

(1). Infrastructure planning evidence

(a).

(b). The 123 List

Transport. - Infrastructure needs a should be lengthened to accommodate any transport/ highway improvements needed between 2016 and 2028 - not just the listed site specific planning applications during this period as other more important highway infrastructure needs could come forward.

Flood risk management - Off site flood risk management works should be identified. Maintenance of The Keyford SUE, SUD as the sandy soil will soon block it up and cause flooding down below the site and on into Barwick and Stoford.

Outdoor Play Space, Sports, Community and Cultural facilities. - why only Primary and Local Market Towns in both sections? Why not in the many Rural Villages of South Somerset District Area ?

Sports Hall improvements or provision again in the many Villages 3G Synthetic Turf pitch improvements or provision. Village Need to be included.

These minor additions are need to be added to keep Rural Committees fit and healthy and give them and village meeting place if needed, as much as the big Urban, eg Westlands project needs funding .

(c). The Funding Gap - This is the most important consideration I believe. What justification or fairness is there in the discrepancy between. - The indicative gap of £124.1 million 106 money gained by the Council from now, 2016 until 2028 and the CIL charge will make very little significant contribution if it's value over the same period is estimated to be £14.6 million. DX meeting Agenda 12th May 2016. Neither will it be very large or fair amount of money over this period to the Parishes , who were led to believe that they would received infrastructure investment of 15% or 25% to off set the impact of large development up on their village's infrastructure and neither will 106's compensate them in the same way as they are not to be paid upfront as the Government has stated CIL should be.

(d). CIL. Rates should be applied fairly across the whole of South Somerset. Of course houses paying CIL will be disadvantage having to pay higher over all prices for their new properties and in particular the Rural Villages and paying CIL up front and subsidising the Urban / SUE prices against their "0" zero rated properties.

(e). Yes, because up front payments will ensure sites are built out within reasonable time.

(ii). Economic Viability Evidence

a). Viability study of setting effective residual valuation approach is a snap shot in time, and possibly unrealistic at this moment.

b). The Sue development, Keyford ,South. With 800 dwellings consisting of 30% affordable homes and infrastructure demands not only for internal roads but for the same infrastructure demands placed on the previous site plan originally designed for 1565 dwellings/ 2500 dwelling Etc. All this site infrastructure is still contained in the 800 dwelling site today and it is no wonder that it is unviable and not all needed with the lesser number and could be reduced. Local infrastructure could help support this site until perhaps the other future adjacent Garden City sites are developed and could take some of the present infrastructure at a later date. It is a huge on cost demand on 800 houses and a reduction to 25 % affordable homes may be more sustainable and deliverable and pay some CIL contribution. Assumptions need to be challenged.

(c). - ' Real World ' conditions. Are not being presented. Where are the prospective purchasers coming from?

(e). - There are other large sites around the urban Edge of Yeovil, which are very slowly developing and house prices in many instants are out of range in our low wage economy.

(f). Changed economic circumstances - With the up to the minute economic climate circumstances - all development should carry some CIL. This deliberation on viability has been continuing for far to long on the SUE site. We have been through prosperous times, recession , partial recovery, to the present day.

(e). CIL zoning map. Yes I believe it does result in anomalies and a perception of unfairness between urban and rural areas.

(ii). Conclusion - CIL will guarantee infrastructure to minimise the impact of development on communities with local improvements to help new communities blend to the local environment.

SSDC Issue 2 - 4316161 2. (1) Rate for residential charging informed and consistent With the evidence.

(i). No, a revised figure taken across all housing development would be seen to be fairer and more deliverable

(ii). No. An overall South Somerset District area CIL charge should be paid by the Yeovil South SUE Keyford, as the large disproportionate infrastructure remains. The only reduction is in the industrial and commercial development.

(iii) Affordable Housing should carry CIL because now in the future after a few years the properties can be purchased.

(iv). No All properties should bare CIL costs. (the lower the rate charged all round the SSDC Area the better) building may then flourish.

SSDC Issue 3. 4316161

3. ((I). Levy Rates - Again all rates should carry CIL the 123 list needs to be in place for the infrastructure needed. A reduction in 106 payments could improve the economic viability of sites considered vulnerable.

(ii). No time to comment

(iii) No time to comment

SSDC Issue 4 4316162

4. (i). If an appropriate balance between CIL and 106 taking is achieved at a sensible setting, then all parties will be encouraged to develop. We do not have the infrastructure to support large urban developments as large cities do who have Eco Towns / Sustainable Garden Cities designed to annex their peripheral edges. Yeovil is a small regional town.

(ii)

SSDC Issue 5 4316161

5 n Sadly there is no time left to address these issues . As the midnight deadline comes. Thank you.

With Regards

Cllr Gina Seaton