

**South Somerset District Council Local Plan 2011-2028  
Main Modifications**

**Examination in Public**

**Somerset County Council: Highways and Transport  
Representation**

May 2014

**Issue 1: Duty to Co-operate, public consultation and the  
Councils Overall Strategy**

**Note:**

Somerset County Council as the Highway Authority is submitting this written representation with regard to highways and transport matters only.

With regard to Issue 1, Somerset County Council as the highway authority wishes to make representation to the following questions:

Question 1.1 Has the Duty to Co-operate been complied with regarding the formulation of the Main Modifications?

Somerset County Council considers that South Somerset District Council has complied with the Duty to Co-operate with regard to highways and transport matters. This is referenced by the meetings that have been held with South Somerset District Council the minutes of which are contained in Appendix 1A.

## Appendix 1A

### Duty to Cooperate and Topic-specific meeting notes County Hall, Taunton Friday 14 February 2014, 10am – 1.30pm

#### 1. Duty to Cooperate (district wide issues)

*Attendees: Jo Manley (SSDC), Paul Browning (SCC), Paul Wheatley (SSDC), Keith Lane (SSDC).*

PW outlined Local Plan background, the Proposed Main Modifications (PMMs), and timetable for recommencement of the Examination. PB gave overview of Local Enterprise Partnership and Somerset Strategic Planning Conference – the next SSPC meeting is on March 20<sup>th</sup>. Planning needs to help deliver solutions to the issues raised by the LEP/production of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP).

**Action: SSDC to update Duty to Cooperate topic paper in advance of the hearing sessions.**

PB highlighted that Larry Burrows can provide assistance with ecology issues.

**Action: PB to send Service Level Agreement for PW to consider.**

#### 2. Transport / Highways capacity (Yeovil, Ilminster)

*Attendees: as item 1, plus Mark Clements (SCC), Andy Roberts (Highways Agency), James Purkiss (Halcrow on behalf of Highways Agency).*

PW highlighted the key findings of the latest Yeovil traffic modelling study. AR: key Highways Agency aims were to limit traffic growth on the strategic route network, and promote sustainable travel. MC: want to be ambitious with sustainable travel, but 50% non-car travel is not considered realistic or achievable. Potential options for re-drafting policy YV6 discussed: either keep a non-car target/requirement with a lower non-car proportion; or delete references to a non-car target/requirement, and have a criterion based policy only.

**Action: SSDC to consider necessary amendments to policy YV6, and send to MC, AR, JP for comments.**

MC: impact of the urban extension will be very similar wherever located, key concern was 50% non-car travel requirement.

Highways Agency are happy that further traffic modelling has been carried out, but would like to have time to consider the findings.

**Action: AR/JP to provide feedback on the latest Yeovil traffic modelling studies by Wednesday 19 February.**

AR/JP: the latest modelling studies would have been based on Cartgate roundabout without the forthcoming improvements (slip roads on to A3088)

programmed through pinch point funding – the report should ideally take this into account.

**Action: MC to provide traffic flow information from the model to the HA regarding Cartgate roundabout so that the HA are able to have an informed view on the traffic impact at this location, by Wednesday 19 February.**

AR mentioned the feasibility study being produced for the A303/358/30 with the aim of improving the strategic performance of the whole route. Funding is not necessarily guaranteed, but Ministers have said these potential improvements warrant “special attention”. The decision to fund or not will be announced just prior to the Autumn 2014 budget statement.

AR/JP: need some high level evidence for the impact of the Canal Way direction of growth at Ilminster on Southfields roundabout e.g. AM and PM peak. Not expecting this to be an issue, but would like evidence to inform the Highways Agency view.

**Action: MC to provide information to the HA regarding the potential level of traffic that could impact on the Southfields roundabout, to enable the Highways Agency to take a view on the traffic impact, by Wednesday 19 February.**

**Action: SSDC, SCC highways, and the Highways Agency to maintain regular communication up to the hearing sessions.**

### 3. Education (Yeovil, Ilminster, Castle Cary, Chard)

*Attendees: as item 1, plus David Clews (SCC) and Charlie Field (SCC)*

#### Yeovil

DC disappointed at the PMM to change from a single, larger sustainable urban extension at Yeovil to two smaller areas; as this removes an element of certainty about when and where a secondary school site could be delivered in Yeovil.

Work is required to more thoroughly understand the issues and options for delivering a secondary school in Yeovil. This includes a detailed assessment of the capacity within the existing 3 secondary schools, and the ability to increase capacity and for how long. This work should investigate the potential level of S.106 / CIL contributions, and given it is not possible to identify a site at this stage, outline how a long term strategy can be produced to resolve secondary school issues within Yeovil.

**Action: SSDC to consider preparing an Education topic paper containing scenarios and an action plan on delivering a secondary school in Yeovil.**

DC: useful evidence will be in the Schools Organisation Plan which compares school rolls against capacities; and the School Population Forecast 2013 – both documents are on the SCC website. Analysis on school catchment areas also exists.

**Action: DC will send analysis on school catchment areas to SSDC.**

DC did some work for Taunton Deane looking at growth in the housing trajectory and the number of children that this generates.

**Action: SSDC to work with DC to assess SSDC's housing trajectory and the number of school aged children this generates.**

#### Iminster

DC: Greenfylde has just been extended and is at capacity; there is potential capacity at Swanmead and Wadham. Need an additional primary school in Iminster, but this is not yet in the capital programme. The direction of growth at Canal Way gives greater certainty that a primary school can be delivered, especially as the land is owned by Somerset County Council.

#### Castle Cary

DC: Some scope to accommodate additional children within existing schools, however, no physical capacity to extend the size of the primary schools. There is potential for a new primary school in the direction of growth to meet future requirements. CF: a scheme is to be submitted shortly in the direction of growth including employment, a road and an identified site for a primary school.

#### Chard

There is a need for a new primary school at Chard as all 3 primary schools will be over capacity by 2017.

**Action: PW to discuss with SSDC Development Manager regarding contributions to a new primary school in Chard.**

#### **4. Historic environment / Archaeology (Yeovil and Iminster)**

*Attendees: as item 1, plus Steve Membery (SCC)*

#### Yeovil

SM: there is no connection between the Upper Mudford direction of growth and the settings of the West Mudford medieval settlement Moated site at Hinton Farm and the Deserted medieval village of Nether Adber designated assets, and English Heritage haven't raised an issue so development should be acceptable. The shrunken settlement adjacent to the north is not designated so not nationally significant – and is also some distance from the Sustainable Urban Extension. Need to separate landscape and historic environment issues.

SM: there is likely to be locally/regionally significant sub-surface archaeology in the Upper Mudford direction of growth – geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation should occur prior to developing a masterplan. There is potential to excavate if locally important, and also undertake archaeological outreach to inform the community of findings.

The Coker direction of growth requires mitigation, although the setting of the Roman Villa is largely confined to the site itself with little linkage to the outside world e.g. hedgerows are much more recent.

#### Iminster

JM: the Archaeological Issues report and later statement submitted by SM is sound.

### **5. Minerals**

*Attendees: as item 1, plus Guy Robinson (SCC) and Heather Brown (SCC)*

GR: Waste Core Strategy adopted last year – do Waste Site Allocations after completing the Minerals Plan. The Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme has recently been updated.

Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan (MLP) 'pre-submission' stage is due to begin in March 2014. Key issues for South Somerset are safeguarding, building stone, and oil and gas.

Discussion on SSCC comments submitted on Minerals Preferred Options, particularly on safeguarding. GR outlined this policy (SMP14) was to prompt dialogue, and whilst the MLP does provide a positive framework for small scale extraction for "needed" building stone types, potential including new areas of working, in practice safeguarding was more likely to be an issue if non-mineral development was proposed adjacent to existing minerals development sites.

### **6. Strategic Housing Market Assessment**

*Attendees: as item 1.*

PB: Reflecting changes to the planning system and revocation of the RSS, SCC have had no involvement in SHMAs since 2011 and there is no appetite for a county-wide SHMA as different districts relate to different areas – South Somerset is relatively self-contained.

PW: there is potential to update the SHMA – PB suggests doing this through Somerset Strategic Planning Conference, Strategic Housing Officers Group and Duty to Cooperate meetings.