilities for the Ilminster direction of growth options and this evidence is presented in the Ilminster Further Evidence Compendium [CD 170]. The revised SA uses this evidence to consider the ability for each option to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment. In summary development in any option has the potential for a minor long-term positive effect on reducing the effect of traffic on the environment.

2.3.22 The Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Report [CD 161.d.ii] recognises that some out-commuting may occur as a result of development at Canal Way but that traffic modelling on this route and of the Southfields Roundabout does not indicate that traffic movements will be significant.

Agricultural land value

2.3.23 Direction of Growth for Ilminster - Background Report [CD 166] explains why the Council reconsidered the agricultural land values present in the options for growth for Ilminster and the Full Council report (13th March 2014) illustrates how the revised evidence and agricultural land values were considered through the SA process and informed the Council's decision making with regard to the direction of growth for Ilminster.

2.3.24 The majority of land in Canal Way is Grade 3b agricultural land which is not considered to be "Best or Most Versatile" (BMV) agricultural land in the NPPF. Grade 3a agricultural land is present in the south of the option but it is considered unlikely that development would extend this far, and therefore unlikely that it would lead to the loss of BMV agricultural land. The northern option is predominantly Grade 3a, and therefore Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and also contains some Grade 2 agricultural land. The south eastern option is predominantly Grade 3a agricultural land and therefore BMV agricultural land.

2.3.25 In summary, development of either the northern or south eastern option (Shudrick Valley) would lead to loss of BMV agricultural land which would potentially have a significant permanent long-term negative effect. The loss of agricultural land was one of the key differentiators between the three options for growth.

The provision of infrastructure, services and facilities (including employment, waste water, education and health)

2.3.26 The provision of infrastructure, services and facilities has been considered through the Infrastructure Planning in South Somerset [CD 36] which sets out the infrastructure required to support the growth planned for the District on a settlement by settlement basis. It identifies that Ilminster requires social and green infrastructure including leisure, community and health provision.

Employment

2.3.27 The direction for growth in Ilminster does not include any employment provision as this is to be delivered through the Strategic Employment Site (Policy EP1) at Hort Bridge.

Waste Water

2.3.28 Wessex Water is the provider of water supply and sewerage for South Somerset.

They have not indicated that Ilminster requires additional infrastructure to increase sewerage capacity in association with the proposed Local Plan growth (Infrastructure Planning in South Somerset [CD 36]).

Education

2.3.29 Somerset County Council has indicated that there are capacity issues with Greenfyld First School and that a new school is likely to be required in Ilminster by 2015 / 2016.

2.3.30 SCC has indicated that development to the south west would offer a more efficient solution to delivering a new school due to SCC being the land owner. At this moment in time however, SCC does not have the site on its capital programme, as such, from a point of consistency, the ability to deliver a school does not result in a more positive scoring through the SA process. Should the Direction of Growth be approved and development be forthcoming, SCC have indicated that they can make the land available for development and the delivery of a school in 2015 (see Statement of Common Ground).

Health

2.3.31 The Somerset Primary Care Trust (PCT) provides the strategic view about the health provision required in South Somerset. They indicated that in Ilminster replacement facilities for North Street Surgery and Summervale Medical Centre are necessary infrastructure (Infrastructure Planning in South Somerset [CD 36]). The new combined medical centre is open and therefore no longer a requirement.

Pollution

2.3.32 The SA and its various iterations address pollution through their assessment of the overall sustainability of each direction of growth. It is considered that sufficient mitigation is provided through Local Plan Policies and is available at the project level to address any potentially significant negative effects.

Question 2.4: Is the direction of growth viable and deliverable?

- 2.4.1 The Council's Direction of Growth for Ilminster - Background Report [CD 166] sets out how the south west option is viable and deliverable.
- 2.4.2 The option is identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) update 2013 and is being actively put forward by the landowner and developer.
- 2.4.3 The site (W/ILMI/0011/B) is identified as suitable, available and viable and the panel notes it is a "very good site" for development in the SHLAA.
- 2.4.4 In addition to the detailed evidence base, the Council has been proactively working with the landowner and developer to better understand the site based constraints, and to improve awareness of the deliverability issues associated with the site, and confirm the build out rates and timescale for commencement and completion that can be expected from the site. Additional details on viability and deliverability can be found in the Statement of Common Ground signed by the Council, Persimmon Homes, and Somerset County Council, which was submitted to the Inspector on the 27th May 2014.

Appendix

1.0 Additional Historic Environment Evidence

SSDC Local Plan Proposed Modifications – Ilminster

SA Objective 10 concerns the historic environment which is defined in the NPPF as '*All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.*'¹

In making an assessment of the potential impact of development it is therefore necessary to consider all these elements and aspects. The Turley report and Steve Membery's review focus upon the archaeological assets and do not extend to the other categories that need consideration.

I suggest that the relevant types of asset here, in addition to the archaeological already considered, are the buildings and structures within the urban area both nationally designated (listed) and of local interest and the designated Ilminster Conservation Area which also encompasses most of the built assets. Indeed because the Conservation Area and the listed building are formally designated they are of greater significance than the archaeological, all of which (currently known) are undesignated and of a significance that does not make them the equivalent of scheduled monuments.

Both development options would impact upon the conservation area and listed buildings. Although neither would be physically impacted upon, their settings would be affected. It is important to bear in mind that the issue of setting is given considerable weight in the NPPF. Para.132 states: - *Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.*

The setting issues arise through the topography of the town, elevated above the valley of the Shudrick stream on its south side so that the setting of many buildings and some of the conservation area is formed by the valley to the south and particularly the rising open land beyond reaching up to Herne Hill and Pretwood Hill.

Option 1

There are two listed buildings outside the Conservation Area in close proximity to the Option 1 area, one within 30m and one 75m. There are several LBs within the CA on Bay Hill and Townsend, including a Grade 2* listing, which are further away from the area but more elevated. All these possess a clear and extensive prospect across the Shudrick valley to Pretwood Hill which therefore, indisputably, forms a key part of their individual settings. Development both on the more level valley bottom and especially on the rising ground beyond would radically alter this setting from a rural one to a substantially urban one which, I consider, would result in such a significant change as to cause substantial harm to the settings. The CA extends west of Bay Hill in a linear form and widens to take in both East Street and Butts. Its setting, certainly as far as Love Lane along East Street and to Butts Castle on Butts is the Shudrick valley up to the skyline of Pretwood Hill. Butts Castle is within the CA and these elevated buildings, some 3 storey, command an especially wide prospect across the Option 1 land. This is the setting of the CA and it would be harmed by a change of character from rural to urbanised. The landform would result in a massing of built form of considerable impact particularly on the steeper southern part of the area. Landscape buffering can relieve the impact of development upon the setting of a heritage asset where the land is flat and wider views are not part of the asset's setting but in this case the topography would prevent any buffering being effective in separating and hiding adjacent

¹ NPPF Annex 2

development. My conclusion is that development at Option 1 would have a harmful affect upon the setting of designated heritage assets.

Option 2

The Option 2 land is also a valley with land rising behind forming the skyline (Herne Hill) when seen from the western extent of the conservation area along Station Road which here contains a high proportion of listed buildings. The option land is more distant; at least 150m and the likely most heavily built area probably twice this distance. Furthermore the valley is a less significant part of the setting of these assets with less inter-visibility because of distance and the gentler topography. Existing Canal Way development also intervenes and forms part of the existing setting which as a result will be less changed by further building within the valley. Particular harm would only occur if development encroached higher up the slopes of Herne Hill.

Conclusion

While the impact upon archaeological assets is deemed low, as stated by Steve Membery, and of broadly equal impact on the two options, the impact that would result at option 1 upon the settings of significant **designated** heritage assets would be far greater than at Option 2.

Adron Duckworth
Conservation Manager
22.1.14

2.0 Additional Archaeology Evidence

SSDC Local Plan Proposed Modifications - Ilminster

Introduction

In response to Turley Associates submission SCC HES were requested to assess the document. The submission concluded that the impacts on the historic environment were incorrectly scored within the revised Sustainability Assessment (November 2013). Turley's conclude that both Options (Canal Way and Shudrick Lane) should have a similar scoring (neutral or Unknown). In order to assess the archaeological issues associated with the two areas a scoring system based on Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB August 2007) is used.

Prehistoric and Roman

Canal Way

A recent archaeological investigation has revealed Bronze Age and Roman period buried archaeology at Canal Way. These remains are of local significance (Low Value) and development is likely to remove these types of asset (Major Magnitude of Impact)

Shudrick Lane

Archaeological evaluation at Walnut Place recovered Bronze Age artefacts of Local significance (low Value) and development is likely to remove assets of this nature (Major Magnitude of Impact).

In terms of as of yet undiscovered buried archaeology both Shudrick Lane and Canal Way have very similar potential in terms of Prehistoric and Romano-British activity. It is not possible to state with certainty the significance, or the impact on these assets without further assessment.

Canal Way

Low Value

Major Magnitude of Impact

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Low Value

Major Magnitude of Impact

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Medieval

Canal Way

The area is within part of a medieval deer park of which there are 83 (source Somerset Historic Environment Record) in Somerset. There is no evidence of any surviving landscape features associated with the park within the proposal area. The significance of this asset is considered to be local so equating with DMRB Low Value. The impact on the park is considered to be Minor (slight alteration to asset).

Shudrick Lane

The area includes medieval lynchets (SHER has 110 records). These will be impacted by development possibly leading to complete removal of this asset. The lynchets are of Local significance (so Low Value) with complete removal potentially leading to a Major impact.

Canal Way

Low Value

Minor Magnitude of Impact

Neutral/Slight Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Low Value
Major Magnitude of Impact
Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Post Medieval

Canal Way
Within the area are earthworks representing a golf course that was used as a WWII base. This asset is of Local Significance (low Value) but could be subject to some removal (as only part of the asset lies within the proposal area) so a Minor magnitude of Impact.

Shudrick Lane
There is an anti-tank scarp with associated anti-tank posts within the area. This asset is considered locally important (Low Value). It is not possible to assess any direct impacts as the asset is on the boundary of the area but its setting will be very minor change (Negligible Magnitude of Impact).

Canal Way

Low Value
Minor Magnitude of Impact
Neutral/Slight Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Low Value
Negligible Magnitude of Impact
Neutral/Slight Significance of Effect

Cumulative Score

| | |
|--|--|
| Canal Way Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect | Shudrick Lane Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect |
|--|--|

In Conclusion in terms of archaeology both sites have equal scoring.

APPENDIX

Tables from DMRB

| SIGNIFICANCE (VALUE) | | FACTORS FOR ASSESSING THE SIGNIFICANCE (VALUE) OF HERITAGE ASSETS |
|----------------------|-----------|---|
| A | Very High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites); Assets of acknowledged international importance; and Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives. |
| B | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled Monuments (including proposed sites); Grade I and II* Listed Buildings; Undesignated heritage assets of schedulable or exceptional quality and importance; Conservation Areas containing very important buildings; and Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives. |
| C | Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated or undesignated assets that have exceptional qualities or |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | <p>contribute to regional research objectives; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade II Listed Buildings. |
| D | Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated and undesignated heritage assets of local importance; Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations; and Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives. |
| E | Negligible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest. |
| F | Unknown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of the resource has not been ascertained. |

Table 5.1 – Significance of Effects Matrix

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| VALUE | Very High | Neutral | Slight | Moderate/ Large | Large or Very Large | Very Large |
| | High | Neutral | Slight | Moderate/ Slight | Moderate/ Large | Large/ Very Large |
| | Medium | Neutral | Neutral/ Slight | Slight | Moderate | Moderate/ Large |
| | Low | Neutral | Neutral/ Slight | Neutral/ Slight | Slight | Slight/ Moderate |
| | Negligible | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral/ Slight | Neutral/ Slight | Slight |
| | | No change | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major |
| MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT | | | | | | |

3.0 Additional Highways Evidence

SCC work undertaken at the request of SSDC to enable the Highways Agency to take an informed view on the potential impact of development to the south west of the town on Southfields roundabout (27.02.14)

Calculations

The Shudrick Lane proposal originally included in the Local Plan consisted of 340 dwellings to the east of Ilminster. The Atkins Highway Capacity Assessment undertaken estimated two-way trip generation at a total of 136 Movements in the AM Peak and 162 in the PM Peak (rates of 0.400 and 0.476 respectively).

Of those, Atkins assumed that 21.2% of traffic would use the A303 Southfields Roundabout. These are mainly trips to/from Taunton Deane, Sedgemoor and Devon. It is reasonable to assume that eastbound traffic (e.g. to Yeovil) would use the B3168 Bay Hill assuming that suitable access was provided. This would result in around 29 AM movements and 34 PM movements at Southfields.

The new proposal (Proposed Main Modification 3) is for a development to the southwest of Ilminster, south of Canal Way. From this location traffic heading east on the A303 are more likely to use the Southfields Roundabout, and the majority of car trips not remaining within Ilminster are likely to travel in that direction. Based on 340 dwellings and 39.3% of car trips, this equates to 53 (AM)/64 (PM) movements through Southfields.

However it is implied by the Proposed Main Modification that the development size would be smaller – of the order of 305 dwellings. This would mean 48 AM and 57 PM movements through Southfields.

These assumptions and results are summarised in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Summary of assumptions and resultant movements through Southfields Roundabout

| Site | Peak | Two-way Trip Rate | Development Size (Dwellings) | % vehicles through Southfields | Movements through Southfields |
|-------------------------------|------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Shudrick Lane (340) | AM | 0.400 | 340 | 21% | 29 |
| | PM | 0.476 | 340 | 21% | 34 |
| SW Ilminster (340) | AM | 0.400 | 340 | 39% | 53 |
| | PM | 0.476 | 340 | 39% | 64 |
| SW Ilminster (Reduced to 305) | AM | 0.400 | 305 | 39% | 48 |
| | PM | 0.476 | 305 | 39% | 57 |

Conclusion

A site to the southwest of Ilminster is likely to make trips to/from the east (Yeovil, for example) more likely to pass through the Southfields Roundabout rather than use the B3168. Assuming trip generation and distribution are similar, and assuming that the size of

the site is reduced from 340 dwellings to 305, around 20 additional movements could be expected to pass through the roundabout during each peak. It should be noted however that many of these would still have joined/left the A303 further east.”