

Summary of the key issues / concerns:	NDP Panel response and proposed changes to the NDP (where relevant):
EX01 – Highways England	
No further comments to those made previously.	Support welcomed.
EX02 – Y Verley	
Due to narrow roads and weight of existing traffic, no more houses in the Parish or close surroundings other than development of vacant houses and large plots in St Michaels Road and Hyde Lane. 5 houses too many? That will mean at least 7 or 8 cars.	The NDP does not propose to allocate land for housing.
EX03 – K Tutill	
Land to the north of Langaller Road and land round to Creech Heathfield were not part of any questionnaire and have been included within the Green Wedge without consultation. Please remove this land from the Green Wedge designation.	The method and scope of all consultation is set out within the Consultation Statement and an Additional Information Paper has also been submitted with this response to provide greater detail.
It would seem that the allocation of such a large area of land between Creech St Michael and Creech Heathfield is purely there to prevent development, the M5 is a natural barrier and can be enhanced by planting along its length.	The justification for including this area of land within the Green Wedge is explained in detail within the Green Wedge Assessment submitted with the drat NDP.

	<p>Draft Policy CSM11 does not preclude development within the Green Wedge. Rather, it seeks to resist proposals that would conflict with its important purpose as set out on Plan 15. The approach taken is intended to reflect the existing approach of TDBC's Green Wedge designation within Core Strategy Policy CP8 albeit on a more local level which was explicitly scoped out of TDBC's Green Wedge Assessment. Under the Policy CP8 approach, major residential development has been granted in the Green Wedge at Killams, Taunton (38/12/0203) and Jurston Farm, Wellington (43/14/0130) which confirms that appropriate development can be supported within the Green Wedge.</p> <p>The role and function of a Green Wedge however is separate from that of a Local Green Space which is subject to the provisions of paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF, hence why there are separate and specific policies for each. It is the intention within the Local Green Space to restrict development in special circumstances. Justification is provided below in the text for CSM10 and within the Additional Information Paper submitted with this response.</p>
<p>Development to the north of Langaller Road is much more sustainable than "throwing" it out beyond the existing boundaries to the east. On this basis this</p>	

<p>area should be removed from the Green Wedge designation.</p>	<p>The NDP does not allocate land for housing and therefore does not comment as to the appropriateness of land within the NP Area to be used as such.</p> <p>Applications for development in the Borough will be determined in accordance with S38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
<p>EX04 – S Harris</p>	
<p>Why is the eastern boundary in the northern area of the Green Wedge not following the road at 1 and 2 Heathfield Farmhouse? This could allow development that is detrimental to these existing properties but almost sever the green lung between the Monkton Heathfield urban extension and Creech Heathfield.</p>	<p>Subject to the view of the Examiner, the Qualifying Body would accept a minor modification to regularise the Green Wedge boundary at 1 and 2 Heathfield Farmhouse, as suggested by Mr Harris. Heathfield road would form the Green wedge boundary. This land was omitted in error from Figure 1.</p>
<p>Creech Heathfield has been plagued by noise and pollution from the M5 for years. With the proposal for the Monkton Heathfield extension surely priority should be given now to adequate screening of the motorway on both sides?</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. The Site Boundary Plan included in TDBC's Core Strategy to support Policy SS1 identifies an area to be reserved for external green spaces associated with developable area immediately west of the M5.</p> <p>Draft Policy CSM11 seeks to mirror this approach on the eastern side of the M5 whilst ensuring that new development is supported provided it does not conflict with the purpose of the Green Wedge</p>

	and is otherwise acceptable, when considered against the provisions of the development plan and material considerations.
How will the deer be protected if the underpass within Area 1 of the Green Wedge is to be pedestrianised?	The NDP does not include proposals for this underpass at Creech Heathfield and is therefore a separate matter. For information, Somerset County Council as Highway Authority has written to Highways England which owns the underpass to establish whether it would consent to the creation of pedestrian access through the underpass. A response is awaited. At present, the land either side of the footpath is in private ownership and there are no rights for public access across this land.
The urban extension is a major development; surely the NDP should be addressing the issues before they become a major issue.	The delivery mechanism for the Monkton Heathfield urban extension is the TDBC Core Strategy and site wide masterplan which has been led by TDBC since inception. It is therefore not proposed to include any specific NDP policies in relation to the urban extension and this is confirmed in Section 4.0 of the NDP for the avoidance of doubt.
EX05 – West Monkton Parish Council	
Is the SADMP a Supplementary Planning Document, if so please correct typo	Noted and checked, no amendment required.

<p>Modifications suggested in relation to paragraph 7.17 and paragraph 2 of Policy CSM2 to state that the NDP will not have a negative impact on neighbouring parishes especially West Monkton.</p>	<p>We do not consider that this amendment is necessary to ensure the soundness of the NDP, however, we have no objection to its inclusion.</p>
<p>Remove requirement within Policy CSM4 for new developments to be limited to 2-to-2-and-a-half storeys because this has the potential to “skew” the allocation of taller new buildings increasing the amount required in other areas to achieve the densities required within TDBC’s Expression of Interest document.</p>	<p>We understand that as part of the Monkton Heathfield urban extension it may be necessary to deliver development in excess of 2-and-a-half storeys.</p> <p>The requirements within CSM4 are based upon an analysis of the existing character of Creech St Michael both in terms of the built environment and wider role and function of the settlements within it. It is considered that the introduction of 3 storey and above buildings into the villages within the NDP Area would be wholly inappropriate. Such proposals are considered to have a negative impact on the villages and hamlets in terms of being out of character and over development. Moreover, such a proposal would be contrary to the overall vision and objectives of the NDP.</p> <p>Further justification of this policy is also included within separate comments provided in response to TDBC’s Regulation 16 representations.</p>

	<p>Comment accepted. An amendment is required to Map 14 Appendix E to remove land from the Local Green Space within West Monkton Parish administrative area.</p>
<p>EX06 – V Knight</p>	
<p>How and why has my land at Husk Farm been proposed as green belt without consultation, this is not a publicly accessible space. It appears to me that small landowners have been targeted, objection to the approach and lack of consultation and would like to understand the consultation process. Please remove the restrictions from my property at Husk Farm until we have held open dialogue.</p>	<p>A list of those consulted at each stage is included at Appendix A of the Consultation Statement. An Additional Information Paper has also been submitted with this response to provide greater detail. As a resident of the Parish, Ms Knight would have been aware of the NDP preparation through the numerous communications, including the consultation survey questionnaire sent to all Parish households by The Community Council for Somerset in 2016 and hand-delivered Creech Comms Quarterly (copy of the latest publication attached), as well as posts on The Parish Council’s Facebook site and other hard copy notices posted through the Parish.</p> <p>The Qualifying Body is satisfied that appropriate consultation has been undertaken.</p>
<p>EX07 – Natural England</p>	
<p>NDP appears well-researched and generally positive document that reflects local aspirations for the area and we welcome consideration given to landscape character and the objective to protect valued green spaces, landscapes, waterways and natural environment. Reference to measures to reduce noise and air pollution would be strengthened by reference to light pollution.</p>	<p>Support welcomed, suggested modifications can be incorporated.</p>

EX08 – The Canal and River Trust	
Possible new bridge over the canal should be discussed with the Trust as it would require our permission.	Noted, outside the scope of the NDP.
CSM1 should be amended to separate out mention of Larkfleet Estate and access in general along and to the canal towpath.	Provided that this is deliverable in terms of land ownership we agree this suggested amendment.
EX09 – Historic England	
No comment.	Noted.
EX10 – Z Nation	
Regarding Policy CSM3, agree that bungalows appeal to many local residents, do not think many residents would want a new build due to emotional and physical connection to current property. Should be noted such properties are often purchased by “young” older couples for their own retirement. Young families may be put off by refurbishing a bungalow, building mainly 2-bed homes means families may be crowded.	Observations noted, no changes to the plan required.
EX11 – N Davidson	

<p>I have had no involvement in the NDP because I did not know about it until last week. I do not believe that Government guidance on landowner involvement in Green Space planning was followed (PPG paragraph 019 and 048).</p>	<p>A list of those consulted at each stage is included at Appendix A of the Consultation Statement. An Additional Information Paper has also been submitted with this response to provide greater detail. A title search confirmed that the registered title holder of this land was SLA Property of Ipswich and a consultation letter was sent to this company. As a resident of the Parish, Mr Davidson would have been aware of the NDP preparation through the numerous communications, including the consultation survey questionnaire sent to all Parish households by The Community Council for Somerset in 2016 and hand-delivered Creech Comms Quarterly (copy of the latest publication attached), as well as posts on The Parish Council’s Facebook site and other hard copy notices posted through the Parish.</p> <p>The Qualifying Body is satisfied that appropriate consultation has been undertaken.</p>
<p>Objection to paragraph 7.6.1 due to emphasis on word “crucial” in reference to community importance for Green Space and questions asked during consultation process which has no comprehensive paper trail. Discrepancies between consultation versions of the NDP.</p>	<p>Full details of the consultation carried out are contained in the Consultation Report. An Additional Information Paper has also been submitted with this response to provide greater detail.</p>

<p>Objection to Appendix E Plan 13</p>	<p>The designation of Local Green Space has been carried out in accordance with the tests set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF. It is considered that the Local Green Space shown on Plans 13 and 14 is compliant with these tests. Justification is provided below the text for CSM10 in the NDP itself and within the Additional Information Paper submitted with this response.</p>
<p>No glossary to provide definition of Local Green Space</p>	<p>Local Green Space is explained within NPPF paragraph 76.</p>
<p>Policy CSM10 will not achieve the objectives listed in paragraph 7.6.2 of the NDP</p>	<p>We agree that paragraph 7.6.2 does not list objectives relating to the overall vision as set out in Section 5.0 of the NDP. To clarify, we consider that Policy CSM10 will deliver the objectives of the NDP listed at paragraph 5.2.1 of the NDP, namely to improve cycle and leisure routes, protect valued green spaces, landscapes and waterways and to prioritise local settlement distinctiveness. Paragraph 7.6.2 could be amended to address this if necessary.</p>
<p>Objection to Policy CSM10 because it does not meet the tests set out in NPPF paragraph 77.</p>	<p>Justification for Policy CSM10 is provided below in the text for CSM10 and within the Additional Information Paper submitted with this response.</p>

EX12 – LRM Planning on behalf of Mrs Taylor, Mr Langford and Messrs Cossey	
<p>Policy CSM11 is contrary to the NPPF and PPG.</p>	<p>There appears to be some confusion by some submitters over the role of a Green Wedge and that of Local Green Space, the latter being the designation where NPPF paragraphs 76 and 77 apply.</p> <p>Draft Policy CSM11 does not preclude development within the Green Wedge. Rather, it seeks to resist proposals that would conflict with its important purpose as set out on Plan 15. The approach taken is intended to reflect the existing approach of TDBC's Green Wedge designation within Core Strategy Policy CP8 albeit on a more local level which was explicitly scoped out of TDBC's Green Wedge Assessment. Under the Policy CP8 approach, major residential development has been granted in the Green Wedge at Killams, Taunton (38/12/0203) and Jurston Farm, Wellington (43/14/0130) which confirms that appropriate development will be supported within the Green Wedge.</p> <p>The role and function of a Green Wedge however is separate from that of a Local Green Space which is subject to the provisions of paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF, hence why there are separate and specific policies for each. The specific role and purpose of the Green Wedge is explained in the Green Wedge Assessment. It is the intention within the Local Green Space to restrict development in</p>

	<p>special circumstances. Justification is provided below in the text for CSM10 and within the Additional Information Paper submitted with this response.</p>
<p>Policy CSM11 is supported by evidence that has been prepared on the basis of a flawed and poorly executed methodology.</p>	<p>The Green Wedge Assessment accords with the approach taken by TDBC but on a much more local level. It is considered to be an appropriate, proportionate and robust evidence base on which to support the inclusion of Policy CSM11 in line with PPG paragraphs 040 and 041. This is bearing in mind the policy's purpose to define and implement a set of purposes for the land that should be reflected within new development rather than to prevent development coming forward across the NDP Area.</p>
<p>Policy CSM11 is seeking to create a designation that the strategic plan for the area has not considered to be necessary and is without justification in planning terms.</p>	<p>Policy CSM11 intends to build upon Core Strategy Policy CP8 by addressing local designations that were scoped out of the Core Strategy process. The principal of such an approach is broadly supported by TDBC in its Reg 14. Consultation response (page 5).</p>
<p>No consultation with the landowner in respect of the Green Wedge designation.</p>	<p>Full details of the consultation carried out are contained within the Consultation Statement and an Additional Information Paper submitted with this response.</p>

EX13 – Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council	
Endorsement of paragraph 4.2.4 and request for no negative impact on neighbouring country lanes as a result of Policy CSM1.	Noted, no negative impacts anticipated.
EX14 - Gladman	
Consider that the NDP vision is not consistent with national policy guidance, in particular, due to reference to “rural, peaceful and green” which conflicts with direction of growth and strategic allocations in Development Plan and is therefore not in general conformity.	This matter has been addressed within responses to the Reg. 14 representations.
Concerns around conclusions of Housing Needs Survey	The conclusions of the Housing Needs Survey are outside of the scope of the NDP. We would point out however, that the intention of Policy CSM3 is to meet any identified local housing need, and therefore it follows that if there is no or a low identified housing need then that would need to be reflected within any proposal. The Policy should not in itself preclude development coming forward provided that it is compliant in all other policy respects.
Intention to maximise community cohesion is recognised as important and a practice supported in general, we suggest that policies should not include	We consider that the financial implications of complying with this policy would be negligible and be very unlikely to render an

<p>requirements that could create unreasonable financial burden and could potentially act to render an otherwise sustainable development proposal unviable.</p>	<p>otherwise viable and deliverable development proposal unviable.</p> <p>The welcome pack would likely contain information that is already being prepared for marketing and travel planning, and therefore a cost saving is already made. It is considered that the benefits of such a measure are clear and that there is strong policy support as detailed in the justification accompanying the policy.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, if there is a genuine concern that viability could be compromised, we would be content that “where viability is not compromised” is inserted at the end of bullet point 4 of Policy CSM6.</p>
<p>Consider CSM11 to act as an unnecessary policy constraint which restricts sustainable development opportunities to the north of Creech St Michael from coming forward.</p>	<p>Draft Policy CSM11 does not preclude development within the Green Wedge. Rather, it seeks to resist proposals that would conflict with its important purpose as set out on Plan 15. The approach taken is intended to reflect the existing approach of TDBC’s Green Wedge designation within Core Strategy Policy CP8 albeit on a more local level which was explicitly scoped out of TDBC’s Green Wedge Assessment. Under the Policy CP8 approach, major residential development has been granted in the Green Wedge at Killams, Taunton (38/12/0203) and Jurston Farm, Wellington (43/14/0130) which confirms that appropriate development will be supported within the Green Wedge.</p>

	<p>The role and function of a Green Wedge however is separate from that of a Local Green Space which is subject to the provisions of paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF, hence why there are separate and specific policies for each. The specific role and purpose of the Green Wedge is explained in the Green Wedge Assessment. It is the intention within the Local Green Space to restrict development in special circumstances. Justification is provided below in the text for CSM10 and within the Additional Information Paper submitted with this response.</p> <p>The Green Wedge Assessment reflects the approach taken by TDBC but on a much more local level. It is considered to be an appropriate, proportionate and robust evidence base on which to support the inclusion of Policy CSM11 in line with PPG paragraphs 040 and 041. This is bearing in mind the policy’s purpose to define and implement a set of purposes for the land that should be reflected within new development rather than to prevent development coming forward across the NDP Area.</p>
EX15 – Network Rail	
<p>Comments made in respect of statutory responsibilities, funding arrangements and consents procedures.</p>	<p>Comments noted – outside the scope of the NDP.</p>

EX16 – Persimmon Homes	
<p>Remove reference to bungalows within supporting text for Policy CSM3.</p>	<p>The reference to bungalows is taken from the conclusions of the Housing Needs Assessment, the conclusions of which are outside of the scope of and not under the control of the NDP process.</p> <p>The reference is made within the supporting justification and does not form part of the policy wording. It is intended to state fact from the Survey and therefore does not determine an appropriate housing mix moving forward should more robust / up to date evidence become available.</p> <p>Furthermore, as per Section 4.0 of the NDP it is recognised that the urban extension operates within the context of existing permissions and S106 obligations.</p>
<p>Remove the requirement from Policy CSM4 to use locally distinctive materials where this will complement and enhance the character and street of the locality because this is prescriptive and unnecessary.</p>	<p>As per Section 4.0 of the NDP it is recognised that the urban extension operates within the context of existing permissions and S106 obligations. Policy CSM4 only applies in specific circumstances i.e. when it would result in enhancement or complement the existing vernacular and is in general conformity with national and local planning policies as set out in the justification for Policy CSM4. The</p>

	wording allows flexibility and only requires a commitment, not delivery. Therefore, it is intended that if commitment is shown but there is no possibility of delivery of one or more of the bullet points within the policy then compliance may well still be achieved depending on the merits of the case.
EX17 – Taunton Deane Borough Council	
Comments provided in response dated 22.06.2017	See separate response submitted.