

WEST SOMERSET LOCAL PLAN TO 2032

MATTER 6 AGENDA

17 MARCH 9:30

Other sites in the event that the Council needs to bring forward additional development sites for soundness

Inspector's Note: some of these sites have been suggested as alternatives to those proposed in the plan. That is not the test for the inclusion of such a site. Additional sites would only need to be recommended if insufficient land was proposed to meet the identified need and/or proposed sites were found not to be deliverable either in whole or in part or at the rate of delivery assumed.

Issue 1: Land to the east of Williton (Summerfield Developments (SW) Ltd)

I understand this site to be SHLAA ref: WIL3 but have been unable to find a site location plan. I assume it is all or part of the Williton East site shown in the SA (SD14, Annex B, Map 4). Summerfield Developments Ltd should appreciate that I have (quite properly) only been supplied with the responses made at Regulation 20 stage (SD21). That does not include any of the technical reports referred to as being submitted at earlier response stages. I have not therefore seen these.

1. Flood issues appear to be the main reason for this site being rejected at SA stage (SD14). Summerfield Developments Ltd however argues that 70% of the site is in Zone 1 (ED26/6). What are the implications for the development of the site and how many dwellings could come forward?
2. Is the SA conclusion for this land consistent with that for allocation site EC2 which is also in the functional floodplain? What evidence is there of the sequential and exception tests having been carried out?
3. Without knowing exactly where the site is it is difficult to judge the SA comment regarding 'remoteness'. However, as written ('more remote') (SD21 page 28), a comparison is implied with other sites. If all sites were required to meet the need, would this concern remain?

Issue 2: Land at Liddymore Farm (WAT4) and Doniford Road (WAT6) (Summerfield Developments (SW) Ltd)

1. This is now proposed as an early release site. I assume Summerfield Developments (SW) Ltd now support the plan in that regard as no further statement has been made in respect of this site under Matter 6. However, under Matter 5 the capacity is put at 200 dwellings (ED26/5). What should be assumed as the contribution from this site?

Issue 3: Land east of Watchet (South West Strategic Developments)

The SHLAA reference number for this site has not been provided and the site name used by South West Strategic Developments is not, as far as I can tell, that used by the Council in any documents. Nevertheless, it forms part of the 'Watchet East' site in the SA.

1. The site at Issue 2 is part of the Watchet East site rejected through the SA process. How does the Council's promotion of that site through the plan affect its reasons for rejecting this site? There does not appear to be any standout reason in the SA for this site to be treated differently from the others considered in Watchet.

Issue 4: Land at Dunster Marsh (The Crown Estate)

The Crown Estate identifies this site as SHLAA reference DUM8. This passed the higher assessment criteria (Appendix A of the report to the Local Development Panel on 25 November 2015 which does not appear to have a document number).

1. Prior to the Crown Estate's development of 54 dwellings, how many dwellings were there in Dunster Marsh?
2. The Crown Estate put forward a possible three phase development of the land. What would trigger moving onto successive phases?
3. Which parts of the site are in flood zone 2?
4. Having regard to the Council's principal reasons for rejection of this site (and those in ED34/6 do not appear entirely consistent with those in Appendix B of the report to the Local Development Panel on 25 November 2015) what level of development might be acceptable if additional land had to be identified?

Issue 5: Land east of Porlock Road, Minehead (Acorn Rural Property Consultants (for Miss E Thorne, Mr R Thorne and Mrs S Doggrell))

1. Part of the suggested site is now proposed as early release sites MIN30 and 41. Why has the remainder of the suggested site not been brought forward (ED34/6 does not say)?
2. What is the Council's view on their contribution in the light of the viability issues raised by the West Somerset Flood Group (ED28/5) and the apparent uncertainty as to how the sites will be brought forward, that is, individually or as a comprehensive development in part at least (Appendix 1 of the report to the Local Development Panel on 25 November 2015)?

Issue 6: Land north of Bratton Lane, Minehead (MIN15) (Mr C Shapland)

Mr Shapland identifies this site as SHLAA reference MIN15. The SA includes this land within the Porlock Road area (SD14, Map 2). The summary on page 22 suggests that this area as a whole was rejected because of flooding (parts are in

flood zone 3) and negative effects on landscape. However, the Environment Agency says the development site put forward is in flood zone 1 and acceptable (ED21/6). Nevertheless, Exmoor National Park Authority confirms its objection on landscape character and visual amenity grounds (ED25/6). However, Appendix A of the report to the Local Development Panel on 25 November 2015 says this site was not considered due to possible access issues with the existing road network while in ED34/6 the Council does not mention flooding or highway access but says it was rejected because of its poor relationship to services and facilities. A possible concern about the effect on the National Park is raised and subsequently confirmed by the ENPA.

1. Given that early release sites MIN4, 5, 30 and 41 are all within the Porlock Road area and the ENPA has suggested mitigation measures in respect of these sites (ED25/3), why has this site not been put forward for early release?

Confirmed Participants: Summerfield Developments (SW) Ltd; The Wyndham Estate; South West Strategic Developments ; Mr C Shapland; Crown Estate; West Somerset Flood Group; Environment Agency; West Somerset Council