

West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan

(WM&CFNP)

2017-2028

Supporting Document

**Consultation Statement**

West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Councils

July 2017

## Consultation Document:

### Contents

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement	4
Those consulted include:	4
<b>Meetings</b>	6
With Ann Rhodes TDBC	6
WM & CF NP Monthly meeting	6
WM & CF Annual Parish meetings	7
West Monkton Parish Council Meetings	7
Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council Meetings	8
Creech St Michael PC Meeting	8
Creech St Michael NP Panel Meeting	8
Developers Consortium	8
<b>Communications</b>	8
Mailing Lists - NP Mailchimp	9
New Buildings & Development Mailchimp	
SWOT Analyses	9
Community Council for Somerset Schools Survey	11
Creech St Michael (neighbouring parish and Core Strategy)	11
WM & CF Consultant Consultation with Creech St Michael NP Group	12
Somerset JSNA 2011 Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment	12
Meetings for Research by Writing Groups	12
Recreation and Environment	12
Proposed Country Park Meetings	13
Environment Agency meetings	13
Canal & Rivers Trust	14

<b>Transport</b>	14
Consultation on Bus Shelters, Bus Services, Delivery of Infrastructure	
<b>Housing</b>	15
<b>Employment</b>	16
<b>Recreation</b>	22
Business Breakfast	22
Improve features and facilities	23
<b>Skills Base</b>	24
<b>Appendices</b>	
Community Council for Somerset: Young People Consultation	26
WM & CF meeting for Bus Services	32
Heathfield Coffee Morning	33
Pharmacy Team, NHS	37
National Grid Contact Information	39
TDBC Consultation List (as at February 2017)	40
<b>Hard Copy</b> (available on request)	
Residents Questionnaire	
Business Questionnaire	
Supplementary Questionnaire	
Schools Survey, CCS	

## **Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Consultation Statement**

The Consultation Statement provides:

- details of the people and the organisations consulted;
- details of how they were consulted;
- a summary of the main issues and concerns raised through the consultation process;
- a description of how these issues and concerns were considered, and addressed in the proposed NP.

The Neighbourhood Plan was launched in the two parishes of Cheddon Fitzpaine and West Monkton in July 2015, when a meeting of volunteers was called. Following the meeting, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was formed and a Chairman was identified. The Steering Group included Councillors and residents from both parishes. Other residents with expertise were adopted at appropriate times throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Following a meeting with Ann Rhodes, Policy Officer (Planning and Environment) Taunton Deane Borough Council and West Somerset Council the NP area was advertised prior to approval.

### **Those consulted include:**

- local residents via mailshot questionnaire (Residents' Questionnaire);
- local Councillors (Parish, District and County at Parish Council Meetings);
- local shopkeepers, businesses and major employers via mailshot (Business Survey);
- business organisations, Taunton Deane (TD) Chamber of Commerce, TDBC Economic Development Section (via email and phone);
- community groups, Canal & River Trust, Inland Waterways, Cycling Group, Coffee Morning groups (by personal interaction) Registered Social Landlord Warden (by personal interaction);
- educational establishments: West Monkton Primary School, Heathfield Secondary School, Cheddon Fitzpaine Primary School, Kings Hall Preparatory School (via Community Council for Somerset (CCS) School Survey);
- local Institutions: Tacchi-Morris Art Centre (by email);
- sports Groups: local Cricket Club and Rugby Club (by personal contact);
- health & Social Care Organisations: Crown Medical Centre, Public Health at Somerset County Council, regarding future provision of patient care and pharmacies (by parish contact and email).

**Volunteers for Steering Group work:** some residents, some councillors by advertisement in local newsletters and website.

Once the NP area was formally agreed, on 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> January of 2016, public exhibitions were held at Cheddon Fitzpaine Memorial Hall and West Monkton Village Hall to show the plan area, features of the landscape, details of the topography, drainage systems, and development plans. Those attending the exhibitions were invited to leave contact information if they wished to be further involved, and from this a mailing list of 139 addresses was developed which was used subsequently to keep residents informed by updates and to seek extra information on some topics. Following feedback from the exhibitions, a questionnaire was written which was sent to all households in the NP area in March 2016. Responses were encouraged via Survey Monkey and in hard copy. From the 2,500 questionnaires that were sent out, there were 420 responses. The responses were analysed using the Survey Monkey data analysis tools.

The results were made available to the public using the mailing list.

In addition to regular updates, the mailing list was used for a Supplementary Questionnaire, which was sent out in October 2016 to clarify some of the responses from the Household Questionnaire. From 139 recipients, 62 responses were received, and analysed using the Survey Monkey data analysis tools.

Throughout the period, the NP Steering Group met on the second Tuesday of the month at West Monkton Village Hall, once at Cheddon Fitzpaine Memorial Hall, and latterly at the Brittons Ash Community Hall (BACH). These meetings were open to members of the public. They were advertised on the CF website, WM website, and in CF Newsletter, and WM Village News. The record of the meetings was posted on both websites.

Throughout the process there have been regular meetings with Ann Rhodes, Policy Officer (Planning and Environment, Taunton Deane Borough Council and West Somerset Council), and Jane Birch, Community Involvement Officer, CCS. The purpose of the meetings has been to ensure that the development work of the WM & CF Neighbourhood Plan is in accord with current best practice, and in agreement with current TDBC and SCC policy. Contentious issues have been addressed at an early stage.

## **Meetings:**

**Ann Rhodes**, with Kelvin Tutill (Chairman) plus other members of the Steering Group from time to time:

5 August 2015

10 November 2015

14 December 2015

January 2016 (phone)

4 April 2016

27 October 2016

January 2017 (phone)

16 February 2017

1 March 2017

## **References from Ann Rhodes**

### **Neighbourhood planning**

[http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/How\\_to\\_write\\_a\\_consultation\\_statement.pdf](http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/How_to_write_a_consultation_statement.pdf)

### **Neighbourhood planning guidance**

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#consulting-on-and-publicising-a-neighbourhood-plan-or-order>

### **Neighbourhood planning regulations**

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/all?title=The%20Neighbourhood%20Planning%20Regulations%20>;

Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/schedule/1/made>

## **Build out rate of housing numbers:**

TDBC's projection of completion rates for all allocated sites.

The latest trajectory can be found in the 2015 SHLAA at

<http://consultldf.tauntondeane.gov.uk/portal/shlaa/shlaa2015?tab=files>.

**Jo Humble**, TDBC Housing Enabling Officer, with Kelvin Tutill:

13 June 2016

**Jane Birch CCS** and Kelvin Tutill with Cllr Norman Cavill and two clerks:

Tricia Cavill, Jo Pearson

7 January 2016

27 June 2016

**WM & CF Neighbourhood Plan monthly** meetings were advertised, held and open to the public.

30 June 2015 – WM Village Hall

27 July 2015 – WM Village Hall

8 September 2015 – WM Village Hall  
13 October 2015 – CF Memorial Hall  
10 November 2015 – WM Village Hall  
8 December 2015 – WM Village Hall

12 January **2016**- WM Village Hall  
9 February 2016 – WM Village Hall  
22 March 2016 – WM Village Hall  
5 April 2016 – WM Village Hall  
10 May 2016 – WM Village Hall  
14 June 2016 – WM Village Hall  
12 July 2016 – WM Village Hall  
9 August 2016 – WM Village Hall  
13 September 2016 – WM Village Hall  
18 October 2016 – 2 Hill Farm Cottages, WM  
No November meeting (policy writing)  
20 December 2016 BACH Bathpool

10 January **2017** BACH Bathpool  
7 February 2017 BACH Bathpool  
28 February 2017 BACH Bathpool

#### **Annual Parish Meetings:**

March 2016 Kelvin Tutill, Chairman of NP Steering Group addressed West Monkton APM  
Cllr Jason Woollacott, Steering Group Committee member addressed Cheddon Fitzpaine APM.

#### **West Monkton Parish Council Meetings**

##### **2015**

The meeting dates since the resolution to make a Neighbourhood Plan are given below. A report was given on the NP progress at each meeting.

12<sup>th</sup> August 2015 at which the resolution to make a Neighbourhood Plan was made, thereafter monthly reports given on 9<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> October, 11<sup>th</sup> November and 9<sup>th</sup> December.

##### **2016**

5<sup>th</sup> January, 10<sup>th</sup> February, 9<sup>th</sup> March, 13<sup>th</sup> April, 11<sup>th</sup> May (Annual Parish Council), 8<sup>th</sup> June, 13<sup>th</sup> July, 10<sup>th</sup> August, 14<sup>th</sup> September, 12<sup>th</sup> October, 19<sup>th</sup> November, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

##### **2017**

11<sup>th</sup> January, 8<sup>th</sup> February, 8<sup>th</sup> March, 12<sup>th</sup> April, 9<sup>th</sup> May (APCM), 13 June.

## **Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council Meetings**

### **2015**

(bi-monthly meetings): 9 July, 10 September, 12 November

### **2016**

(monthly meetings): 14 January, 11 February, 10 March, 17 March (Annual Parish Meeting), 14 April, 12 May (Annual Parish Council), 9 June, 14 July, 8 September, 13 October, 10 November, 8 December.

### **2017**

12 January, 9 February, 9 March, 13 April, 11 May (APCM), 1 June.

## **Creech St Michael (CSM) Parish Council Meeting**

11 April 2016 – Creech Village Hall (attended by Cllr Norman Cavill and two clerks Tricia Cavill, Jo Pearson).

## **Creech St Michael NP Panel Meeting**

12 May 2016 - WM & CF NP Consultant met with CSM NP Consultant

19 December 2016 – Creech Village Hall (attended by Cllrs Norman Cavill, Ray Tully, Jason Woollacott; NP Chairman Kelvin Tutill, and clerk Tricia Cavill).

19 January 2017 – WM & CF NP Consultant met with CSM NP Consultant

## **Meetings with Developers' Consortium**

These meetings were to share early ideas for Masterplanning and the relationship between Masterplanning and the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Summer 2016, Cheddon Fitzpaine Memorial hall

Sept/Oct 2016, Tacchi-Morris, Monkton Heathfield

Nov 30<sup>th</sup> 2016, BACH (Brittons Ash Community Hall) Bathpool

## **Communications**

All **Agendas and Minutes** have been posted on WM and CF websites.

Also, information was posted regularly in:

Cheddon Fitzpaine Link Up (parish monthly magazine)

Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Newsletter (bi-monthly – delivered to 800 households and on the website).

West Monkton Village News (bi-monthly delivered to 1000+ houses and on the website).



## Mailchimp

A Mailchimp mailing list of 139 subscribers was established following the public exhibitions in January 2016. This communication channel was regularly used to provide updates on the development of the NP, request feedback, and responses to supplementary questions.

Further regular reporting was undertaken using the Mailchimp mailing list called 'New Buildings & Development' which is run by a volunteer under the auspices of West Monkton Parish Council. It has 120 subscribers.

From the above meetings, the concerns raised were further explored by SWOT analyses and supplementary questionnaires and surveys.

## SWOT analyses

SWOT analyses were taken at four venues at gatherings of different sections of the community:

- coffee mornings attended by largely elderly residents;
- outside the Pre-school playgroup, where young parents and some grandparents took part;
- sports afternoon run by Knightstone Housing for local residents and their children;
- two separate coffee mornings were attended (different clientele/age profile at each) to discuss and inform about bus routes and services.

<b>SWOT Analysis Diagram</b>	
<b>STRENGTHS</b>	<b>WEAKNESSES</b>
Being close to the countryside	Lack of buses/inadequate bus shelters
Schools nearby	Lack of transport infrastructure especially regarding the Urban Extension
Good school provision: preschool, primary, secondary	Over stretched doctors' surgery, need pharmacy and dentist
Canal towpath a useful route for footpath and cycleway	Not enough parking space on roads in the new estates
Lots of green space/public open space	Not building enough bungalows
Good community spirit	Will there be enough work for occupiers of new houses?

Village hall	Need more consideration of habitats for wildlife
Safe environment for children	Need more cycle ways and safe routes to school
Close to amenities such as Wellsprings fitness centre and Stoney Furlong football ground	Busy and congested roads, speeding traffic, not safe for children
Good communications by newsletter and website	No dog wardens
Friendly	Not a village anymore
Good doctors' surgery	Fly tipping
	Police not highly visible
	Youths misbehaving in public places
	Congestion at all schools, caused by pick-up and drop off
	Not enough local shops
<b>OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<b>THREATS</b>
Use need for more bungalows to protect the views to the Quantocks and the Blackdowns	Over-development will cause concrete wasteland
Increase connectivity by more paths (cycleways and footpaths)	Bus gates/no busgates/loss of bus routes
Increase employment opportunities by providing more start up units	Insufficient preservation of hedgerows/green space/trees
Build in ways to clean streams and pathways regularly, construct wildlife corridors	More traffic, dangerous junctions
Maximise and increase local employment opportunities	More people – overstressing doctors' surgery and causing shortage of beds at Musgrove park Hospital
Increase provision of local stores/convenience store/pharmacy	Lack of community
Integrate new residents, build a community, make new friends	Lack of footpaths and cycleways
New intake for pre-school, new primary school building, new community hall	Increase in anti-social behaviour
Traffic calming by bus gates	

## **CCS Schools' Survey**

The two primary schools and the secondary school in the NP area were surveyed to ascertain the youth view. The private preparatory school in the NP area also took part in this survey, which was conducted by Community Council for Somerset. The questionnaire was devised following discussion between CCS and the NP Steering Group, then further refined by consultation with one of the primary school teachers. The survey was conducted by CCS and the results are presented at the end of this document. The purpose was to ascertain the aims and aspirations of the young people in the NP area in order to inform all four policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

## **Creech St Michael (A neighbouring parish also affected by growth plans in Core Strategy)**

The NP Steering Group Chairman, accompanied by some members of the Steering Group, attended a meeting with the Creech Saint Michael Neighbourhood Plan Panel in December 2016. The purpose of the meeting was to establish areas of common ground, as the two NP areas share a common boundary and the proposed Urban Extension at Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 will cover parts of West Monkton Parish and parts of Creech St Michael Parish. Common aims related to:

- road infrastructure;
- safe routes to school;
- good pedestrian and cycle routes that link to existing routes and possible improvements;
- use and control of public open space;
- flood alleviation measures.

Drainage off the Quantocks affects WM, CF and CSM parishes. The five main streams from the Quantocks are Kingston Stream, Maidenbrook, Dyers Brook, Allens Brook and Walford stream. These all drain into the River Tone. Of these five streams, the first four are in the WM and CF NP area, whilst Walford stream crosses the Creech St Michael NP area north south.

Assets common to both NP areas include the Bridgwater & Taunton Canal, which runs through both NP areas, providing a major cycle and pedestrian route into Taunton, and the railway line (Paddington to Plymouth) which has two unused lines that could offer leisure and recreational space, plus another route into Taunton.

## **Meeting between WM &CF NP Consultant with CSN NP Consultant**

The NP Consultant had a very positive meeting with Darren Summerfield of WYG Consultancy on 19 January 2017. CSM produced a very ambitious project plan for the next few months and hoped to have some outline policies in February 2017. An agreement to share information before the pre-submission consultation was made to ensure that the proposed plans were not conflicting and could indeed work together. It was agreed that ongoing liaison would be a positive step.

## **Somerset JSNA 2011 Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment (PNA)**

July/August 2016

Somerset Intelligence: Pharmacy

<http://www.somersetintelligence.org.uk/files/Somerset%20PNA%20Section%20II%207%20Taunton%20and%20Area%20280115.pdf>

It was discovered that no pharmacy was allocated to Monkton Heathfield in the planned period from 2011. Consequently, West Monkton Parish Council made a response to David Ward (Assistant Contract Manager, Pharmacy Team, NHS England, South West) in respect of PNA consultation.

*(Ref: Emailed correspondence with Dr Orla Dunn, Consultant in Public Health, Somerset County Council).*

## **Meetings for research by individual Writing Groups**

### **Recreation and Environment**

Member of Recreation and Environment Writing Group (M Chinnock) meeting with Somerset Wildlife Trust (SWT):

**Date:** 31 October 2016 at SWT office

**Attended by:**

SWT - Jolyon Chesworth - Nature & Wellbeing Manager

Belinda Wheeler - Landscape Ecologist,

WM & CF - Norman Cavill, Mike Thompson and Michael Chinnock

**Purpose of the meeting:** To introduce ourselves, run through the Environment based questions/responses on our NP questionnaire and to establish how we may be able to work together to achieve our NP aims and Somerset Wildlife Trust aims.

**Outcomes:**

1. The SWT wrote to us after the meeting as follows (and MC couldn't agree more with these comments)

*'it is good to know that our developing aspirations are aligned with yours and hopefully we can work together more closely in the future, we are certainly keen to expand community engagement and green space management across Taunton'.*

2. We were invited to, and attended, Green Forum meetings as follows:  
12 December 2016 (attended by Cllr Cavill and MC).  
23 January 2017 (attended by MC, Andy Pritchard (Friends of Farriers Green) and clerk).  
27 February 2017 (attended by MC, Andy Pritchard (Friends of Farriers Green) and clerk).

**Member of Recreation and Environment Writing Group (M Thompson) meeting with FWAG (Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group):**

16 June 2016: Ben Thorne, Senior Farm Conservation Advisor, FWAG Southwest (Ref: Natural Flood Management)

20 July 2016: Jenny Uglow at FWAG Southwest (Ref: Slow the Flow)

**Proposed Country Park**

25 August 2016: Meeting with the Crown Estate, James Denis, Crown Officers, TDBC Officers and Cllr Cavill to agree the 'in principle long lease' and establishment of a Country Park on fields between Maidenbrook and Yallands Hill, north of the A3259.

**Parish Council meetings with Environment Agency: (Ref: Flooding at Bathpool and environs)**

11 January 2016:

- John Southwell, Flood and Coastal Risk Management Advisor, Development & Flood Risk Technical Specialist)
- Somerset Partnerships & Strategic Overview Team, Wessex Area
- Members of the Parish Council
- Local volunteer - record keeping
- Chairman of the NP Steering Group
- Clerks of WM & CF Parish Councils.

16 January 2017:

- John Southwell, accompanied by John Viney, EA Asset Performance Team
- Chairman of the NP Steering Group
- Local volunteer- flood monitoring
- Clerks of WM & CF Parish Councils

### **Canal & Rivers Trust (CRT)**

7 November 2016: Meeting with Canals and Rivers Trust's Georgina Wood and CF and WM parish clerks to discuss the potential for a community cafe along the canal of which the Trust was very supportive. (This also provided background information for the Transport and Employment sections of the NP.)

## **Transport**

### **Consultation on bus shelters**

#### **September 2016**

Meeting with SCC Cllr J Fothergill, John Perrott SCC, Cllr N Cavill and 40+ local residents at Heathfield Community Hall to discuss improvements to the local bus service to improve services to hospitals, doctors and pharmacies.

#### **4 & 5 January 2017**

Coffee mornings at Heathfield Community Hall and West Monkton Village Hall. Mainly attended by users of public transport. The purpose of the meeting with these user groups was to establish user ideas for making the use of public transport more attractive, in support of the emerging policies in the Transport section. It was found that 29 people gave overwhelming support to the provision of bus shelters rather than post and flag bus stops.

### **Consultation on bus services**

#### **9 June 2016**

Site meeting to determine need and routes, which was attended by John Perrott (SCC Service Manager, Transporting Somerset), Jane Newell (SCC Servicing Commissioning Manager, Highways and Transport), two members of WM and CF Parish Councils, and both Clerks of WM and CF Parish Councils. Subsequently, John Perrott attended one of the coffee morning groups at Heathfield Community Hall to ascertain needs of local public transport users. Subsequent actions determined funds were made available and a route determined that would serve users in the NP area.

## **31 January 2017**

Meeting to discuss delivery of transport infrastructure in CF and WM under S106 agreements for Nerrols/Northwalls Grange Development. This meeting was attended by John Perrott (SCC Service Manager, Transporting Somerset), Dan Mawer (Principal Development Infrastructure Officer, SCC Economic and Community Infrastructure, Traffic and Transport Development Group), Rachel Mulcaire (Assistant Estates Officer, Asset Management of Taunton Deane Borough Council, and West Somerset Council), and the clerk of Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council.

## **Housing**

Informal consultation with TDBC Development Manager (31<sup>st</sup> January 2017) resulted in the following comments from the leader of the NP housing writing group.

1. Given the strong responses in the questionnaire I do not think it unreasonable to ask for 10% bungalows, given that none are currently being built, and that there is clearly a demand, in the main, for the older end of the market but also from single residents and to a lesser extent families with a particular need. The comment about 350 dwellings I presume comes from the Urban Extension figure of 3500. Of the 3500 25% will be social so the net figure, if attained, would be 2625 and therefore 262 bungalows. On the assumption that the whole number will take 14 years to build that is less than 20 bungalows a year, or 10 per developer assuming Persimmon and Redrow build everything. Provision of single story dwellings will create a more interesting roofline and will give the feeling of space, something that is necessary within a Garden Town.
2. Equally Policy H2 will ensure provision of dwellings across the market, not just family homes as are in the main being built at the moment. If we are trying to retain young people and families in the area we must ensure they have somewhere to live and if developers do not make provision then the existing stock will become more expensive and a proportion of these people will leave. Mortgages are available for apartments and small units and government and developer led schemes will enable them to become more affordable.
3. In response to H3 we have recognized that local stone used in older dwellings is not now available, but that a suitable equivalent will allow planners to insist on something that will break up the monotony of red and yellow bricks. This, coupled with the use of a natural slate, which is not much more expensive

than Eternit 'fibre cement' slates will create a more distinctive feel to the Garden Town.

4. I await Jo Humble's comments but as I understand it part rent /part buy units are more expensive than full low-cost rental and therefore with house prices rising, a higher provision of rental units will enable those who are unable to afford to buy to at least live in a new property with all the benefits that brings.

## Employment

Business questionnaire circulation was determined by an amalgamation of three sources: Royal Mail (PAF), Google and The Office for National Statistics (ONS).

Following consultation by a member of the Employment Writing Group with the owner of the existing Farm Business Units the following response was received. This offers support to NP Policies E1b Starter Units and to E2 Diversification of Farm Buildings

Quote from existing Farm Business Units Owner:

*'In the last year 2016 (I wasn't actually advertising for the full year so this is really without full advertising) and from only 1 online website called 'InstantOffices.com' we received approx. 30 enquiries of which:*

*six were for large space i.e. over 10 desks (one of these was for 20)*

*nine were for small space i.e. three or less*

*three or four were for studio space i.e. photography, upholstery*

*three or four were for service sectors i.e. dog grooming, beauty, hairdressing*

*five were medium size i.e. for eight or nine desks*

*In the past, we have also had enquiries for a Children's Nursery, a vet, a pet undertaker, and a couple of magazines.'*

A number of local, residential and commercial estate agents and other businesses were consulted, as detailed in Other Evidence.



Your Ref:  
Our Ref: MNPD/EK  
Date: 02 August 2016

Mr Kelvin Tuthill  
49 Greenway  
Monkton Heathfield  
Taunton  
TA2 8NF

Taunton Office: Residential  
13 Hammet Street  
Taunton  
Somerset  
TA1 1RN  
residential.taunton@gth.net

Dear Kelvin

**Re: Cheddon/West Monkton Neighbourhood Plan**

I write following our recent discussion regarding the emerging neighbourhood plan having now been able to consider further the subject of an appropriate mix of future housing for your Parish. I have now also been able to consult with colleagues.

Your Parish obviously encompasses quite a spread of different 'zones' with the communities spreading from the Quantock Hills fringe down to the Hankridge Farm development. The area also encompasses the 'urban extension' at Monkton Heathfield that is currently under construction.

In addition to the different styles of community that are involved, consideration also has to be given to the wider market place and demand that as agents we see on a day to day basis.

For any community to properly cater for demand, and in your case particularly to reflect the local attractions and facilities in particular both primary and secondary schooling, there needs to be a mix of housing sizes and types. It is inappropriate therefore to particularly focus upon starter homes or larger detached family houses and a broad brush should be adopted in that regard. Clearly with starter homes and three bedroom properties which are likely to appeal to the younger couples/early family mix, these should be kept more central to the community and within easy walking distance of both the schooling facilities and local shops as there is likely to be a good deal more pedestrian movement required. More established family groups will require larger properties and larger plot sizes and although there should be no attempt to completely separate these individual housing types, nevertheless their need to be so central is not so important and accordingly can be placed more on the fringes of communities.

It is also extremely apparent that there is a complete lack of bungalows in any new scheme as these are 'land hungry' and accordingly do not find favour generally with development companies unless they are already within an area dominated by single storey property. We nevertheless in the UK have an ageing population and as agents we experience strong demand for bungalows which, in general, now date on the whole from the 1970s period or older.

Residential | Lettings | Agricultural | Commercial | Development Land & Planning | Architectural Services | Auctions | Antiques Saleroom

**Partners:** Anthony Overhill FRICS FAAV (Chairman) Neil Biffen FRICS FAAV Michael Dukes MRICS Derek Biss FRICS FAAV Charles Clark MRICS FAAV Graham Ford  
Richard Webber MRICS Simon Havens MNAEA Justin Lowe MRICS Robert Venner MRICS FAAV Jeremy Bell FRICS FAAV Duncan Brown FRIBV  
William Handel MRICS FAAV Andrew Perry FNAEA (Residential Partner) Robert Clark MRICS (Commercial Partner)

**Associates:** Richard Sanders FRICS Mark Walters MRICS FAAV Sally Mitchell MRICS Sonia Matthews FARLA Andrew Wakinslaw  
Christopher Way Martyn Venner MRICS Stephen Allen Graeme Biffen MRICS FAAV Paul Ashton MRICS  
Nick Forrest Simon Gitsham MRICS Andrew Preston MRICS Robert Stone MRICS FAAV

Partnership Secretary: Susie Westcott



www.gth.net



There has been a deficit in this department therefore for some 30-40 years despite the general population age profile. Bungalows will need to be well located to local shops and bus routes although obviously not with any due proximity to the local schools.

The above comments obviously exclude any reference to 'affordable housing' which no doubt will be required in accordance with core strategies and section 106 agreements to have an ongoing provision of a minimum of 25% of any new releases.

I hope that these comments are helpful to you.

Yours sincerely



**Michael N P Dukes MRICS**

Partner

michael.dukes@gth.net

T 44 (0)1823 277121 F 44 (0)1823 336064



May 2017

I refer to our recent conversations regarding the above matter and your need for some market evidence from Agents dealing with local sale of property regarding policies within the emerging plan, in particular, the need for a minimum of 10% of private dwellings to be 1 & 2 bed starter homes and a minimum of 10% to be 1, 2 or 3 bedroom bungalows. I understand that the affordable housing element will remain as the usual 25% of the total.

It is evident from market trends in the last year or so that the demand for 'first time buyers' has returned at a reasonable level having been very quiet for several years due to combination of reasons, not least the availability of mortgage finance. We have seen a much-improved registration of 'first time buyers' within the past 12 months in particular and new build schemes for which we have been involved that have involved starter homes have been taken up extremely quickly indicating that the supply is considerably outstripped by demand. Accordingly, I consider that the policy for a minimum of 10% to be more than appropriate for starter homes.

As far as bungalows are concerned, there of course has been a complete dearth of the construction of any bungalows for a considerable period of years now despite our increasingly ageing population. I cannot recall (other than the odd one off) where a new scheme has involved bungalows within the Taunton Town area for many years and this is mirrored again with demand considerably outstripping supply.

Despite the fact that we are talking about a suburb area rather than the town itself, given the availability of local facilities as well as good communication links into the town centre, I am of the opinion that there should be a positive policy for bungalows within the emerging local plan policy for West Monkton.

I hope that this letter is sufficient for your current needs.

Yours sincerely,

**Michael Dukes MRICS** Partner Greenslade Taylor Hunt

T: +44 (0)1823 277121 | F: +44 (0)1823

336064 | [michael.dukes@gth.net](mailto:michael.dukes@gth.net) | [www.gth.net](http://www.gth.net) 13 Hammet Street Taunton TA1

1RN

The logo consists of the lowercase letters 'gth' in a white serif font, positioned on a red rectangular background.

Greenslade Taylor Hunt

---

WEST MONKTON/CHEDDON FITZPAINE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EMPLOYMENT GROUP RESEARCH

Enquiries made; opinions sought; conclusions reached from the following:

Estate Agents: Newton King, 55 East Street. Sept/Oct/Nov 2016.  
Fox and Sons, 52 East Street.  
Bradleys, 49, East Street.  
Connells, 53 High Street.  
Ware & Co, 53 Bridge Street.  
Wilson's, Magdalene Lane.  
Wilkie May Tuckwood (evidence submitted)  
Greenslade, Taylor Hunt, Hammett Street.

Chamber of Commerce Jane Burden, Administrator.

Federation of Small Businesses - Nicola Bailey- Local Administrator  
John Meyer – Regional Chairman

MJK Newspapers – Mike Rawlings, Proprietor.

*~ M/ra Caclant*

Fresh Farm Meats, Alan Hembrow.

Mail Box – Tom Whetton.

Mountfields Used Cars, Jack Matthews.

Johnsons Dry Cleaners, Claire Wright.

County Stores – Proprietor, Hugh Duder.

Somerset County Cricket Club – Andy Nash, Chairman.

Dr. John Scanlon – recently retired GP, Goosenford.

Colin Napper – Proprietor, Landmark Gardens. Upper Cheddon.

Dr Malcolm Lown - Chairman, Cheddon Village Hall Committee.

Brian Tanner, Former Chief Executive, Somerset County Council.

---

This resulted in one letter from one of the estate agents: 31 January 2017

Wilkie May & Tuckwood:

I have given much thought to the employment situation in Taunton both in the town itself and the surrounding parishes, for as long as I can remember (and considerably further back!!) Taunton has suffered from a 'brain drain' as aspirational young people have gravitated towards the cities firstly for University education and then later for high paying jobs, it seems a surprise that although Taunton seems to be able to support three large independent schools there is a distinct lack of high paying jobs.

The Economic Development Strategy for Taunton, 'Grow & Green. A New Economic Strategy for Taunton Deane, 2010' showed that the Borough is highly dependent on public sector jobs (40%) and re-balancing the local economy away from the public sector is a vital element of the new strategy. The strategy includes an analysis of the current allocations and plans for employment land within the Borough and recommends that the availability of one or more strategic sites with good motorway connections should be brought forward in the medium term.

If we could attract a series larger employers with quality high paying positions this would obviously help to stop young people leaving and encourage them to bring up families in this area,

However.....

In my opinion for long term sustainability of the region, our local authority must work much harder to attract small to medium sized businesses as this will create both localised wealth and far more job opportunities, additionally smaller businesses seem to be far more committed to using local suppliers for procurement than massive companies this then keeps wealth in our community, here at WMT we try to get all of our consumables firstly from Taunton, failing that Somerset, and I know for a fact that friends who run small business across the area all try to do the same.

TDBC must work much harder to make small business viable and profitable in this region and with that we will have a far more sustainable community

Kind Regards

John Wrelton

Managing Partner, Wilkie May & Tuckwood

Winchester House, Corporation St, Taunton, TA1 4AJ

[www.wilkie.co.uk](http://www.wilkie.co.uk)>Home | Wilkie May & Tuckwood | Estate agents in Bridgwater ...

[www.wilkie.co.uk](http://www.wilkie.co.uk)

Wilkie May & Tuckwood is an independent, progressive firm of estate agents founded in the early 1990's. We now have eight offices throughout Somerset and Devon



## Recreation

A number of meetings have been held locally to discuss ways to improve features and facilities throughout the NP.

- 02/02/16 Meeting with the Hestercombe Advisory Group to discuss ways of improving local facilities.
- 01/06/16 NP Meeting.
- 16/06/16 Meeting with FWAG's Ben Thorn, Mike Thompson and Cllr Cavill to discuss potential environmental improvements.
- 20/07/16 Joana Uglow, Mike Thompson and Cllr Cavill – FWAG – with Mike Thompson to walk potential sites.
- 08/16 20+ people to discuss the need for a better and more reliable bus service.
- 25/08/16 Meeting with the Crown Estate, James Denis, Crown Officers, TDBC Officers and Cllr Cavill to agree the 'in principle long lease' and establishment of a Country Park on two fields between Maidenbrook and Yallands Hill north of the A3259.
- 07/09/16 Meeting with SCC Cllr Fothergill and 40+ local residents to discuss improvements to the local bus service to improve services to hospitals, doctors and pharmacies.
- 04/10/16 Meeting with the Hestercombe Advisory Group to discuss ways of improving local facilities.
- 31/10/16 Meeting with SWT to discuss potential for wildlife improvements.
- 07/11/16 Meeting with Canals and Rivers Trust's Georgina Wood and CF and WM parish clerks to discuss potential community cafe along the canal of which the Trust were very supportive.

The 'One Team' in Halcon, including Sgt Murphy, organised various sports games which produced many health and well-being benefits.

## Business Breakfast

### 20 January 2017

Organised by South West Business Insider at Sedgemoor Auction Centre and attended by WM Parish Councillor and WM Clerk to discuss future benefits to the Somerset area of Hinkley Point C. The purpose of attending the business breakfast was to gather information about how the NP area would benefit with reference to Employment, Transport and Housing.

*(Ref: South West Business Insider Magazine: December 2016, Vol 10, No. 10, Hinkley Point C Special Report.)*

**A number of meetings have been held locally to discuss ways to improve features and facilities throughout the NP**

**Hestercombe Gardens Trust Community Advisory Group**

**2 February 2016**

Meeting initiated by Hestercombe with Community Groups within the Parish (Memorial Hall, Church, School, Parish Council, Hestercombe Gardens Trust (HGT) to discuss ways of improving local facilities. District Councillor Cavill and County Councillor Fothergill also attended. Liaison is important as HGT is part of the Recreation and Environment section of the NP as Hestercombe House & Gardens straddle the boundary between the two parishes.

**4 October 2016**

Met to discuss ways of improving local facilities.

**Knightstone Housing Group: 2 June 2016**

Sports Event – Stoney Furlong. SWOT analysis undertaken with residents and other supporters.

**Public Consultation – six weeks**

The public consultation has taken place in April/May 2017 via newsletters, public flyers, and the relevant NP websites. Hard copies were available at TDBC offices, Taunton Library and both Parish Clerks.



## Skills Base – Steering Group Members

The skills brought to the NP steering group include: Management, Engineering, Building, Technology, Landscaping, Strategic Planning, Lecturing, Finance, and Eco-sustainability.

Some Members of the two Parish Councils volunteered for the NP Steering Group, whilst a number of local residents, having expertise in particular fields, came forward to be members of the NP Steering Group.

- ✓ Retired Managing Director of National House Building Company with responsibilities for staffing, budget, sales, construction, technical issues, land acquisitions and planning approvals.
- ✓ Broad range of Management Experience in retail, transport, health, security and agriculture
- ✓ National and International Expert in sustainability and energy efficiency in the construction industry as a practitioner, project manager, author and consultant.
- ✓ IT Architect/Consultant with more than 26 years' experience across a variety of industry sectors
- ✓ Retired Police Officer, Chairman of Magistrates Bench, Associate of County Cricket Ground, and Rugby Club.
- ✓ Government policy writer
- ✓ Two Taunton Deane Borough Councillors – totalling 50 years' experience (one from each Parish)
- ✓ Engineering and Management Qualifications
- ✓ Programme/Project Management in an international IT Company
- ✓ Chairman of Primary School Governing Body, and Schools Governance Finance.
- ✓ Further Education and University Lecturers, including Adult and Community Education
- ✓ Commercial Insurance Underwriter experienced in analysis and research.
- ✓ Members of the Somerset Wildlife Trust and Inland Waterways Association.
- ✓ Volunteers in Community and Environmental Organisations
- ✓ Aeronautical Transportation Specialist
- ✓ Landscape architect and Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute
- ✓ Planning department, local government
- ✓ Psychologist managing Mental Health Charity
- ✓ Collective Experience in Private Enterprise
- ✓ Public Sector and Private Company Directors
- ✓ Technical Writer
- ✓ Five Parish Councillors (from both Parishes)
- ✓ Parish Clerks of both Parishes, qualified in Certificate in Local Council Administration, CILCA

## **Appendices**

Residents Questionnaire – sent to 2,500 houses (March 2016).

The information gathered from community engagement is very important but it should be clarified these are the subjective views of the existing population, and, in the case of West Monkton, there will be, in effect, a new community the size of a small town.

Supplementary Questionnaire (September 2016).

Schools Questionnaire (October 2016).

Business Questionnaire, sent to 150 businesses (November 2016).



Image above moved inwards

# West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan

## Young People Consultation

Conducted by  
The Community Council for  
Somerset, October 2016.

Telephone **01823 331222** |  
**www.somersetccc.org.uk**

Email [info@somersetccc.org.uk](mailto:info@somersetccc.org.uk)



**Community Council for Somerset, Victoria House, Victoria  
Street, Taunton TA1 3JZ**



The Community Council for Somerset is a Company Limited by Guarantee,  
Registered in England & Wales No. 3541219, and is a Registered Charity No. 1069260

© 2015 This report, or any part, may be reproduced in any format or medium, provided that is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The source must be identified and the title of the publication specified with the copyright status acknowledged.

## Young People Consultation

The West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan group commissioned CCS to carry out a consultation with the young people who live and/or go to school in the parish. The group had already carried out an extensive consultation through a household questionnaire which was delivered to all homes in the parishes. This additional piece of research was carried out to ensure all parts of this community were involved in the process and that their views, ideas and ambitions for their community can be included in the plan.

## How did we do it?

To capture a snapshot of the views of the young people it was decided that it would be most effective to work through the schools as these are inclusive, all young people will be included in these as opposed to out of school activities which would attract different groups of young people with different issues/concerns/views. In the West Monkton school, Heathfield community school and Kings hall school, the consultation was carried out with the school council.. Each school has a school council which has representatives from each year group. The young people volunteer to be school councils and are aware of their responsibility to represent their year group not just their own views. In Cheddon Fitzpaine school it was the yr 6 students who were consulted.

We consulted West Monkton Church of England Primary School (Reception to Yr 6), Cheddon Fitzpaine Church School (Reception to Yr 6), King's Hall School (Reception to Yr 8) and Heathfield Community School (Yrs 7 to 11).

We used a series of questions which were given to each young person consulted. These are the questions we used:

1. What do you like most about living here?
2. What don't you like about living here?
3. What would you like to see here in the future?
4. What do you like to do in your free time?
5. What would you like to be able to do in the future in your free time?
6. How do you feel about walking or cycling to school? Do you feel safe?
7. What do you want to do when you grow up?
8. How can we protect the environment in our area?
9. We've been thinking about community orchards and space to grow vegetables, is this something you'd like to get involved in?

## The Results

The results of the consultation were inputted and categorised in an Excel spreadsheet. From this we can see what are the main outcomes from the questions.

### 1) What do you like most about living here?

The main things young people like about living here are the access to and seeing the countryside and wildlife - this is relatively more important to the older age groups.

They all enjoy living near friends and with younger children being able to play in the parks being really important.

## 2) What don't you like about living here?

The main things young people don't like about living here is the amount of traffic, both congestion and speeding traffic. Other themes to emerge are lack of enough or poor play equipment in parks or near enough to their homes. Also a number commented on the lack of shops in the local area, particularly students from Heathfield who miss the village shop outside the school.

## 3) What would you like to see here in the future?

More sporting and recreational facilities are the key areas the young people would like to see in any future development in the parishes. The overwhelming majority would like to see a multi purpose swimming pool aimed at sports development as well as leisure use – particularly catering for those want to take part in water sports and diving.. Additional facilities include more outside space for sports such as football, rugby, cricket, tenniskateboarding, and suitable facilities gymnastics and trampolining. The younger respondents were keen to have more play parks and better equipment in existing parks.

Young people from all age groups would like more cycle paths for safer cycling as they felt scared or unsafe cycling on the roads. There was also demand for a fishing lake.

## 4) What do you like to do in your free time?

The answers to this question mirror to a large extent the demands expressed in Question 3. The main activities being swimming, playing in the park, football, playing with friends, gymnastics, rugby, cricket, tennis and playing computer games.

5) What would you like to be able to do in the future in your free time?

There was a wider variety of response, and the main areas are swimming, playing more football, play more sports generally, horse riding, going for bike rides, playing on good equipment at the park.

6) How do you feel about walking or cycling to school? Do you feel safe?

Of those who did it the majority of young people felt safe walking or cycling to school. The findings suggest that some of the respondents are not cycling to school because the roads and paths are too narrow. However there were a number of comments that cycle paths were too narrow to use or the roads are not suitable for cycling as too narrow. Once again, the young people would like more cycle paths to make it easier to cycle.

7) What do you want to do when you grow up?

There was a huge range of responses, the most common ones are a teacher and footballer. Other responses include astrophysicist, paramedic, actor, soldier, sportsman, vet, inventor, window cleaner, dentist, wedding dress designer, dancer, carpenter, scientist, work in the music industry and photographer.

8) How can we protect the environment in our area?

The majority felt that we should plant more trees and flowers, create wildlife areas and reduce litter. The young people also felt that we should increase recycling and grow more of our own vegetables and that more allotments would encourage this.

9) We've been thinking about community orchards and space to grow vegetables, is this something you'd like to get involved in?

The large majority would like to get involved – see results below.

65%	Yes they would like to get involved
34%	No they would not like to get involved
1%	Maybe

## Conclusions

As you can see from these consultation results there are some main themes which the young people would like to be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, these are:

- 1) The best things about living here are the access to the countryside and other green space including play parks and being part of a community and close to friends.
- 2) The most negative things about living here are traffic congestion and speed and the lack of suitable quality play equipment and space.
- 3) The young people are already participating in sports, and they are keen to remain active and take part in more sport and so want the facilities to do this. They are asking for provision for swimming, football, rugby, cricket, tennis, gymnastics, trampolining and skateboarding.
- 4) There is also a need for more cycle paths to help them to travel around the area safely and increase bike use.
- 5) The majority of young people consulted are keen to get involved in community orchards and growing vegetables.



## WEST MONKTON PARISH COUNCIL

Notes of a meeting with John Perrett and Jane Newell SCC Transport at Crown Medical roundabout on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016

Present: Cllrs Woollacott and Cavill, Clerks Pearson and Cavill, SCC Officers J Perrett and J Newell.

The transport section at SCC is not a statutory consultee and officers have found it difficult to tie in with development and highway plans for the WM and CF areas. It appears there are moves afoot within County Hall to rectify this. The section understands the need to be involved in the Masterplanning for the next phase of the Core Strategy, 3500 houses; and they are now aware that a Rapid Transport System is part of the proposals. They agree that unless a bus service is in place, the culture of the new development will become set on using the car.

SCC has no funds to subsidise bus services, but can liaise with commercial enterprises to try to ensure the area is covered. They are creating a one stop portal to allow users to check bus timetables, routes etc and book tickets. It was suggested that in the Travel Plan for new residents in the Urban Extension a smart card bus pass could be included rather than residents having to make an application for a bus pass.

The officers now appreciate the distances involved, and the pressures on the need for bus service connections to post offices, surgeries and pharmacies. The Urban Extension at MH and soon the large estate at Nerrols are affected. They are trying to commission a circular route to visit all outlying rural settlements, which would then have to stand alone.

The choice of the PCT not to provide either a surgery or a pharmacy in the 1000 house local plan part of the Urban Extension was noted – this puts pressure on transport links between MH and the surgery and post office in Creech St Michael as well.

Use of the S106 funds from DWH (Nerrols) allocated to bus shelters was discussed even though currently there is no bus service. Depending on how the S106 is worded it may be possible to use the S106 money to provide a tarmac footpath from the footpath at the corner crossing place to the bus stop, by the roundabout on the Bridgwater side of the road.

There are funds to support establishment of community transport initiatives – needs volunteer drivers. An online toolkit is available on SCC website. Not suitable for entrepreneurial commercial enterprise (other considerations, HSE, DDA, CRB etc etc).

Tricia Cavill, Clerk

12<sup>th</sup> June 2016

## West Monkton Parish Council

Attendance at Heathfield Community Hall coffee morning as follow up to deputation of residents to Parish Council meeting on 10th August 2016

In attendance: Cllr Fothergill SCC, Cllr Cavill TDBC, John Perrett SCC, Tricia Cavill Parish Clerk; about 20 residents of the parish.

John Perrett explained the existing provision.

Commercial bus companies had cut the service provision in a small section of the network i.e. from Monkton Heathfield to Cheddon Road.

He explained that currently the County Council has very little influence over the non-subsidized First Bus services, which are run purely commercially.

There are subsidized services over which SCC has influence, including Slinky Bus and the volunteer driver scheme. The Slinky 16 seater minibus bus requires 24 hour booking in advance and only runs on certain days, residents were urged to make use of this service if the days are appropriate. Medical appointments will be prioritized if this information is given at the time of booking. Concessionary bus passes can be used on the Slinky Bus.

John Perrett then explained what the current and future situation was.

The Monkton Heathfield Urban Extension has a Travel Plan which has to be delivered by the Developers when certain conditions (e.g. number of houses occupied) are reached. The trigger for SCC to claim the first 50% of the travel subsidy has been reached so the letter requesting the funds has been sent to Persimmon. Once the funds have been received by SCC, tenders will be invited to deliver a bus service which is currently envisaged to be a circular route linking all parts of the Monkton Heathfield area (old and new) to go down to the Crown Medical Centre, on into the railway station, Taunton town centre and possibly to Musgrove Park Hospital (if time allows) and back. The SCC subsidy should ensure that the bus service would be supported for its first 5 or so years by which time it should have gained commercial viability.

The developer response to the letter requesting the funds should not be long, as it is a S106 agreement that the developer will pay the agreed sum. It is hoped that the funds will be received within the next few weeks after which the new service can go out for tender. J Perrett's team will draw up a proposed route and a bus timetable which the Parish Council will be asked to comment upon before it goes out to tender.

Other comments:

Comments were made about the current state of the buses not being cleaned very effectively, and the ride rattles along. *These comments will be conveyed to the Local Manager of First Bus by J Perrett at his regular meeting on Friday.*

The exact location of the new bus shelters outside the Local Centre and the school was questioned – *This was later checked on the plans and found to be as explained, in the laybys provided outside the Local*

*Centre and the Primary School. The person who made the comments was phoned with the response at 2.00pm today.*

The dangers associated with the bus stop opposite the Butchers shop on the A3259 were noted, also lack of Bus Shelter. *The plans for the Hartnells development were checked. These plans show a pavement on the farm side of the road, with a new bus shelter on that side, and crossing points are also shown. The existing bus shelter on the Taunton side will be moved down the road a little. The plan is on TD website application 48/13/0008, and can be viewed at the Deane House.*

Councillor Fothergill will be taking this forward, please contact him directly [djafothergill@somerset.gov.uk](mailto:djafothergill@somerset.gov.uk) or via the Parish Clerk [clerk.westmonktonpc@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:clerk.westmonktonpc@yahoo.co.uk)

## **Second Bus Meeting: 31 January 2017 – 2.00pm**

### **In attendance:**

Dan Mawer, SCC Principal Development Infrastructure Officer

John Perrett, SCC Service Manager, Transporting Somerset

Tom Main, (title unknown, but Support Officer)

Rachael Mulcaire, Assistant Estate Officer

Jo Pearson, Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Clerk

### **After introductions:**

S106 made Dec 2010 with Crown, but when land sold to developer (DWH) takes on the obligations to carry out the S106 legal requirements.

Martin Payne was Director of Taylor Wimpey – now Director of David Wilson Homes. (Jo had contacted in past regarding Adoption of Maidenbrook!).

1.11 page 3 bus furniture

1.77 – no fixed Travel Plan in place yet, but this paragraph refers to the ‘measures’ to be met.

1.78 refers to Travel Plan £25k, and Co-ordinator £4k

(In due course), RM to apply for ALL £70k Bus Stop Contribution in one sum. DWH has legal obligation to pay sum in 20 days.

Bus Stops and Furniture to go where previously specified (2 at CMC on A3259, and 8 on Nerrols Drive). No bus stops on eastern portion of A3259 as all Northwalls Grange houses are within 400m of Nerrols Drive.

J Perrett to contact Albert Ward (also SCC) regarding the application/commencement of the Travel Plan.

Travel Plan Co-ordinator is an SCC officer. JP/DM to identify person and report to RM.

Currently, no buses run north/south on Nerrols Drive – therefore it would seem impractical to spend £70k on Bus Furniture that is not required (at present).

No. 3 Bus used to run on Nerrols Drive – but this was with S106 money from Bishops Hull to Taunton Centre and on to Priorswood.

**Discussion took place** regarding the provision of buses, and timing when future developments come onstream.

260 houses in Phase 1.

Up to 340 houses in Phase 2 - though no information forthcoming from Crown at present time as to when this planning application will come forward.

Possible 300 houses on 'Trust Land' adjacent to Lyngford Lane/north of Priorswood (outside Cheddon Parish) – proposed in the future.

**Total 900 houses** on eastern side of Nerrols Drive to be built over (possibly) 10 years.

**Thoughts:** It would seem practical to establish a bus shelter on A3259 at CMC – AND link the footpath on the northern side of the road to Nerrols Drive. 40 yds @ £1k p/metre - £40k.

DM suggested the first Bus Shelter installed by TDBC (£3k) and Cheddon Parish (£2k) should be reimbursed by the Developer. It was not known that this bus shelter was covered by S106 at the time of installation as the Developer had not been chosen by the Crown in 2014 when planning commenced.

With SCC support, and discussion with DWH undertaken, this may be a sensible way forward.

DM/JP to investigate and report back to RM/Parish Clerk.

# West Monkton Parish Council

Response to David Ward Assistant Contract Manager, Pharmacy Team, NHS

England, South West

25<sup>th</sup> July 2016

West Monkton Parish Council is grateful to have been included in the consultees regarding the unforeseen benefits applications from three pharmacies relating to Monkton Heathfield, and wishes to place the following comments on the record.

West Monkton Parish Council received copies of three applications which were forwarded to TDBC Economic Development Unit; and Mrs J Moore, Planning Officer responsible for the Monkton Heathfield Urban Extension, was informed.

The email dated 22<sup>nd</sup> July was the first time any of the supporting documents had been received by WMPC.

Statement: 'fail to satisfy Regulation 18 of the NHS (Pharmaceutical Services) Regulations 2014 as an application to secure an improvement of better access to the existing pharmacy network if the need had been identified with the Health and Well Being Boards Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment (unforeseen benefit). The Area Team must have regard to reasonable choice, service innovation, and a protected characteristic being able to access pharmaceutical services'.

The case is made by 'Well' and 'Boots' that the applicants have failed to identify the residents with protected characteristics in the locality, and failed to identify specific health needs that the pharmacy would meet should the application be granted. Resistance by 'Boots' to expansion by other pharmacists is hardly surprising, but is not conducive to a healthy commercial competitiveness in provision to the local and growing community.

The email from Nigel Woollcombe-Adams dated 14<sup>th</sup> July contains a crucial error. He states '...and of course the Boots Pharmacy *at the heart of* Monkton Heathfield situated at the Crown Medical Centre...'. My italics – this is factually incorrect as the Crown Medical centre is located at Priorswood, in Taunton, and is far from the heart of Monkton Heathfield, and not even within the Parish of West Monkton.

Many of the residents of the parish of West Monkton (including Monkton Heathfield) are registered at the Crown Medical Centre, which is reached by car in about 8 -10 minutes. It is not suitable for pedestrians to walk, as there is no pavement for the final stretch of the route along the A3259, which is a

double carriageway, very busy road, being one of the routes out of Taunton to Bridgwater. The route for a pedestrian living in the older settlement of Monkton Heathfield is circa 1.2 miles, whilst a resident of the new Urban Extension could be as far as 1.8 miles away. Currently there is no direct bus service connecting Monkton Heathfield to either the Crown Medical, Creech St Michael, or Priorswood pharmacy. The pharmacy at Priorswood and the Creech St Michael pharmacy are too far to consider walking, being respectively circa 1.8 and 2.5 miles from Monkton Heathfield.

The letter from Dr Yoxall for the Somerset LMC may not be correct in stating there is a 100 hour pharmacy at Sainsbury's on the southern edge of the site. SINE states that there are no 100 hour pharmacies in Taunton and Area Federation, but quotes that '...Sainsbury's pharmacy at Hankridge Farm by Junction 25 of the M5 does currently open for 86 hours per week...'. It is not known if this continues to be the case<sup>[1]</sup>. However, it should be noted that Sainsbury's is some distance from the southern edge of the site, and separated from it by the railway, the canal, the river and the area designated as employment land, it is between 3 and 4 miles from the new houses.

The applications have come in as a result of the Urban Extension currently being built as part of Taunton Deane's Local Plan, and continuing as part of Taunton Deane's Core Strategy. The current Local Plan development is for 1000 houses, a 14 class primary school, a Local Centre of five or six retail units, a Community Hall, and employment land. Circa 500 homes are already occupied and the school will open in October. The next phase under TD Core Strategy is for 3500 dwellings, plus schools, a District Centre and employment land: Masterplanning is due to start at this time, if not already started. The Core Strategy runs until 2028.

The SINE Somerset Pharmaceutical Needs assessment runs from 2015 – 2018. The forecasting states that '...if a gap were to emerge it is most likely to be in such peripheral housing estates where access to existing providers is for whatever reason difficult'. This is already the case, particularly for the residents at either end of the age spectrum who may not have access to private transport. The new Urban Extension has a network of walkways and cycleways within the estate. The difficulties arise beyond the estate, since trying to reach the Crown Medical pharmacy involves to a lesser or greater degree the use of major roads, the A3259 (having been already mentioned) and the A38 Eastern Relief Road.

West Monkton Parish Council would respectfully suggest that the nature and scale of the development has not been taken into account by the PNA, and that a pharmacy in the Local Centre would address a pharmaceutical need within the period of the current PMA and therefore these applications should be allowed.

Tricia Cavill, Clerk  
West Monkton Parish Council  
1<sup>st</sup> August 2016

---

1. Federation & Somerset Pharmacies Dispensing GP and Population Figures at July 2014

Consultation Details for National Grid who should be consulted on site specific proposals that could affect their infrastructure:

Robert Deanwood  
Consultant Town Planner  
n.grid@amecfw.com  
Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK  
Gables House  
Kenilworth Road  
Leamington Spa  
Warwickshire  
CV32 6JX

Spencer Jefferies  
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid  
box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com  
National Grid House  
Warwick Technology Park  
Gallows Hill  
Warwick  
CV34 6DA



## Consultation List TDBC as of February 2017

Body	Postal address	Email address
West Somerset Council	-	<a href="mailto:a.rhodes@tauntondeane.gov.uk">a.rhodes@tauntondeane.gov.uk</a>
Taunton Deane Borough Council	-	<a href="mailto:a.rhodes@tauntondeane.gov.uk">a.rhodes@tauntondeane.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Highways	Highways Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:transportpolicy@somerset.gov.uk">transportpolicy@somerset.gov.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:smills@somerset.gov.uk">smills@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Education	Education Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:MWLewis@somerset.gov.uk">MWLewis@somerset.gov.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:jrfrost@somerset.gov.uk">jrfrost@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Children & Young People	Children & Young People Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:jbrown@somerset.gov.uk">jbrown@somerset.gov.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:LEDavey@somerset.gov.uk">LEDavey@somerset.gov.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:childrens@somerset.gov.uk">childrens@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Libraries	Libraries Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:generalenquiries@somerset.gov.uk">generalenquiries@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Biodiversity	Biodiversity Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:LBurrows@somerset.gov.uk">LBurrows@somerset.gov.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:AFSerjeant@somerset.gov.uk">AFSerjeant@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Rights of Way	Rights of Way Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:rightsofway@somerset.gov.uk">rightsofway@somerset.gov.uk</a>

Somerset County Council - Water Management and Flood Risk Manager	Water Management and Flood Risk Manager Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:flooding@somerset.gov.uk">flooding@somerset.gov.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:swebster@somerset.gov.uk">swebster@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Somerset Health and Wellbeing Board	Somerset Health and Wellbeing Board Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:JAJackson@somerset.gov.uk">JAJackson@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Heritage and Archaeology	Heritage and Archaeology Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:steve.member@swheritage.org.uk">steve.member@swheritage.org.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Minerals and Waste	Minerals and Waste Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:mineralsandwaste@somerset.gov.uk">mineralsandwaste@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Somerset County Council - Spatial Planning	Spatial Planning Somerset County Council County Hall Taunton TA1 4DY	<a href="mailto:pvbrowning@somerset.gov.uk">pvbrowning@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Coal Authority		<a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</a>
Homes and Communities Agency		<a href="mailto:mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk">mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk</a>
Natural England		<a href="mailto:amanda.grundy@naturalengland.org.uk">amanda.grundy@naturalengland.org.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:Simon.stonehouse@naturalengland.org.uk">Simon.stonehouse@naturalengland.org.uk</a>
English Heritage		<a href="mailto:caroline.power@english-heritage.org.uk">caroline.power@english-heritage.org.uk</a> <a href="mailto:ross.simmonds@english-heritage.org.uk">ross.simmonds@english-heritage.org.uk</a>

Network Rail Infrastructure Limited		<a href="mailto:townplanningwestern@networkrail.co.uk">townplanningwestern@networkrail.co.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:Barbara.Morgan@networkrail.co.uk">Barbara.Morgan@networkrail.co.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:Lisa.Bullock@networkrail.co.uk">Lisa.Bullock@networkrail.co.uk</a>
Highways Agency		<a href="mailto:planningsw@highwaysengland.co.uk">planningsw@highwaysengland.co.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:andy.roberts@highways.gsi.gov.uk">andy.roberts@highways.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Marine Management Organisation		<a href="mailto:angela.gemmill@marinemangement.org.uk">angela.gemmill@marinemangement.org.uk</a>
BT	PM Hastings BT, Exbridge House, Commercial Road, Exeter EX2 4BB	
Open Reach		<a href="mailto:newsitereception@openreach.co.uk">newsitereception@openreach.co.uk</a>
Mobile Operators Association		<a href="mailto:ginny.hall@monoconsultants.com">ginny.hall@monoconsultants.com</a>
Vodafone & O2		<a href="mailto:EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk">EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk</a>
EE [mobile]		<a href="mailto:public.affairs@ee.co.uk">public.affairs@ee.co.uk</a>
Three [mobile]		<a href="mailto:jane.evans@three.co.uk">jane.evans@three.co.uk</a>
National Grid		<a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a>
Western Power Distribution		<a href="mailto:land@fulfordsland.co.uk">land@fulfordsland.co.uk</a>
Wales & West Utilities		<a href="mailto:enquiries@wwutilities.co.uk">enquiries@wwutilities.co.uk</a>
Wessex Water		<a href="mailto:dave.ogbourne@wessexwater.co.uk">dave.ogbourne@wessexwater.co.uk</a>
NHS England		<a href="mailto:reception@southwest.nhs.uk">reception@southwest.nhs.uk</a>
<b>Parish Meetings, Parish and Town Councils in TDBC</b>		
Ash Priors Parish Council - Mr S Jones		<a href="mailto:stevevasc.jones@gmail.com">stevevasc.jones@gmail.com</a>
Ashbrittle Parish Council - Mr Charles Doble		<a href="mailto:charles@greenandcarter.com">charles@greenandcarter.com</a>
Bathealton Parish Council - Mrs C H Weir		<a href="mailto:dgweir@btinternet.com">dgweir@btinternet.com</a>
Bishops Hull Parish Council - Mrs Helen McGladdery		<a href="mailto:bishopshullparishclerk@gmail.com">bishopshullparishclerk@gmail.com</a>
Bishops Lydeard & Cothelstone Parish Council - Mrs Amy Shepherd		<a href="mailto:clerk@bishopslydeard.org.uk">clerk@bishopslydeard.org.uk</a>
Bradford-on-Tone Parish Council - Mr D Bott		<a href="mailto:angelabottderrick@gmail.com">angelabottderrick@gmail.com</a>
Burrowbridge Parish Council - Ms Deborah House		<a href="mailto:bbparishclerk@outlook.com">bbparishclerk@outlook.com</a>
Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council - Ms Jo Pearson		<a href="mailto:cheddon@live.co.uk">cheddon@live.co.uk</a>
Chipstable Parish Council - Mrs Karen Collings		<a href="mailto:clerk.chipstableparish@btinternet.com">clerk.chipstableparish@btinternet.com</a>
Churchstanton Parish Council - Mr David Gollin		<a href="mailto:kd.lears@btopenworld.com">kd.lears@btopenworld.com</a>
Combe Florey Parish Council - Claire Morrison-Jones		<a href="mailto:combefloreysec@gmail.com">combefloreysec@gmail.com</a>

Comeytrove Parish Council - Mr J W Jenkins		<a href="mailto:JWJenkins@somerset.gov.uk">JWJenkins@somerset.gov.uk</a>
Corfe Parish Council - Louise Mackley		<a href="mailto:corfeparishclerk@live.com">corfeparishclerk@live.com</a>
Cotford St Luke Parish Council - Miss Caroline Roche		<a href="mailto:croche@pellfrischmann.com">croche@pellfrischmann.com</a>
Creech St Michael Parish Council - Mr S Altria		<a href="mailto:clerk@creechstmichael.net">clerk@creechstmichael.net</a>
Durston Parish Council - Mr. T. Hiscock		<a href="mailto:tim.hiscock@btinternet.com">tim.hiscock@btinternet.com</a>
Fitzhead Parish Council - Jill Loader		<a href="mailto:jill_loader@yahoo.co.uk">jill_loader@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Halse Parish Council - Tim Payne		<a href="mailto:halseparishcouncilclerk@gmail.com">halseparishcouncilclerk@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:clerk@halseparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@halseparishcouncil.org.uk</a>
Hatch Beauchamp Parish Council - Claire Morrison- Jones		<a href="mailto:hatchbeauchamp.pc@gmail.com">hatchbeauchamp.pc@gmail.com</a>
Kingston St Mary Parish Council - Miss Caroline Roche		<a href="mailto:croche@pellfrischmann.com">croche@pellfrischmann.com</a>
Langford Budville Parish Council - Mrs Christine Hake		<a href="mailto:christinehake@hotmail.com">christinehake@hotmail.com</a>
Lydeard St Lawrence Parish Council - Lorna Thorne		<a href="mailto:clerk@lsltollandpc.org.uk">clerk@lsltollandpc.org.uk</a> <a href="mailto:lornathorne-lsltpc@hotmail.com">lornathorne-lsltpc@hotmail.com</a>
Milverton Parish Council - Mr G Wren		<a href="mailto:gwilwren@aol.com">gwilwren@aol.com</a>
North Curry Parish Council - Mrs Barbara Wellwood		<a href="mailto:parishcouncil@northcurry.com">parishcouncil@northcurry.com</a>
Norton Fitzwarren Parish Council - Mrs J Gobey		<a href="mailto:nfpc@btinternet.com">nfpc@btinternet.com</a>
Nynehead Parish Council - Ros Shepherd		<a href="mailto:nyneheadclerk@gmail.com">nyneheadclerk@gmail.com</a>
Oake Parish Council - David Gliddon		<a href="mailto:oakepc@outlook.com">oakepc@outlook.com</a>
Otterford Parish Council - Mrs Penny Hart		<a href="mailto:pennyhart@btopenworld.com">pennyhart@btopenworld.com</a>
Pitminster Parish Council - R D W Tyzack Esq		<a href="mailto:pitminster@hotmail.co.uk">pitminster@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Ruishton Parish Council - Heather Bryant		<a href="mailto:ruishtonpc@gmail.com">ruishtonpc@gmail.com</a>
Sampford Arundel - Christine Garland		<a href="mailto:clerk@sampfordarundel-pc.gov.uk">clerk@sampfordarundel-pc.gov.uk</a>
Staplegrove Parish Council - Helen Mcinnes		<a href="mailto:staplegroveparishcouncil@hotmail.com">staplegroveparishcouncil@hotmail.com</a>
Stawley Parish Council - Sally Freeman		<a href="mailto:stawleypc@yahoo.co.uk">stawleypc@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Stoke St Gregory Parish Council - Mrs Becky Goodchild		<a href="mailto:ssgparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk">ssgparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Stoke St Mary Parish Council - Miss G Coombes		<a href="mailto:stokeparishclerk@gmail.com">stokeparishclerk@gmail.com</a>
Thornfalcon Parish Council - Heather Bryant		<a href="mailto:ruishtonpc@gmail.com">ruishtonpc@gmail.com</a>

Tolland Parish Council - Lorna Thorne		<a href="mailto:clerk@lsltollandpc.org.uk">clerk@lsltollandpc.org.uk</a> <a href="mailto:lornathorne-lsltpc@hotmail.com">lornathorne-lsltpc@hotmail.com</a>
Trull Parish Council - Mrs Becky Howat		<a href="mailto:trull.clerk@gmail.com">trull.clerk@gmail.com</a>
Wellington Town Council - Greg Dyke		<a href="mailto:info@wellingtontowncouncil.co.uk">info@wellingtontowncouncil.co.uk</a>
Wellington Without Parish Council - Mr Neil Dalton		<a href="mailto:wellingtonwithoutpc@gmail.com">wellingtonwithoutpc@gmail.com</a>
West Bagborough Parish Council - Peter Hamilton		<a href="mailto:westbagboroughpc@gmail.com">westbagboroughpc@gmail.com</a>
West Buckland Parish Council - Mrs J Larcombe		<a href="mailto:kentisbearepc@yahoo.co.uk">kentisbearepc@yahoo.co.uk</a>
West Hatch Parish Council - Mrs Gillian Midworth		<a href="mailto:clerk@westhatchparish.org.uk">clerk@westhatchparish.org.uk</a>
West Monkton Parish Council - Mrs P. Cavill		<a href="mailto:clerk.westmonktonpc@yahoo.co.uk">clerk.westmonktonpc@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Wiveliscombe Parish Council - Bryan Howe		<a href="mailto:parishclerk@wiveliscombe.com">parishclerk@wiveliscombe.com</a>
Neroche Parish - Mr H Midworth This parish includes Bickenhall Parish Council, Curland Parish Council, Orchard Portman Parish Council, Staple Fitzpaine Parish Council		<a href="mailto:neroche.pc@nerochevillages.org.uk">neroche.pc@nerochevillages.org.uk</a>
<b>Parish Meetings, Parish and Town Councils in Sedgemoor that adjoin TDBC</b>		
Over Stowey (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:thedanes@live.co.uk">thedanes@live.co.uk</a>
Spaxton (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:suzike@aol.com">suzike@aol.com</a>
Broomfield (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:clerk@broomfieldparish.org">clerk@broomfieldparish.org</a>
North Petherton (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:townclerk@nptc.info">townclerk@nptc.info</a>
Thuroxton (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:henwalker@googlemail.com">henwalker@googlemail.com</a>
Lyng (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:henwalker@googlemail.com">henwalker@googlemail.com</a>
Westonzoyland (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:alanhurf@fsmail.net">alanhurf@fsmail.net</a>
Middlezoy (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:middlezoyparishcouncil@hotmail.com">middlezoyparishcouncil@hotmail.com</a>
Othery (Sedgemoor)		<a href="mailto:j.swayne@btinternet.com">j.swayne@btinternet.com</a>
<b>Parish Meetings, Parish and Town Councils in West Somerset District that adjoin TDBC</b>		
Crowcombe (West Somerset) - Mrs Jan Leeming		<a href="mailto:janleeming@hotmail.co.uk">janleeming@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Stogumber (West Somerset) - Mrs Jan Leeming		<a href="mailto:janleeming@hotmail.co.uk">janleeming@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Elworthy (West Somerset) - Mr Ron Buckingham		<a href="mailto:vitacons@vitacons.com">vitacons@vitacons.com</a>
Brompton Ralph (West Somerset) – Mr Brian Smith		<a href="mailto:brian.smith639@btinternet.com">brian.smith639@btinternet.com</a>
Clatworthy (West Somerset) - Ms N Martin		<a href="mailto:martin.ne@btinternet.com">martin.ne@btinternet.com</a>
Huish Champflower (West Somerset) - Mrs A Cowley		<a href="mailto:clerk.hpc@btinternet.com">clerk.hpc@btinternet.com</a>

Upton (West Somerset) - Mrs P Purvis		<a href="mailto:uptonparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk">uptonparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Skilgate (West Somerset) - Mr G Hughes		<a href="mailto:gareth@hughes-exmoor.com">gareth@hughes-exmoor.com</a>
<b>Parish Meetings, Parish and Town Councils in South Somerset District that adjoin TDBC</b>		
Alter (South Somerset) - Miss Emma Meecham		<a href="mailto:aller_pc@btinternet.com">aller_pc@btinternet.com</a>
Curry Mallet (South Somerset) - Mrs Angela Clarke	2 Doble Close, Higher Street, Curry Mallet, Taunton, Somerset, TA3 6SY	
Curry Rivel (South Somerset) - Mrs Jenny Ludgate		<a href="mailto:m.ludgate@btinternet.com">m.ludgate@btinternet.com</a>
Fivehead (South Somerset) - Mrs M Knox		<a href="mailto:fiveheadpc@gmail.com">fiveheadpc@gmail.com</a>
<b>Parish Meetings, Parish and Town Councils in East Devon that adjoin West Somerset District</b>		
Yarcombe (East-Devon) - Mrs W Randle		<a href="mailto:clerk@yarcombe.eastdevon.gov.uk">clerk@yarcombe.eastdevon.gov.uk</a>
Upottery (East-Devon) - Mrs K Kennell		<a href="mailto:clerk@upottery.eastdevon.gov.uk">clerk@upottery.eastdevon.gov.uk</a>
<b>Parish Meetings, Parish and Town Councils in Mid Devon that adjoin West Somerset District</b>		
Bampton (Mid-Devon) - Jane Eyre		<a href="mailto:bamptontownclerk@hotmail.co.uk">bamptontownclerk@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Clayhidon (Mid-Devon) - Michael Osmond		<a href="mailto:clayhidonparishcouncil@gmail.com">clayhidonparishcouncil@gmail.com</a>
Culmstock (Mid-Devon) - Sue Squire		<a href="mailto:susan.squire@virgin.net">susan.squire@virgin.net</a>
Hemyock (Mid-Devon) - Donna Evans		<a href="mailto:clerk@hemyock.org">clerk@hemyock.org</a>
Holcobme Rogus (Mid-Devon) - Leslie Findlay		<a href="mailto:holcomberogusparishclerk@gmail.com">holcomberogusparishclerk@gmail.com</a>
Morebath (Mid-Devon) - Martin French		<a href="mailto:clerk@morebath.org.uk">clerk@morebath.org.uk</a>
Clayhanger Parish and Hockworthy Parish are part of the combined Borden Gate Parish Council (Mid-Devon) - Hazel Ridd		<a href="mailto:bordengateparishcouncil@live.co.uk">bordengateparishcouncil@live.co.uk</a>
<b>Developers/Planners asked to be kept informed</b>		
Mark McGovern		<a href="mailto:mark.mcgovern@ssaplanning.co.uk">mark.mcgovern@ssaplanning.co.uk</a>

Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation Comments Received May 2017				
West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine				
		The following spread sheet is a brief report summarising comments received and describing if and how the Neighbourhood Plan has been modified in response to the issues raised. All the representations received are listed below, and have been given due consideration by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting 14 June 2017 (which was open to the public). Decision and response to each representation is shown below.		
Resident/Name of Consultation Body	Relevant Section	Summary of Comments	Plan Amended	Detail of Change, or justification for No Change
Resident 1	T2	Commuting by bicycle from Monkton Heathfield into Taunton town is an easy ride along the canal towpath. however: a) there is a small section of "missing" cycle path just where the new A38 joins the old Bridgewater Rd (bottom of Milton Hill) to Dyers Lane (from where I can access the canal) - this is a few yards only.	No	Matter in hand, dealt with by SCC. TRO commencing 3 July 2017 .
	General	b) at the other end of the canal tow path at the Firepool Weir the track takes a sharp turn and at the same time becomes a dirt track (despite being labelled as a cycle track) - it has muddy puddles the breadth of the path when it rains. This deters me from using this route to commute into town - if I am to arrive looking smart enough for work - but with mud up my legs!	No	This comes under TDBC Firepool Development outside the NP area.
	T2	I would like to be able to cycle to Sainsbury's, Hankridge Farm. In order to get there I need to use the Bridgewater Road between Dyers Lane (as above) and Tone Way. There is a short section of very narrow, pot-holed, gravel-strewn cycle track marked for a couple of hundred yards at the Tone Way end where the road is widest - but the place it is most needed is the narrow section at the Dyers Lane end (and over the canal bridge) - it is similarly precarious for pedestrians with a very narrow and usually overgrown footpath.	No	Already in hand with WMPC/ SCC/TDBC/CIL.
	General	I often jump into the car to do this journey - which is only a mile or so on the flat and easily cycled.	No	Not required.
	T2 and R4	There is <u>almost</u> a way "off road" using the river and canal paths - but one has to come up onto (and cross) the busy Bridgewater Road to cross the railway - putting in a parallel cycle bridge would be wonderful.	No	Connectivity is covered in NP T2 and R4. (Bridge is 175 years old). Not enough width for cycleway without significant engineering. SCC/TDBC .
	T2 and R4	Tone way itself - there is a nice cycle path along the south side of Tone way - but as I found out - impossible to access from the north side Bridgewater road - without taking a huge and pedestrian ("no cycling") route over the foot bridge - adding a significant time and distance to getting to the Hydrographic offices / Asda etc from where I live - I assume a number of people might be commuting that way / shopping?	No	NP T2 and also in R4 addressing gaps in networks.
	General	A 3259 Yallands Hill - Priorswood Road. Another narrow busy road that I need to use at points to get to West Monkton Village hall / shops / Venture way / doctors surgery.	No	Covered by WRR plans.
	General	There is a tantalising short section of cycle track (Tudor Park area) - that just ends abruptly dumping the cyclist onto a dangerous narrow road.	No	There is a route through Waterleaze to the Doctors Surgery/Venture Way etc
	General	I resort to cycling on the footpath along the Monkton Heathfield stretch of this road - eg to access Village Hall / the butchers / Monkton Elm garden centre	No	T2 and R4 policies are addressing this issue. The comment highlights the need for a cycleway north of Yallands Hill and into West of Greenway.
	General	I am shortly moving up to Kingston - and am worried, too, about the Kingston Road - a heavily used route - and very narrow in places - it would be a nice and easy commute to town along this road BUT - so busy! It would be wonderful to have a good cycle/foot path alongside that road to keep cyclists and pedestrians safe.	No	Kingston PC and SCC Highways
	General	These are just a few points to share from the routes that I regularly use (or don't use because of safety.) As a fortunate car <u>and</u> cycle owner - I have the option to choose - and if the local plans are to try to encourage people like me to chose the bike over the car - I hope looking at some of the above might make a difference.	No	T2 and R4 are trying to link new cycle ways with old cycleways and will eventually be a network. Current infrastructure is deterring cyclists.
Resident 2	General	I have read through all the documents regarding the NP...whilst I am happy with most of it..and agree that the development is a natural progression for the Monkton Heathfield area I do have one major concern not really addressed in the plan.		
	General	As a resident of Goosenford for nearly 30 years I have seen a massive increase in traffic through the hamlet....in recent years the volume of cars..and lorries has become a worry.		New Development does increase traffic on existing roads. This is evaluated and considered by SCC/TDBC/PCs at the Planning Applications stage, and mitigation put in place to address any unacceptable impacts.

	<b>General</b>	Recent roadworks on the A3259 have increased traffic levels even further as driver rat run to avoid queuing on the main road..there have been a couple of serious road traffic incidents caused by speeding drivers along these lanes and it is very unsafe to walk or cycle any more.		PC is aware of increased traffic and recent accidents, whilst not something this Plan is addressing directly, we are working with the Police and SCC to monitor and address. Policy T2 supports high quality path network (page 56).
	<b>Transport General</b>	My proposal would be to close Goosenford to through traffic at one end...at the top of the hill at the natural pinch point to stop traffic using these lanes as rat runs...there is precedent for this as Britons Ash lane has been closed for the very same reasons.		SCC has installed SIDs to measure traffic flow prior to consideration introduction of traffic calming measures
	<b>Transport General</b>	As traffic management on the main road is developed it will encourage non residents to use these corridors and not endanger those living along the narrow lanes of the parish.		This area will be included in a traffic impact assessment for the masterplanning of MH2
<b>Resident 3</b>	<b>E4</b>	While reading the report it crossed my mind that the housing proposed for elderly people did not include warden supported type accommodation.	Yes	
	<b>E4</b>	I know this may be an out of date idea but with the cost of individual care for a person being beyond the reach of most people it may be worth including.	Yes	
	<b>E4</b>	I am sure a lot of elderly people could remain semi independent with the help of a warden rather than being placed in a home away from friends and relatives.	Yes	P70 Policy E4 expanded to include '....or sheltered housing'. We accept the principle of the representation.
<b>Resident 4</b>	<b>General</b>	This is probably not a very useful comment in response to the Public Consultation, but I am strongly against any more developments in this area of Taunton. It is beautiful just as it is! Can't we just leave things as they are?	No	The Local Authority has set the quantum of development in our area and National Policy has a presumption in favour of sustainable development, this cannot change. However, the NP can influence how that development is shaped.
<b>Resident 5</b>	<b>General</b>	Very Lengthy. Lots to take in. Does Taunton really need all this?	No	Noted
<b>Network Rail</b>	<b>Transport</b>	Network Rail has been consulted on the West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to comment on this Planning Policy document.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure. In this regard, please find our comments below.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	Network Rail would draw the council's attention to the following (which applies to England only):	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015</b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>Publicity for applications for planning permission within 10 metres of relevant railway land</b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>16.—(1) This article applies where the development to which the application relates is situated within 10 metres of relevant railway land.</b>	No	Not a planning decision therefore not NP, but more like S106, equivalent to transport plan and bus contribution.
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>(2) The local planning authority must, except where paragraph (3) applies, publicise an application for planning permission by serving requisite notice on any infrastructure manager of relevant railway land.</b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>(3) Where an infrastructure manager has instructed the local planning authority in writing that they do not require notification in relation to a particular description of development, type of building operation or in relation to specified sites or geographical areas ("the instruction"), the local planning authority is not required to notify that infrastructure manager.</b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>(4) The infrastructure manager may withdraw the instruction at any time by notifying the local planning authority in writing.</b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>(5) In paragraph (2) "requisite notice" means a notice in the appropriate form as set out in Schedule 3 or in a form substantially to the same effect.</b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<b><u>Developer Contributions</u></b>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	The West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure where growth areas or significant housing allocations are identified close to existing rail infrastructure.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	Many stations and routes are already operating close to capacity and a significant increase in patronage may create the need for upgrades to the existing infrastructure including improved signalling, passing loops, car parking, improved access arrangements or platform extensions.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements.	No	S106 to be negotiated with TDBC, this is outside scope of NP. Suggest any developer contribution is ring fenced to local area
	<b>Transport</b>	Specifically, we request that a Policy is included within the document which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	The likely impact and level of improvements required will be specific to each station and each development meaning standard charges and formulae may not be appropriate. Therefore in order to fully assess the potential impacts, and the level of developer contribution required, it is essential that where a Transport Assessment is submitted in support of a planning application that this quantifies in detail the likely impact on the rail network.	No	



	<b>Transport</b>	To ensure that developer contributions can deliver appropriate improvements to the rail network we would recommend that Developer Contributions should include provisions for rail and should include the following:	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	A requirement for development contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where appropriate.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	A requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure to allow any necessary developer contributions towards rail to be calculated.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	A commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network and may require rail infrastructure improvements. In order to be reasonable these improvements would be restricted to a local level and would be necessary to make the development acceptable. We would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of Network Rail's remit.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<u>Level Crossings</u>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	Development proposals' affecting the safety of level crossings is an extremely important consideration for emerging planning policy to address. The impact from development can result in a significant increase in the vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic utilising a crossing which in turn impacts upon safety and service provision.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	As a result of increased patronage, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with strategic and government aims of improving rail services.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	In this regard, we would request that the potential impacts from development affecting Network Rail's level crossings, is specifically addressed through planning policy as there have been instances whereby Network Rail has not been consulted as statutory undertaker where a proposal has impacted on a level crossing. We request that a policy is provided confirming that:	No	The request for funding is not part of the Neighbourhood Plan.
	<b>Transport</b>	The Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<i>Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) order, 2010 requires that... "Where any proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning Authority's Highway Engineer must submit details to both Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate and Network Rail for separate approval".</i>	No	Network Comments relate to the Development Management Procedures which are not relevant to this NP, but comments will be passed to the Local Authority.
	<b>Transport</b>	Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	<u>Planning Applications</u>	No	
	<b>Transport</b>	We would appreciate West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Councils providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on any future planning applications should they be submitted for sites adjoining the railway, or within close proximity to the railway as we may have more specific comments to make (further to those above).	No	Consultation is a matter for TDBC and SCC
	<b>General</b>	We trust these comments will be considered in your preparation of the forthcoming Neighbourhood Development Plan document.	No	
<b>CSM Parish Council</b>	<b>General</b>	I write having received your draft Neighbourhood Plan and with CSM Parish Councillors have considered it at their meeting on 8th May 2017.	No	The representation is noted.
	<b>General</b>	I would advise that CSM PC has asked me to convey to you their full support for your NH Plan and their admiration for the work you have undertaken in developing it.	No	The representation is noted.
	<b>General</b>	As you are aware our areas (and I include Ruishton PC) are subject to a period of unparalleled change and this council recognises the value of our authorities working together to provide a voice for the benefit of our citizens.	No	The representation is noted.
<b>Bishops Hull Parish Council</b>	<b>General</b>	There is nothing in the plan that adversely affects the Bishops Hull Parish, and therefore have no further comments to make.	No	The representation is noted.
<b>TDBC Leisure Development:</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	The CIL 123 priorities for Cheddon Fitzpaine.		
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>P109 Community Health and Well Being:</b> Improved Children's Play Equipment. Play equipment as it is outside TDBC CIL (currently still under S106) but the parish can spend their CIL "meaningful portion" on it. Currently playgrounds are under TDBC ownership and maintenance. Are Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council looking to take on the playgrounds, using CIL for improvements and/or maintenance?	Yes	CFPC is not looking to take on the Playgrounds. The wording is changed from 'improved' to 'additional' .
<b>Economic Development:</b>	<b>Employment</b>	Having reviewed the Employment section, there are no further comments.	No	None
<b>Landscape:</b>	<b>General</b>	<b>Preface</b> - support the aspiration for the NP area that "it becomes a place where families and people can grow and thrive in a sustainable and ecologically sensitive community "(p2)		
	<b>General</b>	<b>Introduction</b> - found the SWOT exercise interesting. However, not sure that I support the desire for more bungalows to be built, although I can see that people want to maintain views of the two nearby AONBs.	No	Noted: Preference for bungalows is clearly demonstrated in the questionnaire responses.
	<b>General</b>	<b>Map 1</b> - It would be useful if both parish boundaries were shown on the map.	No	Noted: NP area is shown.
	<b>General</b>	<b>Area profile</b> - A good description but could there be more information about the Council's Landscape character Areas? The document acknowledges use of images from the Local landscape character assessment but could state which Landscape character areas the two parishes are located in. These are:	Yes	Noted: Description amended on page 21 of NP document.
	<b>General</b>	1a Farmed and settled Low vale –Vale of Taunton Deane		
	<b>General</b>	2a River Floodplain- the Tone		

	<b>General</b>	3a Farmed and settled high vale – Quantock fringes and west Vale and		
	<b>General</b>	7a Hills and Fringes with wooded coombes - Southeast Quantock		
	<b>General</b>	<b>Map 2</b> - I consider that the River Tone is also significant like the canal. Could the PROWs be marked as footpaths and bridleways?	No	The representation is noted. Rights of Way shown on Map 2 Page 15 and Map 3 page 17. Footpaths and bridleways are differentiated at <a href="http://roam.somerset.gov.uk/roam/map#">roam.somerset.gov.uk/roam/map#</a>
	<b>General</b>	<b>Map 3</b> - Is Gadds Valley LNR shown on this map?	No	LNR shown in key.
	<b>General</b>	<b>Map 7</b> - It is good to see that reference has been made to SERC's ecological network mapping.		
	<b>General</b>	However the key could be edited as not all the mapped habitat types appear to be present within the two parishes. (p23)	No	Comment accepted: the map is provided by TDBC.
	<b>General</b>	It would be useful if the document stated which parish the church of St Augustine is located in. (p24)	Yes	Amended page 24.
	<b>General</b>	The River Tone is also a recreational facility (p 25)	Yes	Added to text at page 25.
	<b>General</b>	<b>In Ecology and Conservation</b> - agree with the first sentence. However the species of bat could be stated here – Lesser Horseshoe bat. Dark skies are also essential for these bats. (p29)	Yes	Amended to text at page 29.
	<b>Vision</b>	<b>Vision and objectives</b> - Good vision, strongly support the objective to facilitate the country park. Support the objective to protect dark skies, but how will this be achieved? Elsewhere in the document, reference is made to the lighting of footpaths and cycle ways (p34, p51 and p73)	No	Achieved by Policy R1.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	<b>Policies:</b> West Monkton Quarry is a wildlife feature that could be added to the list on p75	No	The quarry is owned by Wessex Water and bordered by a public footpath. The site could be accessed by members of the public, but is discouraged as the quarry is disused and dangerous; it is therefore NOT included in the list on page 74 and 75 and so nature is taking its course. NPPF paragraph 76-78.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The bat population at Hestercombe could be added to the list of strengths on p77.	Yes	Added to text.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Extensive tree planting for bat mitigation is an opportunity. (p77)	Yes	Added to text.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Support comments made formerly by the Green Infrastructure and landscape officer that the Recreation and Environment section of the document is ambitious and well thought out.		
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Small point on p83, The Somerset County BAP (Wild Somerset) should be mentioned. Also I would not describe the bats at Hestercombe to be a healthy and vibrant community. I think figures recently showed numbers to be static or declining.	Yes	Amend both points.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The Routes to the River Tone project has now finished.P84	Yes	Amended - 'recently completed'.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	There is a strong emphasis on existing and proposed green infrastructure. The construction of a foot and cycle bridge would be of great benefit in opening the former tip to recreation. Is the road referred to here the A3259 or the A38? (p79)	Yes	A38 agreed.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Support former comments made by Larry Burrows that the plan has the potential to affect a European site (Hestercombe SAC). These comments are reflected in the document.	No	Representation agreed.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Footpath linkages could be formed by permissive paths (p98)	Yes	Policy R4 '.... possibly by permissive paths...'
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Consider reference to the Green triangle junctions very pertinent as these features help to define the character of the parishes.		
<b>Arboriculture:</b>	<b>R2</b>	A couple of points regarding policy R2. Countryside hedgerows are already protected if they are 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations. Once they are incorporated into development sites, and they become part of domestic curtilage, they are not protected unless by a planning condition or 106 agreement, but these are progressively harder to police as the years go by. Where there's development, better to keep these hedges (and big trees) within public open space, so that we can control their retention and management.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Regarding protecting important and ancient trees, this is the ideal, and I expect many of them are already protected by TPO. However, the reality is that we have to limit the amount of TPOs we serve, because of the strain on our resources.	No	Representation noted.

	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	As I've probably mentioned before with these NPs, I think it would be good to include some promotion of good arboricultural practice (to BS3998 (2010)) in a policy? I very often see badly-pruned trees in people's gardens – they are an eyesore (to me).	Yes	Text added at page 87: "It is recommended that BS3998 (2010), (promotion of good arboricultural practice), is applied in reference to good maintenance and management practices".
<b>Housing Enabling:</b>	<b>Housing</b>	<b>TDBC Affordable Housing Policy section –</b>		
	<b>H5</b>	Mention of housing schemes of five or more dwellings shall include 25% as affordable units – it is 10 units or more in urban areas. P44	Yes	Amended '.... it is 10 units or more in urban areas....'
	<b>Housing</b>	Code for Sustainable Homes level is mentioned but is no longer in existence.	Yes	Amended.
	<b>H5</b>	80% social rented and 20% intermediate housing split –		
	<b>H5</b>	An 80/20 split may result in viability issues for the schemes due to the reduction in intermediate housing. P47	No	Noted. Policy H5 states it is 'subject to viability assessment'.
<b>Development Management – Urban Extensions:</b>	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Pg32: “provision of a range of property types with a particular emphasis to meet the housing needs of young and older people”</b>		
	<b>Housing</b>	Does this go beyond the core strategy "particular emphasis". Mix of housing has to reflect local need anyway. Persimmon specialize in smaller units anyway so probably no problem for them. What about land north of A3259 where densities may need to be less?	No	Comments accepted. Each planning application will be considered on its merits relative to the local environment. Each development area has site specific considerations to adhere to. See H1 and H2 which conform with Core Strategy CS Policy CP4 and CP5 and NPPF paragraph 50.
	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Pg32: “an increased proportion of single storey dwellings to give older residents the opportunity”</b>		
	<b>Housing</b>	This is not within the development build profile of either persimmon, redrow or david wilson homes who are all active in the MH area.	No	No change to text or policy. NP Questionnaire responses showed bungalows were favoured. The growth since 2011 (census) for housing needs in this NP area does not reflect a predicatable growth pattern due to the Urban Extension. DWH/Redrow include bungalows in their portfolio. See Page 215 of TDBC Strategic Housing Needs Assessment Report October 2016. paragraph 11.2 and 11.3.
	<b>H1</b>	<b>Pg37: Housing Policy H1: Housing Suitable for Older People.</b> Whilst a great aspiration, none of the current house builders active at MH2 include bungalows in their portfolios. So how is this going to be delivered? No real justification why older people need bungalows? 10% of 2500 houses is 250 bungalows.... this seems unreasonable.	No	See final paragraph page 37 for explanation of c14 per year.
	<b>H2</b>	<b>Pg40: Housing Policy H2: Housing Suitable for Younger People &amp; First Time Buyers</b>		
	<b>H2</b>	How will this policy ensure that the houses suitable for younger people will not be occupied by older people. surely the policy should say younger people or first timebuyers as in title of policy?	Yes	Amended Policy H2, page 40 the policy aims to provide for first time buyers. Text amended to include 'first time buyers'.
	<b>H3</b>	<b>Pg43: Housing Policy H3: External Materials for Residential Development</b> Great		
	<b>E2</b>	<b>Pg67: Employment Policy E2: Sustainable Diversification of Farm Buildings for other Employment Uses</b> Cross reference Core Strategy policy DM2 - does this policy conflict with?	No	NP Steering Group does not believe there is a conflict: See TDBC Adopted Core Strategy 2011-2028 Justification for DM2 (page 114, paragraph 6.11-6.12)
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	<b>Pg87: “proposals for public open space areas which include, where appropriate, new seating and litter/dog waste bins”.</b> I thought that TDBC only provide litter bins for joint use would pc pick up cost of maintain and emptying.	No	Parish Councils currently maintain and empty bins they own within the NP area.
	<b>R3</b>	<b>Pg93: Policy R3: Flood Attenuation</b> Ambiguous what if an area does not suffer from flooding or a development will not create flooding according to this policy they will need to reduce flooding or will not be supported	No	Each planning application will be considered on its merits.
	<b>R3</b>	Swales, water butts etc do not in themselves reduce flooding albeit great ideas and necessary for sustainable development.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>R4</b>	<b>Pg98: Policy R4: Recreation and Community Facilities</b> Do they need to include all of these to be supported or just one, two, three?	Yes	Text amended to include '... any of the following'
	<b>R5</b>	<b>Pg106: Policy R5: Local Green Spaces (Highway Triangles and Recreational Sites)</b> "Two new football pitches and club house, newly laid out and under construction as part of phase one of the Monkton Healthfield Consortium Development" If formally designating these spaces, are you prepared to purchase if requested?	No	The Parish Councils would consider adopting in the usual manner with the provision of a commuted sum from the developer.

Highways England	General	Thank you for consulting Highways England on the West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Councils' Neighbourhood Development Plan. We have considered the Plan and have the following comments:	No	Noted
	General	The Vision Statement section is clear and well structured.	No	Noted
	Transport	We welcome the plan's objectives to provide sustainable transport infrastructure to meet the existing and future travel needs of local people. This will include a joined-up foot and cycle path network and improved public transport options to encourage bus and rail use.	No	Representation accepted.
	Employment	We also support the employment objectives to encourage sustainable commuting and which can also reduce outward commuting, whilst at the same time preserving the rural character of the NP area.	No	Representation accepted..
	Recreation and Environment	We support the objective on recreation and environment as this will also contribute to the wider Local Plan policies of walking and cycling by promoting connectivity for people.	No	Representation accepted.
	Glossary	Under 'Glossary of Terms'		
	Glossary	On page 112 'HA Highways England' should be 'HE Highways England' and;	Yes	Amended.
	Glossary	'The Highways England is an executive agency, part of the Department for Transport in England. It has responsibility for managing the core road network in England. It operates a variety of information services, liaises with other government agencies as well as providing staff to deal with incidents on their roads'		
	Glossary	should be amended to		
	Glossary	'Highways England is a government company responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's motorways and major A roads. It operates a variety of information services, liaises with other government agencies as well as providing traffic officers who patrol the motorways and deal with a range of incidents on their roads'	Yes	Amended.
	Glossary	On page 116 the reference to 'the Highways Agency' should be corrected to 'Highways England'.	Yes	Amended.
	General	Finally, we welcome the group's aim of maintaining a sustainable neighbourhood and wish you every success in the delivery of your Neighbourhood Plan.		
Somerset County Council Planning Policy	General	Thank you for consulting the Planning Policy team at Somerset County Council (SCC) about your draft Neighbourhood Plan.		
	General	We welcome the opportunity to comment. The Plan looks good. It is well-constructed, detailed and clearly reflects a significant amount of time and discussion.		
	General	From a minerals planning policy perspective we wish to flag the presence of mineral resources in the parishes of West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine. These resources should be considered within the Neighbourhood Plan-making process, noting that Somerset County Council's adopted minerals and waste plans also form part of the Development Plan. (see <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/minerals-and-waste/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/minerals-and-waste/</a> )	Yes	Amended P14. Text added.
	General	From a waste perspective, we have also highlighted that a zone for strategic waste management in Taunton also covers a significant part of the neighbourhood plan area.	Yes	Amended P14. Text added.
	General	We have appended some technical officer comments from the Planning Policy team that expand on these matters, which I trust are of assistance.		
	General	<b>APPENDIX: 1</b>		
	General	<b>Officers observation on "County" planning policy matters</b>		
	General	1) As the Parish Councils are aware, Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan for the local area.	No	Noted and agreed.
	General	2) In this case, it is clear that the Neighbourhood Plan has been well informed by the adopted Taunton Deane Core strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	No	Noted and agreed.
	General	3) The Neighbourhood Plan has also been mindful of some strategic matters, such as Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) produced by the Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership (HotSW LEP).	No	Noted and agreed.
	General	4) Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan does not adequately consider strategic "county" planning policy matters as contained within the Somerset Waste Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and the Somerset Minerals Plan (adopted 2015). Both Plans are NPPF compliant. (see <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/minerals-and-waste/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/minerals-and-waste/</a> ).	No	Noted. Minerals Waste is a county function; whilst this type of land use can be used to describe the uniqueness of the area, Minerals is the preserve of the Minerals and Waste Authority and defined as "excluded development" for NPs in the Planning Legislation.
	Housing H3	5) Sadly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not mentioned or listed these Plans which is disappointing given that are references to local stone such as red sandstone* (or suitable equivalent) and quarries on pages 24 and 43.	No	Minerals are excluded development for Neighbourhood Plans.
	Housing	<b>Minerals considerations in the parishes of West Monkton &amp; Cheddon Fitzpaine</b>		
	Housing	6) To this end, there are two areas of resonance regarding minerals planning policy that merit further consideration and/or discussion:		
	Housing	• First the geographical extent of the Neighbourhood Plan overlaps with Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) for building stone as shown on Map 8 of the adopted Minerals Plan. The geographical extent of the safeguarding area is shown in the extract below.		
	Housing	<b>Map 8: Extract from adopted Somerset Minerals Plan</b>		

	<b>Housing</b>	( <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/somerset-minerals-plan/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/somerset-minerals-plan/</a> ).		
	<b>Housing</b>	Details of the minerals resources to be safeguarded are listed in Table 4 of the Plan. Further details are within the Minerals Safeguarding Areas: Topic paper 6 (Jan 2014). In the parishes of West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Map 6 refers to:		
	<b>Housing</b>	• Otter sandstone (ie a type of red sandstone); and		
	<b>Housing</b>	• Morte Slates.		
	<b>Housing</b>	Currently neither of these building stones are worked. Thus as the Neighbourhood Plan correctly acknowledges on page 43 below Policy H3: "there is limited natural stone is locally available". Also, that the most significant commercial quarry nearby was Triscombe Quarry which closed in 1999 (page 24).		
	<b>Housing</b>	Whilst this does not result in any apparent conflict in land use, the support for using local traditional external building materials, such as red sandstone in the Neighbourhood Plan has a corollary – the supply of such stone. And this could be given greater consideration at a local level. For example, without prejudice, in line with development plan policies, perhaps:	Yes	Text added at page 24 re quarries.
	<b>Housing</b>	• Highlight the need for proposals for small-scale local quarries to come forward, helping to support building in the local vernacular stone.		
	<b>Glossary</b>	• With the Glossary of terms: amend the definition of Development Plan to include references to adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.	Yes	Text amended page 111.
	<b>Housing</b>	• Second, there are several small patches of safeguarded sand & gravel in the emerging Urban Extension (UE) as set out by CS Policies SS1 (Monkton Heathfield). The location of these sands and gravels are also shown on Map 8 of the adopted Minerals Plan (see <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/somerset-minerals-plan/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/somerset-minerals-plan/</a> ). One area for example lies below the new pitches in Monkton Phase. It should be noted that limited data are available on the sand and gravel resource. The main data source is the British Geological Survey (BGS). In line with adopted policies within our Minerals Plan and the exemptions listed within Table 6 we have not objected to Taunton Deane BC regarding this allocation and do not intend to do so now.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>General</b>	<b>Waste considerations in the parishes of West Monkton &amp; Cheddon Fitzpaine</b>		
	<b>General</b>	7) As shown in the extract below, the adopted Somerset Waste Core Strategy has a zone for strategic waste management in Taunton which covers a significant part of the neighbourhood plan.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>General</b>	Extract from adopted Somerset Waste Core Strategy	No	Representation noted.
	<b>General</b>	( <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/somerset-waste-core-strategy/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/policies/somerset-waste-core-strategy/</a> )		Representation noted.
	<b>General</b>	8) Any strategic waste sites allocated by the County Council must be within the zones, though strategic waste development can take place outside the zones under certain exceptional criteria. Non-strategic waste sites are not restricted to the zones.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	9) The description of the Taunton zone (page 127 of the Waste Core Strategy) highlights the significance of the Priorswood site on the Crown Industrial Estate:	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	"There are nine existing waste management facilities across the zone, some of which coincide with vacant / derelict land and existing employment allocations. Consequently, there would appear to be some scope for the co-location of waste management facilities. Of these sites, Priorswood is considered to offer the greatest potential for development. This site is already home to various waste uses and is allocated in the Taunton Deane Local Plan for B class use."	No	Noted. Planning applications within the Neighbourhood Plan area will be considered by the County, District and Parish Councils at the relevant time and on their merits.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	10) Historically there has been close co-operation between Taunton Deane BC & the County Council on such policy matters. To this end, site allocation TAU10: East of Crown Industrial Estate of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (Dec 2016) is able to accommodate waste uses. Through Policy DM5 the Waste Core strategy also aim to ensure that waste sites are effectively safeguarded and this includes consideration of development adjacent to waste operations.	No	Noted and accepted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	11) More generally there are opportunities to minimise waste production at the design stage of any development; the bigger the project, the more important it becomes to have a strategic approach to construction, demolition and excavation waste management. To this end Policy WCS2 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy requires effective access for waste collection and recycling vehicles. Colleagues from our Transport and Development Group will be able to provide further comment on highway standards in their capacity as the Highway Authority.	No	Noted and accepted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	12) In shaping future engagement on waste matters we would like to take this opportunity to advise that we have commenced a review of our planning policies waste policies. Details of the Waste Local Plan Review are available on our web site at:	No	Noted. Can be reviewed at a future Neighbourhood Plan Review.
	<b>General</b>	<a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/somerset-waste-plan/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/somerset-waste-plan/</a>		
<b>Natural England</b>	<b>General</b>	Thank you for your consultation on the above received 12 April 2017.		
	<b>General</b>	Overall Natural England has no concerns regarding this draft neighbourhood plan.		

	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) area includes Hestercombe House Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and part of the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB). As confirmed in our letter of 28 March 2017 in response to consultation on the SEA and HRA screening, we advise that the emerging NDP is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	Natural England requests that subsequent planning applications are supported by detailed assessment of impacts on the aforementioned designated sites and any local wildlife sites within the NDP area, and opportunities for wildlife enhancement incorporated wherever possible – for example as part of a green infrastructure network. This will help ensure development proposals are in line with the NDP policies R1 'Dark Skies' and R2 'Green Space and Wildlife'.	No	Noted. This is not with the remit of the NDP, and the DM process requires sites where there is a reasonable likelihood of impact on protected species to submit biodiversity surveys and reports.
	<b>General</b>	We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.		
	<b>General</b>	For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact me on the details below. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk		
	<b>General</b>	We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.		
<b>Persimmon</b>	<b>General</b>	Many thanks for forwarding to me a copy of the West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you to both councils for the opportunity to present the draft master plan options for Monkton Heathfield Phase two to you on Wednesday 17th May. These were generated in conjunction with Taunton Deane Borough Council. These will we hope inform the further work on the Neighbourhood Plan. I set out below our comments on the April 2017 Draft Document.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>General</b>	<u>Update on the Master Plan Options.</u> Further to the Urban Initiatives work, the Consortium generated 4 options in 2016 conjunction with the Taunton Council and Somerset County Officers. At our last meeting with yourselves we explained that further work had uncovered a significant constraint to the options thus far generated due to the HSE requirement for safe distances from the two gas pipelines. This would mean that a considerable area of land would be sterilised from development and would impact severely on the form of the master plan and the options to date. The past few months have been dedicated to examining what would and what would not be possible with the constraints and the feasibility of moving the pipes to achieve a better master plan. We have met with the Parish Councils to present the results of the work. Some of the issues uncovered within the mater plan work deal with matters raised int he NHP and we hope this letter follwoing our meeting on 17th May will be of assistance to the NHP work. I trust this deals with the point in red on Page 9 below "Local and National Policy".	No	These comments are helpful, indicating the current position of Masterplanning for Phase 2 of the Urban Extension. The point in red on Page 9 has been removed.
	<b>General</b>	<u>Ensuring Sustainable Development (Page 9).</u> The Master Plan work examines the issue highlighted concerning public transport infrastructure.	No	Noted. The Masterplan is developing in parallel with the Neighbourhood Plan
	<b>General</b>	<u>Area Descriptions (Page 27).</u> The need for more locally based pharmacies is noted, and will be addressed through more detailed discussion with TDBC.	No	Noted. Somerset Intelligence Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment indicates level of requirement/need.
	<b>General</b>	<u>Socio Economic Profile (Page 27).</u> Population change and socio-economic impact. The comments are noted and will be addressed through the development of the planning application.	No	Noted. The Socio-economic profile informed Housing policies H1 & H2.
	<b>Vision/ Transport</b>	<u>Vision and Objectives, Transport Objectives (Page 33).</u> In generating the options for the scheme the Consortium have been mindful of the need to maintain connectivity to phase 1 and the wider areas of Monkton Heathfield West Monkton Cheddon Fitzpaine and Creech St Michael. The options seek to deal with these issues.	No	Noted. Transport Policy T2 (page 56) protects connectivity issues.
	<b>Vision</b>	<u>Vision and Objectives (Page 33).</u> Economic Objective. Please see our detailed comments on policies below:		
	<b>Policies H1</b>	<b>Housing Policy H1</b> Housing suitable for older people. We feel the intents of the policy can be achieved by a variety of ways and note that the policy is prefaced by the need for viability testing. Without this preface, Persimmon Homes would have had to object to a policy requiring 10% of homes evidenced by local need for older people to be sold on the open market as set out in the detailed criteria. In the development of the Master Plan a number of options for dealing with mix, tenure and house type are being considered.	No	Noted. No change to Policy H1. The need for 'Viability testing' remains.
	<b>H1</b>	The policy explanation is objected to as we would believe the aspiration for housing for older people can be achieved by other means such as purpose accommodation which is not in single storey format.	No	The calculation for these figures is on page 37. 10-14 per year is not considered to be unreasonable. Locally, people request bungalows as opposed to flats (questionnaire).
	<b>H2</b>	<b>Starter Homes. Policy H2.</b> The NHP provides a policy explanation which is as yet unable to be verified as the detailed regulations surrounding starter homes are yet to be announced. Therefore, requiring a scheme to provide a minimum of 20% for the 23-40 year old age group is objected to since the delivery of this tenure is still to be established by further statute.	No	NP quotes 10% in H2 Policy. (page 40) 20% is a Governmental aspiration.

	<b>H5</b>	<b>Affordable Housing and Self Build Homes Policy H5 (Page 47).</b> Whilst the spirit of what is being proposed is understood Persimmon Homes have concerns over the practicality of what is intended. The requirement for self-build housing may be appropriate on smaller sites than Major urban extensions. The difficulty of coordinating the efforts of independent people or contractors involved in building self-build homes within a major site can cause difficulty in terms of ensuring that adequate access for all is maintained as well ensuring the requirements of the Health & Safety Executive building sites are being adhered to. In addition, the timing of some works may frustrate the self- builder in gaining access to the site. A further concern is ensuring that where self-builders abandon or take a considerable time to complete their homes the length of time that the site must remain as a construction site become costly and difficult to manage. For these reasons Persimmon Homes object to the policy	No	Subject to viability is noted. Deliverability is the responsibility of the Affordable Housing Provider as opposed to the developer.
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>Transport (Page 48).</b> The Action Plan for safe routes to school is noted and will be returned to during the Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 Master Planning work.	No	Noted
	<b>T1</b>	<b>Transport Policy T1 (Page 52 and 53).</b> The Bus Infrastructure requirements are noted and will be returned to during the Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 Master Planning work.	No	Noted
	<b>T2</b>	<b>Transport Policy T2 (Page 56).</b> The Footpath and cycle path infrastructure requirements are noted and will be returned to during the Master Planning work.	No	Noted
	<b>E1</b>	<b>Employment Context and Profile (Page 57), Map 10 and Policy E1.</b> The employment land shown on map 10 relates to the original Local Plan Policy. Taunton Deane Council has recently concluded a consultation exercise for a new strategic site at Nexus 25. (Junction 25 of the M5). Persimmon Homes support this proposal. It provides a logical location well related to the Park and Ride facility and the new proposals for the Henlade bypass and A3258 improvements. This is reference in the NHP at Page 61 with footnote 3. Given the opportunities now provided by Hinckley Point and the emergence of a new vision for Taunton to be an academic health and renewal energy technology hub, Persimmon Homes are of the view that the original allocations need to be considered in the light of this emerging new vision for the sub region. We therefore believe Policy E1 should be amended to not include B8 uses which would be inappropriate within a largely residential area and the traffic movements would be at odds with the other land uses.	Yes	Page 64 amended to remove: 'Class B8 (storage and distribution)**.' Asterisks amended.
	<b>E3</b>	<b>Retention of existing Employment Areas Policy E3</b> Persimmon Homes object to the Policy "Change of use of land or buildings currently used for employment/commercial uses to non-employment uses, (which include for the purposes of this policy main Taunton town centre uses such as retail and leisure), will not normally be supported (Permitted Development Rights notwithstanding*) unless considerable efforts have been made to market the land/buildings for employment purposes for at least two years. Where such change of use is permitted it must be justified by a viability assessment and marketing strategy which demonstrate that the existing/previous employment use is no longer viable". For the reasons stated above we believe the strict adherence to the policies in the current local plan need to be interpreted more flexibly in planning for Monkton Heathfield Phase 2.	Yes	Text inserted in first line of E3 Policy: '....allocated or....' (Page 69)
	<b>R3</b>	<b>Policy R2 Green Space and Wildlife.</b> The provision of green space and linages both within and to the other areas are being examined as part of the master planning work for the Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 scheme and a number of options are being considered.	No	Noted. Policy R2 defines acceptable proposals. (pag3 87).
	<b>R4</b>	<b>Policy R4 Recreation and Community Facilities.</b> The provision of recreation and community facilities are being examined as part of the master planning work for the Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 scheme and a number of options are being considered. This also includes looking at opportunities for the sharing of recreational facilities.	No	Noted. Policy R4 indicates proposals that will be supported.(page 98)
<b>Gladman</b>		<b>Re: West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation</b>		
	<b>General</b>	This letter provides the response of Gladman Developments (hereafter referred to as "Gladman") to the current consultation held by West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Councils (WM&CFPC) on the West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan (WM&CFNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012).	No	Noted
	<b>General</b>	The preparation of the WM& CFNP will need to be prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions set out in schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).	No	Representation is accepted.
	<b>General</b>	In principle, Gladman support many of the policy options currently being progressed by the emerging neighbourhood plan. However, we feel that the document would benefit from additional modifications to provide further clarity to the policy currently being promoted and to ensure that the Plan provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. In this regard, this letter seeks to recommend a number of modifications which the Steering Group should consider prior to progressing the Plan to Regulation 15 submission.	No	Representation noted, and suggested modifications considered below:
	<b>Policies</b>	<b>Housing Policy H1: Housing Suitable for Older People</b>		
	<b>Housing Policy H1:</b>	This policy requires development proposals of 10 dwellings or more to provide at least 10% of dwellings as bungalows for the housing needs of older people.		

	<b>Housing Policy H1:</b>	Whilst recognising the Steering Group's concern over an ageing population, the policy as proposed would apply to all residential development proposals and may not provide the most optimum use of land in terms of housing density. Instead, it is recommended that the policy be amended and the following wording is put forward for the Steering Groups consideration:	No	Policy H1 is based on the result of the local questionnaire and supported by NPPF paragraph 50 and CS CP4 & CP5.
	<b>Housing Policy H1:</b>	"The West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine neighbourhood Plan will seek to secure sustainable and mixed communities that provide a mix of dwelling types and tenures in line with the adopted Local Plan requirements or the most up-to-date evidence of housing needs".		
	<b>Housing Policy H2:</b>	<b><u>Housing Policy H2: Housing suitable for Younger People &amp; First Time Buyers</u></b>		
	<b>Housing Policy H2:</b>	Whilst supporting the general thrust of this policy which reflects the Starter Homes initiative currently being championed by Government, it should be noted that through the Housing White Paper the Government is seeking to amend the definition of affordable housing to include Starter Homes. As such, Starter Homes will form part of the overall percentage of affordable housing and should therefore not be seen as an addition to open market housing to be provided by a development proposal.	No	The NP Steering Group is satisfied with the policy as it stands given the evidence base on which it was formulated. (P40) NPPF paragraph 50, CS CP4 & CP5.
	<b>Housing Policy H2:</b>	It is currently unclear how this policy will be implemented through the proposed changes to the Framework, therefore, Gladman recommend that this policy is amended to 'support the delivery of starter homes in line with national and local policy' as opposed to setting a specific policy requirement. This will ensure that the policy remains up-to-date over the duration of the plan period should these changes be brought into force.	No	Representation noted. Text amended to include first time buyers. Page 40
	<b>Housing Policy H5:</b>	<b><u>Housing Policy H5: Affordable Housing</u></b>		
	<b>Housing Policy H5:</b>	Whilst recognising the importance of securing the Parishes' affordable housing needs, the purpose of Policy H5 should seek to add value to the existing policy framework and include policies that are distinctive to the local area. There is no need to repeat policies contained in the adopted Development Plan where these do not add value to the existing policy framework, as these will be taken into consideration regardless of whether or not they are included in the neighbourhood plan.	No	The specific policy is designed for the local enhancement of the potential for affordable housing through the tenure split and the opportunity to provide for self-build. (P47) NPPF paragraph 50, CS CP4 & CP5.
	<b>R4</b>	<b>Policy R4 Recreation and Community Facilities.</b> Development proposals will often deliver an appropriate level of recreational and community facilities to meet local needs. However, the policy as currently proposed would require development proposals to deliver all of the facilities listed under the criteria. Theoretically, a Sustainable Urban Extension may be able to provide this level of public open space, however a small scheme (i.e. 10 dwellings) would be unable to deliver all of the community facilities listed under this policy viably.	Yes	Amended to include ' <i>any</i> of the following...'
	<b>R4</b>	Furthermore, policy obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and when they are directly related to the development proposals in accordance with paragraph 204 of the Framework. Contributions must be based on robust and up-to-date evidence of need and cannot be used to support the provision of unrelated items.	No	Representation noted
	<b>General</b>	Gladman have land interests in the neighbourhood area and would welcome the opportunity to discuss the development proposals in more detail and to offer our assistance in drafting the submission version of the WM&CFNP ahead of the Regulation 16 consultation and invite the Parish Councils to contact us in this regard.	No	Noted. NP Steering Group Chairman has contacted Gladman but they have not responded. 14.6.2017
	<b>General</b>	I hope you have found this letter to be constructive. Should you wish to discuss any of the issues raised in this response then please do not hesitate to contact me.		
<b>Alder King Planning Consultants</b>	<b>General</b>	We are pleased to submit these representations on the draft West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Development Plan (NP) Regulation 14 Consultation. These representations are submitted on behalf of our client, David Wilson Homes South west in relation to its land interests at Nerrols Farm, Lyngford Lane, Taunton. The site is identified on the red line plan enclosed with this letter.	No	Noted. N.B: The site referred to is north of the current Northwalls Grange development. The red line plan refers to Alder King's interests in land which for clarity could be described in two halves. The westerly square shaped portion is outside the Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Boundary, whilst the easterly triangular portion is within the joint NP WM& CF area.
	<b>General</b>	As you'll be aware, the site is allocated under Policy SS 2 (Priorswood/Nerrols) of the adopted Taunton Deane Borough Council 2011 to 2028). The allocation as a whole is depicted on the Core Strategy plan enclosed with this letter. The Priorswood part of the allocation is currently under construction providing 630 dwellings and a country park. David Wilson Homes would like complete allocation by progressing a planning application on their site to provide the balance of housing provided by the allocations, compensatory habitat for bats, a comprehensive network of green infrastructure and transport related infrastructure.	No	Comments noted. See below:
	<b>General</b>	It is on this basis that we provide comment on the draft NP. We look forward to engaging with the NP process as it moves through the process of examination and adoption and with West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Councils as our proposals progress through the formal planning application process.	No	Comments noted. See below:



	<b>General</b>	<b>Comment on the Draft Neighbour-hood Plan.</b> The draft NP notes at page 25 that the entirety of the Priorswood/Nerrols allocation is within the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary: "100% of the Priorswood/Nerrols site area is within the NP area designated boundary".	No	N.B: The site referred to is north of the current Northwalls Grange development. Alder King's interests are for one area of two halves. For clarification, the westerly square shaped portion is outside the Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Boundary, whilst the easterly triangular portion is within the joint NP WM& CF area.
	<b>General</b>	However, all of the plans depicting the NP area within the draft document exclude the western part of the site (refer to Map 1 enclosed with this letter). This being the case, we are not clear whether the NP policies apply only to the eastern half or to the site in its entirety. This is a matter that needs to be clarified before the Neighbourhood Plan proceeds to adoption so that the policies are correctly applied in determination of any future planning application on the site.		Continued from box above: NP Steering Group Chairman has contacted Alder King. This NP would cover the easterly portion of this development. Source Google 2017 Nerrols Farm, Lyngford Lane Site Boundary.
	<b>Policy H1</b>	<b>Policy H1 (Housing Suitable for Older People)</b> requires new major development to "provide no less than 10% of dwellings to be sold on the open market to be evidenced by local need, suitable for occupation by older people [subject to a viability assessment]. Such accommodation shall fulfill all of the following criteria: -		
	<b>Policy H1</b>	- Be single storey and either 1, 2, or 3 bed		
	<b>Policy H1</b>	- Be situated within easy access of either existing or proposed local facilities and services".		
		The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, March 2012), confirms at paragraph 50 that local planning authorities should "plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to ..... older people)". The adopted Core Strategy at Policy SS 2 confirms that the Priorswood/Nerrols site is to be allocated for general purpose housing to provide "around 900 new homes at an overall average of 35 to 40 dwellings per hectare". The density provided by the allocation is reflective of the fact that general purpose housing is required on the allocation, a conclusion that was arrived having regard to the prevailing housing needs of the area, including that arising from older people. Draft Policy H1 should not, therefore, apply to the site and clarification to this effect should be provided in the policy text prior to adoption.	No	Agree; the site referred to already has outline planning.
		In any case, this policy is far too prescriptive in requiring housing for older people to be provided at specific storey heights. This is not a reasonable requirement of any development nor is it reflective of the market realities of providing accommodation for older people, which is generally provided at a higher density than that suggested by the policy. This is considered to be an unsubstantiated design requirement which does not conform with the NPPF (see, for instance, paragraph 60.)	No	Noted. The evidence base was gathered from the questionnaire to local residents. NPPF paragraph 50, CS CP4 & CP5, and SHMA.
	<b>Policy H2</b>	<b>Policy H 2 (Housing Suitable for Younger People and First Time Buyers)</b> requires new major development to "provide not less than 10% of dwellings suitable for younger people to be sold on the open market as starter homes and such housing shall include the following house types, as evidenced by local need [and subject to a viability assessment]:		
		1-2 bed houses		
		1-2 bed apartments		
		The policy preamble notes that the Housing and Planning Act 2016 intends to place a duty on TDBC to promote starter homes but this is subject to detailed regulations which are not published at time of writing. This is absolutely correct and, as a result, this policy cannot be adopted until these Regulations have been published and the definition of affordable housing within the NPPF is amended to include starter homes. As a result, this policy should be struck out of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. If the Parish Councils intend to include a policy on starter homes, it should be dealt with through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan or Core Strategy which would allow for any amendments to be made once this policy is confirmed and adopted by Government.	No	Noted. The evidence base was gathered from the questionnaire to local residents. NPPF paragraph 50, CS CP4 & CP5, and SHMA.
	<b>Policy H3</b>	<b>Policy H3 (External Materials for Residential Development) and Policy H4 (Refuse Bin Storage for Residential Development)</b> requires development to use appropriate local and traditional materials and provide suitable access for refuse. Our client will seek to accommodate these policy requirements in its development proposals with the aim of reinforcing local distinctiveness. We would ask, however, that more flexibility is provided in the policy wording to ensure that a high quality and inclusive design is not compromised by aesthetic requirements alone. To do so could undermine other important aspects of the scheme or affect scheme viability. Regard should be had, in particular, to paragraph 60 of the NPPF which states that: "Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles".	No	Representation accepted, provision of ..... "suitable equivalent)...." is allowed in Policy H3. Policy H4 is considered to be a reasonable expectation and in accordance CS DM4 , SADMP (Amenity Space) and NPPF paragraph 58. (Page 43).
	<b>Policy H5</b>	<b>Policy H5 (Affordable Housing)</b> requires that "subject to a viability assessment all affordable housing provided in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP4 must include:		
		a tenure split of 80% social rented and 20% intermediate housing or Affordable Rented on affordable housing provision of 3 affordable dwellings or more*.		
		a percentage (to meet current local demand as evidenced by the Parishes/TDBC) of affordable Self-Build housing** which must be retained as affordable housing through appropriate legal agreement."		

		The NPPF at paragraph 50 requires local planning authorities to set affordable housing policies that address local need and are "sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time." It is on this basis that Core Strategy Policy CPO4 provides a target of 25% of affordable housing to be provided on major development sites, including our site with the "prescribed mix of affordable housing reflective of locally evidenced need in respect of type, size and tenure." The TDBC Affordable Housing SPD (May 2014) confirms that the mix should be 60% social rented and 40% intermediate housing on proposals providing three affordable dwellings or more. West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Councils wish to more ambitiously address the affordability crisis in the Neighbourhood Plan area by requiring a tenure split of 80% social rented and 20% intermediate or affordable rented on proposals providing 3 affordable dwellings or more.	No	Representation is noted. Policy H5 is subject to a viability assessment.
		While we appreciate the desire of the Parish Councils to better address the affordability crisis, this policy should not be so prescriptive as to prohibit the timely delivery of development over the Neighbourhood Plan period. To address this, we suggest that the policy is reworded to provide the tenure split required by the Affordable Housing SPD and then, subject to a viability assessment, the tenure split provided by draft Policy H5.	No	Representation is noted. Policy H5 is subject to a viability assessment.
		On the starter home requirement, as set out above the NPPF requires policies to be justified and based on evidence of need. Only 25 people are registered on TDBC's Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Register and this does not provide the evidence base necessary to justify this policy. This being the case, this policy should be adapted to confirm that self-build proposals and self-build plots would be welcomed within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The policy requiring a portion of major applications to include self-build plots should be struck out and dealt with in subsequent review of the NP once the register has demonstrated local demand for such a policy.	No	Representation is noted. A group of Local Self-builders consider themselves to be the visible tip of a much larger group which is not reflected in TDBC's register. Policy H5 is subject to a viability assessment. The situation will be reassessed by the Parish Councils in future reviews of the NP.
	<b>Policy T1</b>	<b>Draft Policy T1 (Developing high quality bus infrastructure) and Draft NP Policy T2 (Developing a comprehensive and high quality cycle and footpath network)</b> requires new development to provide bus stops to meet bus service requirements and to provide safe and convenient cycle and footpaths to connect to existing networks. We are pleased to confirm that both of these considerations will be taken into account in the design of our development and we do not suggest any amendments to this policy.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	<b>Draft Policy R1 (Dark Skies), draft Policy R2 (Green Space and Wildlife), draft Policy R3 (Flood Attenuation) and draft Policy R4 (Recreation and Community Facilities).</b> Policies R1 to R3 lend support to applications that seek to address light pollution, support wildlife habitats/networks and include measures to reduce flooding such as ponds and wetland areas. We are pleased to confirm that all of these measures are being considered as part of our development proposals. We intend to provide a mix of flood attenuation areas and offset habitat for bats, through a comprehensive mix of landscaping, dark corridors and balancing ponds. This being the case, our proposals could accord with these policies and no amendments are suggested.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>R4</b>	Policy R4 requires new major development proposals to include proposals for new recreational and community facilities which meet a demonstrated local demand. This includes new play areas, allotments, public rights of way and green space areas. The policy preamble makes reference to Core Strategy Policy SS2 which requires the Priorswood/Nerrols application to provide "a multi-purpose 'green necklace' of landscape and public open space surrounding the settlement, providing allotments, outdoor recreation and wildlife habitats." This green infrastructure network currently being provided on the southern part of the allocation and we can confirm our client's intention to connect into this network as part of development proposals.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>General</b>	<b>Conclusion:</b> On behalf of our client, David Wilson Homes, we wish to commend West Monkton Parish Council and Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council for all their work in producing the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The document is comprehensive and considered and we look forward to working with the Parish Council's to ensure our amendments are incorporated and the document proceeds to successful adoption. We hope our comments are helpful in this respect.		
	<b>General</b>	If you have any queries or require any further assistance from ourselves, please do not hesitate to contact me on the details provided.	No	NP Steering Group Chairman has contacted Alder King.
<b>Historic England</b>	<b>General</b>	Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan.		
	<b>General</b>	We have commented recently on the associated SEA Screening consultation and I attach that response for information.	No	See Basic Conditions: Appendix 1 SEA Screening Page 10.
	<b>General</b>	We have no additional comments that we would like to offer other than to congratulate your community on its progress to date and to wish it well in the making of its Plan.		
<b>National Grid</b>		Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 6JX, UK		
		Tel +44 (0) 1926 439 000 amecfw.com, Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK Ltd.		
		Robert Deanwood Consultant Town Planner, Tel )1926 439078 n.grid@amecfw.com		
		Sent by email to:		
		<a href="mailto:talkingtomorrows@tauntondeane.gov.uk">talkingtomorrows@tauntondeane.gov.uk</a> 11 May 2017		
		Dear Sir / Madam		
		West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan Consultation		
		SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID		
	<b>General</b>	National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.		
		About National Grid		

	<b>General</b>	National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.	No	Noted
	<b>General</b>	To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.		
	<b>General</b>	<b>Specific Comments</b>		
	<b>General</b>	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus.	No	Noted
	<b>General</b>	National Grid has identified the following high voltage overhead powerlines as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:		
	<b>General</b>	□ ZZRoute -400kV from Taunton substation in Taunton Deane to Hinkley Point substation in West Somerset.		
	<b>General</b>	From the consultation information provided, the above overhead powerline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.		
	<b>General</b>	<b>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</b>		
	<b>General</b>	Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within		
	<b>General</b>	proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact <a href="mailto:plantprotection@nationalgrid.com">plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</a>		
	<b>General</b>	<b>Key resources / contacts</b>		
	<b>General</b>	National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link:		
	<b>General</b>	<a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</a>		
	<b>General</b>	The first point of contact for all works within the vicinity of gas distribution assets is Plant Protection ( <a href="mailto:plantprotection@nationalgrid.com">plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</a> ).		
	<b>General</b>	Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: <a href="http://www.energynetworks.org.uk">www.energynetworks.org.uk</a>		
	<b>General</b>	Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:	No	Contact details added to Consultation Statement.
		Robert Deanwood		
		Consultant Town Planner		
		Spencer Jefferies		
		Development Liaison Officer, National Grid		
		<a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a>		
		<a href="mailto:box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com">box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com</a>		
		Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK, Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spar C32 6JX		
		National Grid House		
		Warwick Technology Park		
		Gallows Hill		
		Warwick		
		CV34 6DA		
		I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.		
		Yours faithfully		
		[via email]		
		Robert Deanwood		
		Consultant Town Planner		
		cc. Spencer Jefferies, National Grid		
<b>TDBC</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>General Observations:</b> A significant amount of the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to meet the Basic Conditions test.		
<b>Received 14.6.2017</b>	<b>General</b>	Comments and observations are from different specialisms within Taunton Deane Borough Council (TDBC) and therefore there may be varying, perhaps opposing, views on the same topic or policy.	No	Comments and observations are reviewed individually below:
		There are some topics which you could, if you wish, say more on. For example: the Park & Ride, The Country Park, etc.		
	<b>Local Plan</b>	<b>P5.</b> Local Plan, P5. Bridwater (no"e).	Yes	Amended
	<b>Area Profile</b>	<b>P21:</b> TDBC resources mean that the Conservation Areas have not been reviewed for some time. Hestercombe, Cheddon Fitzpaine and West Monkton do not have accompanying Appraisals. There is an opportunity for the neighbourhood plan to review these with the support of the Heritage Officer, and define the character of these areas.	No	Individual Parishes will consider separately when NP is reviewed.
		<b>P28 &amp; 29:</b> Suggest including economic statistics in the profile. Could compare Census, Nomis and MintUK data.	No	Economic statistics are used elsewhere in 'Other Evidence'.
	<b>Vision</b>	<b>P32 Vision:</b> Are there any key characteristics, proposals, etc which could make the Vision locally distinctive and specific to West Monkton and Cheddon Fitzpaine?	No	No Change. The growth planned for the area is exceptional and NP Vision is to accommodate it.

	<b>Vision and Objectives</b>	<b>P32: "an increased proportion of single story dwellings to give older residents the opportunity" .</b> Will people only down size if bungalows are built?	No	Somerset Demographics (SINE) suggests bungalows are attractive to older occupiers.
		<b>P32:</b> Supplementary Planning Documents, rather than a term Guidance, are adopted by TDBC.	Yes	Amended.
	<b>Transport</b>	<b>P33: Transport Objective:</b> is there scope for making use of the Canal as a safe, enjoyable walking and cycling route?	No	No change to Policy T2. Land is in ownership of Canal & River Trust CRT but open to discussion in order to realise the transport objective.
		<b>P34:</b> Suggest that you may wish to encourage delivery of new and improved green spaces (Green Wedge, Local Green Space, Country Park, etc). Is there anything you want to add about the Viridor site links through to Green Wedge and AONB?	Yes	Amended '...and delivery...' in first bullet point.
	<b>Housing H1</b>	<b>P36: Housing Policy H1: Housing Suitable for Older People.</b> Not all older persons housing would need to be bungalows; what about the role of McCarthy & Stone, Churchill, supported housing and extra care schemes, as well as the Lifetime Homes Standards?	No	Representation is noted. P70 Policy E4 expanded to include '...or sheltered housing'. We accept the principle of the representation.
		There may be issues around the marketability and saleability, as well as the area that bungalows require affecting the density of properties on the site.	No	Representation noted.
		Whilst the supporting documents and text refers to the questionnaire responses the policy will need to be supported by objective locally specific evidence of need.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Housing H2</b>	<b>P40: Housing Policy H2: Housing Suitable for Younger People &amp; First Time Buyers Starter Homes</b> are not restricted to one or two bed dwellings <a href="https://www.ownyourhome.gov.uk/scheme/starter-homes/">https://www.ownyourhome.gov.uk/scheme/starter-homes/</a>	No	Homes 'shall include' one or two bedrooms, though other options are not excluded. By their nature, starter homes are smaller and more affordable.
	<b>Housing H3</b>	<b>P43: Housing Policy H3: External Materials for Residential Development "Residential development must incorporate..."</b> In the case of the Urban Extension how would "must incorporate " be applied? Does it mean each house or over all the development or in features at key points (i.e. principle junctions, gateways, key buildings, etc).	No	No change. It will be supported by a Design Code.
	<b>Housing</b>	<b>P44: Affordable Housing.</b> Reference the change imposed by The National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116 (See attached Portfolio Holder Decision in Weekly Bulletin).	No	Noted. P44 - states: 'It is 10 units or more in urban areas'.
		Should SDP read SPD?	Yes	Amended.
		<b>P45: Affordable Housing, first bullet point:</b> Suggest clarify that the requirement to produce a local Housing Needs Assessment will not apply for the Urban Extension.	No	'may' has been italicised.
	<b>Housing H5</b>	<b>P47: Housing Policy H5: Affordable Housing: "80% social rent, 20% intermediate"</b> Objective evidence must be supplied to support this policy, an examiner will be looking for justification from objective sources, not solely subjective (i.e. survey, consultation).	No	Noted. Shared equity mortgages are hard to find and expensive to service. The resale opportunities are reduced, therefore, the NP wish to be more ambitious in offering 80% social rented (page 45).
		To quote another Local Authorities definition of affordable Self-Build housing is not locally specific, it is better to set out and adopt a definition for your neighbourhood plan.	No	Page 46: Teignbridge DC was the first planning authority in England to produce and adopt (July 2016) a SPD on the topic of 'Custom and Self-Build Housing'. This SPD is used with respect to NP Policy H5 until such time as TDBC may produce an equivalent SPD.
		Should SDP read SPD?	Yes	Amended.
		<b>Pg 50:</b> Should there be stronger links with canal?		
	<b>Transport T1</b>	<b>P54: Transport Policy T1: Developing high quality bus infrastructure</b> There is no reference to a Bus Rapid Transport or Park & Ride; the most important bus infrastructure projects within the neighbourhood plan area.	Yes	Amended in Policy T1: '....' (Bus Rapid Transport), Park & Ride, '....
		There will be existing bus stops in many cases albeit they may require improvement.		
	<b>Employment E2</b>	<b>P67: Employment Policy E2: Sustainable Diversification of Farm Building for other Employment Uses</b> This policy would not apply to development which falls under permitted development rights, i.e. tin shed farm buildings to employment, unless it required other development control consent, i.e. listed building, conservation area.	No	Representation accepted. Policy E2 refers to "..... traditional Somerset farm buildings constructed in local stone, brick, tile, slate and timber or be of historical or architectural merit".
	<b>Employment E4</b>	<b>P70: Employment Policy E4: Social Care Employment Opportunities.</b> Are there links between this policy and older persons housing policy H1? "... provide the highway authority is satisfied with the access and parking arrangements, particularly for the emergency services" is not required as this is covered by the responsibility of the Local Highways Authority (SCC)	No	Accepted, agreed.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	<b>P77: Recreational and Environmental Strengths and Weaknesses.</b> Is the summary based on consultation?	Yes	Text amended '.....of the area have been identified by the NP Steering Group, based on local knowledge, public consultation, wildlife consultants, and can be summarised as follows:'....
		Suggest an opportunity could also be links between Green Wedges and Quantock Hills	Yes	Opportunity: amended to include suggestion.

	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	<b>P105: Policy R5: Local Green Spaces</b> There is no mention of the Viridor Site, and whilst the entire Green Wedge may not meet Local Green Space criteria elements of it, i.e. Maidenbrook, may be allocated.	No	Noted. Policy R5 is in line with the NPPF paragraph 76-78. The Viridor site is covered by SADMP Policy TAU11 (page 79) allocating 16 hectares of land at the former Priorswood landfill site for community woodland and other recreational uses.
		Suggest for context in this section you may wish to mention the larger green tracks of land, i.e. Green Wedges, Country Park, etc., and show these on a map.	No	Representation noted: See Map 20 page 101.
	<b>Heritage</b>	<b>Heritage:</b> It appears the Neighbourhood Plan relies on the NPPF and the Borough Council Policy documents to manage heritage.	No	Representation accepted.
		There is an opportunity to mention more about the heritage of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Whilst TDBC have a robust local policy, things like buildings at risk and conservation area reviews are not mentioned. Do you perceive issues such as double PVCu windows or solar panels as being important?	No	Representation noted: Policy H3 is supported by CS DM 4 and SADMP D7.
		Would recommend that you look at the Lymestone Plan, Page 30. the NP concentrates on area specific issues that are not covered at the district/borough level. <a href="http://passthrough.fw-notify.net/download/460375/http://www.lympstone.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/LNP-Final-Post-Inspection1.pdf">http://passthrough.fw-notify.net/download/460375/http://www.lympstone.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/LNP-Final-Post-Inspection1.pdf</a>	No	Representation considered.
	<b>Ecology</b>	<b>Ecology:</b> No further comments on the NP and it does not require further HRA screening.	No	Representation noted.
Self-Builder	<b>Housing</b>	I have recently joined a local group of Self Builders and as you may know, the major issue for this group of people is the finding of a suitable plot of land.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Housing</b>	We are a group of ten local residents who all have the same goal that is to build their own home. Our group arose from the Taunton Deane Register of Self Builders. All of them have filled in the necessary TDBC forms and have satisfied the requirements. The main point being we wish to build and then live in our newly built home. We are not out to make a profit and then move on. All self-builders must agree to live in their property for a period after completion.	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Housing</b>	I have heard that West Monkton PC draft Neighbourhood Plan does address this issue and has proposed some area for allocation to "self-build".	No	Representation noted.
	<b>Housing</b>	I would like to offer our support for your plan as we are receiving very little support from Taunton Deane B. C. If you would like to hear from and get support from more of our members, I will ask the members to write to you.	No	The deadline for further comments has passed.
	<b>Housing</b>	As you may know, the David Cameron government did process some legislation to oblige local councils to a) keep a register of interested self-builders, and b) to "have regard to its register" when carrying out its regular council duties (planning, asset disposal etc). In our minds TDBC has not fully engaged with this.	No	Representation accepted.
Canal & River Trust CRT	<b>General</b>	Thank you for your email regarding the proposed West Monkton & Cheddon Fitzpaine Neighbourhood Plan and your confirmation that the Canal & River Trust (the Trust) were not consulted on the draft document. For your understanding, the Trust is not a Statutory consultee for local plan matters, although we are for planning applications. Instead we appear on the list of 'other consultees' and therefore the Planning Authority decide whether to consult us or not. TDBC regularly consult us on their own plan documents and so it is of some concern that they did not suggest you consulted with us.	No	Representation understood. Although not a Statutory Consultee, CRT was consulted as the canal falls within the Recreation Policy Section. TDBC have been informed of consultation.
	<b>General</b>	We usually work closely with local authorities and local communities who are preparing a plan and, as the Bridgewater & Taunton Canal runs through the parish, we welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed plan to ensure that the Canal is properly protected and promoted and the multi- functional benefits that the waterway can bring to the area is properly recognised.	No	Agree with representation.
	<b>General</b>	The Trust has very recently launched a new document. 'What your local waterway can do for your community- a planning guide for waterways in Neighbourhood Plans'. It can be found at <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/media/original/32800-planning-for-waterways-in-neighbourhood-plans.pdf">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/media/original/32800-planning-for-waterways-in-neighbourhood-plans.pdf</a> . You may need to cut and paste the address into your browser if clicking on the link does not work. This document sets out some issues and opportunities to consider when preparing a neighbourhood plan and considers the contribution that the canal brings to life in your community.	Yes	NP document page 74 amended: 'The Bridgewater & Taunton Canal traverses both parishes within the NP area. The waterway benefits described in the document, "What your local waterway can do for your community" are largely in agreement with the Objectives described above'.
	<b>General</b>	These can be grouped under three main headings, People, Prosperity and Places, although they are of course inter- related.	No	Representation accepted.
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health, wellbeing & happiness		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Engaged people & cohesive communities		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning & enhancing skills		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous & connected places		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green & blue futures		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & environmental assets		
	<b>R4</b>	In addition, appendix 2 of The Town & Country Planning Association Policy Advice Note, titled 'Unlocking the Potential and Securing the Future of Inland Waterways through the Planning System' may provide some further guidance and is due to be re-launched shortly to take into account not only legislation changes but also updating the change in priorities in public policy such as the rise of the health and wellbeing agenda. <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/refresh/media/thumbnail/30984-planning-advice-note-inland-waterways.pdf">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/refresh/media/thumbnail/30984-planning-advice-note-inland-waterways.pdf</a>	Yes	Representation accepted. "and" amended to "&" in Policy R4 . Reference added: ** <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/refresh/media/thumbnail/30984-planning-advice-note-inland-waterways.pdf">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/refresh/media/thumbnail/30984-planning-advice-note-inland-waterways.pdf</a>

	<b>R4 and Section No. 5 Action Plan</b>	Due to the short time available to comment on this document it is suggested that you take a look at this document as you may wish to use it to create a bespoke section and policy relating to the canal. The trust would be willing to meet you to discuss this in more detail and to advise on policy wording.	No	The Action Plan (see page 108) describes the regular review of the NP by both parishes at Parish Council meetings in the future. The proposal of a community café R4 (page 98) was discussed in 2016 between CRT and the two parishes. A community cafe could be a viable community asset as the Monkton Heathfield Urban Extension grows.
	<b>General</b>	The <b>Bridgwater &amp; Taunton Canal</b> runs for 14 miles through 7 locks and we note that the community hold the canal in high regard and enjoy using it regularly. It is therefore important to ensure that the development planned in the two parishes does not have an adverse impact on the canal or result in its degradation in some way, but instead it is protected and improved for the benefit of all.	No	Agree with this representation
	<b>General</b>	The Trust considers the canal to be a very important, multi-functional, cross boundary asset but in this area it is used particularly as;	No	Agree with this representation
		<input type="checkbox"/> a sustainable transport route, linking the area into the heart of Taunton	No	Agree with this representation
		<input type="checkbox"/> an ecology corridor, linking the proposed country park to Hestercombe	No	Agree with this representation
		<input type="checkbox"/> and a recreation asset which can be further developed to provide on and off water recreation and improved facilities such as the community café.	No	Agree with this representation
	<b>General</b>	Unfortunately the recent development in the surrounding areas has put additional pressure on the canal despite not contributing to it and it is important that the second phase of development integrates the canal more fully, provides links to it and supports its improvement to cope with additional usage for the benefit of existing and future residents.	No	Current Core Strategy Policies fully support the canal as an asset.
	<b>Justification for Policy R4</b>	The Neighbourhood plan is an opportunity to set out how the local communities wish to see the canal corridor develop in the future. We would suggest that rather than seeking to protect the canal the plan also mentions 'enhancing it' to cope with the additional use that planned development will bring.	No	See page 98 - second paragraph refers: SADMP Policy ENV5 (Development in the Vicinity of Rivers and Canals).
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The preface mentions using CIL funding to support the country park. It is hoped to link the park to the canal towpath which will be used more as a consequence and we note the intention to provide a community café, which we fully support. However, the provision of the café may result in increased usage of the towpath in the area as it acts as a destination in its own right. The plan must ensure that in improving and promoting on asset it does not unintentionally result in the degradation of another.	No	Future of CIL funding is uncertain. Improvement of the towpath in the vicinity of the Urban Extension would be a suitable use of CIL funds.
		CIL funding could be sought to improve the towpath as well as the country park and a bridge access to it.	No	See above.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The possibility of a new bridge over the canal should be discussed in detail with the Trust as our permission will be required to cross the canal, as well as possibly construct the bridge landings or links to it on Trust land. The bridge design will need to be agreed to ensure it has no impact on navigational safety, or safety of towpath users, and its long term ownership and maintenance must be considered too. The plan mentions that relevant landowners must be included in discussions but we would suggest that the discussions commence now in order that the Parish council is aware of any likely costs in order to seek funding for the proposal.	No	Representation accepted. Any plans would include the Trust (as landowner) and TDBC Planning Authority. It is an objective of the TDBC Green Infrastructure policy (page 78).
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	At the recent Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 exhibition the Redrow representatives, District and County council officer all spoke of wanting to better incorporate links to the canal and recognized its value as a Green infrastructure and sustainable transport link.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The Neighbourhood plan can help to make this a reality by specifically mentioning this aim in the plan but by recognizing that developer funded improvements may also be needed as a result, to ensure that the asset remains fit for purpose following the increase in usage.	No	Representation accepted.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	We note that policy R4 mentions moorings. The provision of private moorings may need planning permission as well as agreement from the Canal & River Trust and this should be discussed with our boating team to ensure that any proposals comply with our policies and guidance. Unfortunately due to the short timescale in which to comment, it has not been possible to seek clarification from business boating or moorings colleagues.	No	Representation accepted. Both parish clerks had a site meeting with the CRT Business Boating Manager in 2016 to discuss this idea.
	<b>Recreation and Environment</b>	The Trust will comment when consulted by the District Council but by then the chance to influence the document is reduced. We would prefer the opportunity to discuss our thoughts and possible minor amendments before the document is submitted, as the neighbourhood plan will be crucial in influencing how the canal is viewed by the council and developers alike, as phase Monkton Heathfield 2 proceeds towards a masterplan.	No	Representation accepted. Amendments have been made where appropriate.
	<b>General</b>	Finally, please note that the correct title of the canal uses an ampersand not 'and' as used in the document.	Yes	Document corrected throughout.