

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
2			6	I would like to make a comment regarding Section 6 (Housing In East Coker) and the recommendations with regard to housing numbers within the Parish of East Coker during the planned period. It is my belief that the figure of 65 dwellings to be constructed within the planned period within the parish is to high and contrary to South Somerset District Council's own agreed and confirmed policy on housing numbers in Rural Settlements. The Local Plan states that at least 2,242 dwellings would be built in Rural Settlements between 2006 and 2028. This equates to 14% of the District's housing requirement. The March 2013 SSDC's Annual Monitoring Report indicated that a residual 750 dwellings remained to satisfy the Rural Settlement requirement. Housing growth in Rural Settlements has outstripped growth in other areas of the District and as such it is important to ensure future applications do not to undermined the Strategic Housing and Settlement policies that underpin the Local Plan.	Parishioner		There are a number of responses on the housing issues associated with the EC Neighbourhood Plan which require a detailed response. This is included within the appendix to this report rather than within these tables to enable the responses to be read and understood more easily and in a comprehensive manner.	See Housing Appendix A (Ref CS25)
3				Plan has identified a policy exception housing sites for affordable housing.	Parishioner		The plan supports affordable housing provision but the plan does not seek to allocate sites for housing. No changes proposed to the NP.	
4	46		U9	Description of match photo/visa versa. Cannot see 'glimpse' of stone, so suggest moved closer to get in and misleading.	Parishioner		Acknowledged. Considered Photo captures essence of Local Green	LGS need to be considered
5	24	ECH1		I am concerned that with 65 proposed additional houses, 43 approved and thus 22 more needed, that not all of these should be in the North Coker part of the village. North Coker will have 5 areas of modern housing development. Further housing should be more evenly shared across East Coker	Parishioner		See 1 above. The NP does not allocate specific sites for housing. The NP requires a range of housing in line with South Somerset District Local Plan.	
6				I very much support the presumption in favour of affordable housing, and in ECH4 that only small scale sites will be accepted for 100% affordable housing. I would not like to see any developments of 100% affordable housing. If possible a social mix should be required by all proposals.	Parishioner		Exception sites should work from a base position of 100% affordable	
7	23			Planning application 15/05325. Why has the Broadacres proposed development of 14 dwelling (out of 40 to the ECP to be approved) not been finished as yet? Delay in agreeing the section 106 and final design is causing a 'blight' on potential property sales in the immediate area. One specific case so far, that potentially more are likely.	Parishioner		Not within the remit of the NP. Noted and thank you for your comment	
8	53/52	Road Safety		Speed issues and need for 20 mph speed limited required for Higher Burton and the Holywell - White Post roads already identified By the additional powers and the above mentioned development at Broadacers. Can there not be additional passing places not he Holywell/White Post road , especially as there may be large lorries buses regularly using that route, some cars have to reverse up to 100/150 yards.	Parishioner		The NP does not provide detailed solutions for improving routes, these may come forward from the Highway Authority and /or improvements related to specific development	
9	24	ECH1		I am concerned that with 65 proposed additional houses, 43 approved and thus 22 more needed, that not all of these should be in the North Coker part of the village. North Coker will have 5 areas of modern housing development. Further housing should be more evenly shared across East Coker	Parishioner		See 1 above. The NP does not allocate specific sites for housing.	
10	25 /18	ECH 4/ EC1		I very much support the presumption in favour of affordable housing, and in Ech4 that only small scale sites will be accepted for 100% affordable housing. I would not like to see any developments of 100% affordable housing. If possible a social mix should be required by all proposals.	Parishioner		See 6 above.	
11	27/28	ECEM 1/ ECEM 2 /						
12		ECEM3 / ECEM4		Fully support these policies of support and promotion of existing and further business development.	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
13	31	ECT1		Support this policy for walking, cycling and bridleway routes. Wish the 'car free' requirement to be emphasised - those paths are a very important facility.	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
14	32	ECT2		Agreed with speed restrictions in the village, and the proposals for the virtual pavement between Tellis Cross and the School.	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
15	43 / 44	ECCN6 / ECCN7		Comment noted ECNP aims to maintain separation between Yeovil and the village	Parishioner		The National Planning Policy Framework para 76 and 77 provide g	Comments noted - additional views and vistas added
16	42	EECN4		Suggest the final phase of paragraph might read ' ..., as well as maintaining the gap between the villages and the Southern edge of the Yeovil urban area, including at the Keyford development'. I am concerned that the separation of the villages (especially North Coker) from the urban edge of Yeovil is very significant over a wider extent than just at Keyford.	Parishioner		Check Policy wording	Comment noted ECNP aims to maintain separation between Yeovil and the village
17	31	8.15		I am very opposed to any alteration to the sunken lanes. They are a key and significant feature of the village landscape and character. Though driving on them is difficult there are other easier access routes to the village which should be preferred routes used.	Parishioner		The NP does not provide detailed solutions for improving routes, these may come forward from the Highway Authority and /or improvements related to specific development	
18		Whole Plan		I am in agreement with the plan as a whole, apart from the comments above. I m aware of the time, afford and commitment of those involved in the production of this plan and I am very appreciative of their work I think the whole document is well produced, detailed , well thought through and readable. Impressive!	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
19				River Od - only has one 'd' and is not River Odd	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Amend text accordingly
20	36			Protection of community assets. The village store still existing's in the NDR ratings list - so perhaps should be protected or alternative uses sought.	Parishioner		Noted. Not within the remit of the NP to seek a use for a property	
21			ECTT2	Village signage was always kept to the barest minimum to protect the rural views village so I have concerns over speed signage impairing this.	Parishioner		Noted. The NP promotes highway safety and the protection and enhancement of the environment	A number of comments have been made relating to the need of additional signage. Implications on EC2 project list as set out in plan.
22			ECT1	Footpaths are missing on your maps and some that are there are not accurately drawn.	Parishioner		Noted. Check plan.	checked and amended accordingly
23			V&V9	Photo does not show the Millennium Stone	Parishioner		Noted. Check photograph	New Photos agreed
24	56			Difference between households and dwellings. Can any of these be identified to be free up for homes?	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	reviewed plan terminology

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
25	21	6.6		Why exclude Keyford -it is in the Parish and there are proposal to integrate it with footpaths etc.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	The ECNP does refer to Keyford but does not address the site in detail because at the time of publishing the draft the SSDC had not approved planning permission even in outline form.
26	21	6.8		So should we be planning extra houses in the village at all?	Parishioner		See 1 above.	The need for additional houses is evidence based following consultation with the community
27	22	6.11		Bearing in mind policy S52 and the above I think this umber far too high.	Parishioner		See 1 above.	Comment noted. Based upon new evidence the numbers are being reviewed.
28	31/ 41		ECT1	I have found no specific reference to dark skies, which were a much appreciated feature according to the Parish Plan - ' appropriately lit' should at least say ' no upward light spillage' and preferably have no street / path lighting at all	Parishioner		Check Policy wording.	Comment noted. Will look at ECNP to include reference to dark skies being maintained as far as possible.
29	45			Should Wraxall be Wraxhill?	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend to Wraxhill
30	47	10.13		No mention of endangered and protected species e.g.. Sandy skill (puffball) ??? Or water voles in the stream.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Comment noted reviewed text
31	41	10.5		Is chapel now part of the conservation area as it reads as though it should be? Is the mill in Mill Lane part of the conservation area, on the map it appears not.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text and map	ECNP does not seek at this time to change the existing conservation area. We are unclear what is meant by "Chapel" For information the Mill in Mill Close is not included in the conservation area.
32	31	8.11		This seems like a strong viable alternative to creating large car parking areas	Parishioner		Noted. The PC have chosen not to allocate sites for parking.	Comment noted.
33	32	8.17		Car parking on the roads creates a problem as houses were not built in a car era. Will the council support applications for off road parking areas to be created?	Parishioner		The NP seeks to encourage off street parking. Planning applications will be considered on an individual basis	This is covered in Policy ECT1
34	52			Speed restriction signs - are they necessary? They will not be enforced at 2am when infringements usually occur. Traffic calming measures on the road would be preferable.	Parishioner		See 21 above	
35	7			On the display sheet - just opt note that any mention of West Wells Cottage garden as a protected ' greenspace' should not be included in final report.	Parishioner		Noted. Check designation	Comment noted.
36				I am concerned re the traffic congestion with more houses esp in E. Coker Rd and by the school, also past the Helyar Arms with parked cars.	Parishioner		The NP seeks to encourage off street parking. Planning applications will be considered in reference to Somerset County Council Parking Strategy.	
37	7			Compatible with EU and convention on human rights - add - or Up superseding legislation	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Interesting point. The plan has to accord with current regulations
38	24		Housing	The 860 figure is too high. East Coker has been targeted by SSDC for its urban expansion therefore future projections to 2028 should be lower . 850 would be more reasonable. 43 already planning meaning 7 over next 11 years.	Parishioner		See 1 above.	
39				General Comment. Many thanks to all on the Parish Council for their time and effort for producing an excellent plan.	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
40				No comment to make	Parishioner		Noted	
41	30	8.3		This section seems factually incorrect regarding bus services to Chard and Bridport. These were cut in early 2016, so that the Chard service is about every two hours (the gap varies through the day) and the Bridport service is two hourly in the morning, with a 3 hour 45 minute gap in the afternoon. Of course, there are fewer on Saturdays and none at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Perhaps even more important is that these services are the local link for the north of the Parish into Yeovil. When combine, these services still leave gaps of 2 - 2 1/2 hours into Yeovil, and 1 1/2 to 2 3/4 hours for the return journey, making it difficult to plan, for instance, hospital or doctor appointments by public transport compared to the previous level of service. This recent reduction in services will increase car journeys in and out of the parish whereas the aims should be to reduce these as much as possible.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Amend text accordingly
42	47	10.13		Hardington Moor is a National Nature Reserve, as well as being a SSSI as stated.	Parishioner		Noted.	Amend text accordingly
43	10	2.15		Refurther development - must be for meeting local needs - affordable housing vital	Parishioner		See 1 above.	
44	18		EC1	Reassuring that any contrary plans need to demonstrate engagement and consultation with ecpc	Parishioner		Your comment noted	
45	22	6.10 / 11		this does seem a realistic and positive scenario. Reassured generally by the depth of detail regarding housing development. Need recognised but rural settlement must be maintained.	Parishioner		See 1 above.	
46	30	8.6		Would welcome 'coloured footpath' from Tellis Cross to the School, as someone who uses that route.	Parishioner		Noted .	this is one of the actions for the plan going forward.
47	31	8.12		Provision of car park at halves Lane - positive idea but.... Hall car park is not fully utilised currently, so would this be used if provided.	Parishioner		Noted. The NP does not allocate sites for a carpark.	Amend text accordingly
48	34	9.5		An observation - Closworth and Sutton Bingham do have their own Parish Churches. Should any mention be made of Coker Ridge Benefice. Just an observation.	Parishioner		Noted	Amend text accordingly
49	52-54			Very impressed with the range of issues, projects and actions. It shows deep consideration for all aspects areas and villagers. Well done all.	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
50				The Plan is extremely well laid out and it is obvious a lot of work and consultation has gone into its production. It covers all the issues and sets out the village and its ethos extremely. Well done to all who have been involved. I do have a couple of comments though. If anything the Plan concentrates overly on housing and perhaps not quite enough on the community facility aspects of the village. Perhaps the reference to the absence of a village shop could have been more positive, as I believe this is achievable with the will of the community behind it to make it happen. Other villages and communities have made this happen. Secondly I was a bit disappointed that the only photograph of the outside of the village hall on page 34 was so small. This is such a brilliant facility and one which many villages would give their eye teeth for, as the saying goes, that I would have liked to see it being given more prominence. These comments apart your plan is brilliant. This is a Plan your village and community can be proud of and I look forward to hearing the results of the consultation.	Parishioner		Noted. Thank you for your supportive comments.	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
51				Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A303 to the north west of the plan area. It is in the context of these responsibilities that our comments are made. We note that the Plan area includes the proposed Southern Yeovil Urban Extension site at Keyford which has been allocated in the adopted South Somerset Local Plan for mixed use development, including up to 800 dwellings. We therefore understand that as this site is covered by Local Plan policies, it has not been considered specifically within the Neighbourhood Plan. This scale of development has the potential to impact on the operation of the SRN and we therefore look forward to working with the District Council and potential developers in the assessment of traffic impact and the mitigation measures which may be necessary to support these proposals as they come forward. In terms of the proposed policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, we are satisfied that these are unlikely to impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. This response does not however prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the appropriate policy at the time.	Steve Hellier - Highways England		NOTED	
52								
53				ECDNP, it is clear that its primary focus is on the villages themselves, with less attention given to wider issues about the Parish or its relationship with Yeovil (or its other neighbours). This is emphasised by the reference to policy. The NP could cover a small area. The ECNDP . acknowledges, there has been substantial discussion about the SUE and its overall planning status is firmly established. The ECDNP also recognises that the Keyford site accommodates growth for the whole of Yeovil (and is in the form it is to meet the town's requirements and not East Coker's or North Coker's). The development will be subject to national and local planning policy and the development management process – which have the same quality objectives and requirements that the ECDNP plan repeats. POLICY ECH1: excludes the SUE but provides no other guidance on where the additional development it refers to may take place. That process will presumably come from the application of policies in the SSLP. The policy also fails to make provision for a review of the SSLP (between now and 2028 when both plans will expire). If this policy needs to be in the ECDNP (and we are not sure it does – Policy ECH1 of the Plan makes no distinction between settlement and parish. It should just apply to East Coker and North Coker, although ECH1 probably doesn't need to be in the ECDNP at all given that it is effectively already in the Local Plan (or other planning guidance), and we recommend that such a reference is added to the end. POLICIES ECCN1, ECCN2, ECCN3, ECCN4, ECCN5, ECCN8, and ECCN9 -the need for these, they do not add value to SSDCLP or national policy. PROPOSAL MAP - inaccuracies and in need of further explanation. A number of suggestions could be made in this light. However, because of the ECDNP's focus (and function) and because the Keyford site is already subject to quality control (that is at least equivalent to that proposed now), as a starting point we recommend that the Plan Area is reconsidered generally and/or that the Keyford site is removed from it.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		Comments noted.	
54	N/A	N/A		We would like to congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and the Parish Council on reaching this milestone in the Neighbourhood Planning timeline, and producing a very good plan. We support the plan. However, we would like to see the addition of three key areas which we believe are important for the Parish and the Community living and working within it. These are:	Parishioner		Thank you for your supportive comments	
55				1. An additional policy should be added which details the flood management plan within the Parish, ensures that development complies with this, and ensures that developers take all actions necessary to minimise the risk of increased flooding as a result of that development.	Parishioner		Noted. The PC has looked into the inclusion of a separate flood risk policy. The NP seeks to avoid overlap. NPPF provides strict tests to protect people and property from flooding. SSDCLP POLICY EQ1: ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE IN SOUTH SOMERSET directs development away from medium and high flood risk areas through using South Somerset's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as the basis for applying the Sequential Test, in addition this policy outlines measures which should be included in development (where appropriate) to reduce and manage the impact of flood risk by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems, through appropriate layout, design, choice of materials and incorporation of methods of flood resilience.	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
56				2. The ECCN policies should be reviewed to ensure that sufficient wording is included to ensure the protection of the natural environment (terrestrial and water) and biodiversity of flora and fauna throughout the Parish. Currently, ECCN 4 covers this in a very generalised manner, while ECCN 9 covers a specific wildlife designation only.	Parishioner		Noted. The NP seeks to avoid overlap. NPPF provides protection for biodiversity. SSDCLP POLICY EQ4: BIODIVERSITY promotes conservation, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity and geology by sustaining and where possible improving the quality and extent of natural habitat and the populations of naturally occurring species. POLICY EQ5: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE and associated Green Infrastructure Strategy encourages development proposals to provide and/or maintain existing areas including public open space, accessible woodland, and river corridors, and by ensuring that development provides open spaces and green corridor links between new and existing green spaces. Policy ECCN4 and ECCN9 considered below.	Green Infrastructure Strategy is looking at YSE. Natural England 'Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard' (ANGSt) relevant to LGS designations re standards
57				3. Policies throughout the plan should be reviewed so that health and well-being of residents within the Parish is maintained or enhanced as a result of development. Specific comments on this are included as separate responses to the draft plan.....where are these.	Parishioner		Noted. The NP seeks to contribute towards health and well being. Health Impact Assessments (HIA)s for significant major developments are a means of assessing the potential health impacts of a development and can help the LPA to make choices about alternative and improvements to actively promote health. HIAs are submitted as part of the planning application for specific development schemes considered likely to have a significant impact on health and wellbeing. For example, major development sites which fall into areas of highest health deprivation. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gave local authorities new duties and responsibilities for health improvement and health protection. The Act requires every local authority to use all the levers at its disposal to improve health and wellbeing. The promotion and protection of health and wellbeing being embedded throughout all directorates and functions of the Council, including spatial planning and development management The NPPF sets out the purpose of the planning system as being "to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development." Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society is recognised by the NPPF and Securing the Future (UK Sustainable Development Strategy) as one of the guiding principles' of sustainable development.	
58				The priority of our responses to the draft plan have be marked in two ways. First, responses linked to the three points above have been marked as "Priority". Other responses, which we hope could be considered by the working group and may provide benefit to the Plan and/or the Parish, have been marked as "Observation".	Parishioner		Noted.	
59	5	Para 1.8		Observation: no mention of the history of the production of flax within the Parish. Should this be considered?	Parishioner		Noted	Amended text accordingly
60	8	Para 2.8		Observation: This paragraph is disjointed, and the point trying to be made does not come across clearly. Consider rewording or adding clarification.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Amended text accordingly
61	8	Para 2.8		Observation: The Policy SS2 box, which has be lifted from the SSDC Local Plan, should carry an appropriate reference.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text .	Amended text accordingly
62	8	Para 2.8		Observation: Fourth paragraph - "... described in section 2.14 below". Section 2.14 is on page 10. not on page 8. Remove the word "below", and replace with "on page 10".	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amended text accordingly
63	8	Para 2.8		Observation: Fifth paragraph - "East Coker is a Rural Settlement". It is not made clear in this plan how East Coker has been classified as such, and by whom. It is mentioned in Para 6.14 that the SSDC Local Plan states this. However, we cannot find where there this is stated in the the local plan. Consider providing a reference to back up the statement. We know that the classification is correct, but we should be seeking to back up statements like these where possible.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amended text accordingly
64	10	Para 2.15		Observation: Believe that there is a missing word (or words) in the first sentence. This sentence is also very long - consider splitting into two to make the message clearer.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amended text accordingly
65	16	Objectives Box		Priority: The plan requires a single objective and associated policy regarding flood management within the Parish, and ensuring that development does not contribute to increased flood risk.	Parishioner		See 55 above	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
66	18	Policy EC2		Observation: Surprised to see mention of speed restriction signs at entrances to village only. It was previously understood that any speed restriction within the village would require repeater signs throughout the village. As a result of this the proposed speed restriction was rejected by the Parish Council. Has this now changed? Further details clarifying this would be useful. If the policy regarding repeater signs has not changed, will the speed restriction be enforceable if signs are only present at the entrances to the village?	Parishioner		See 21 above	these are included in the plan having been discussed with the Highways Authority.
67	20	Table		Observation: Missing brackets in 2 cells - East Coker % column, Children 0-15 year old row & Older People (aged 65+) row.	Parishioner		Noted	Amended text accordingly
68	22	Para 6.9		Observation: Incorrect word in final sentence. Should be "will grow to 1807" not "will grow by 1807".	Parishioner		Noted	Amended text accordingly
69	24	Para 6.14		Observation: As per previous comment on Para 2.8, consider including a reference to the SSDC Local Plan which states that East Coker is a rural settlement.	Parishioner		Noted	Amended text accordingly
70	24	Policy ECH2		Priority: This policy should be amended to include affordable housing for young families. The parish needs young families, however the homes should be suitable for them. Homes suited to the elderly are not necessarily suitable.	Parishioner		Noted. The NP recognises that the community needs housing that meets the local housing need. Affordable homes are negotiated through the planning process. See amendments to policies below.	The plan will rely on the housing assessments undertaken by the District Council and Housing Associations
71	27	Para 7.4		Observation: Second bullet - remove duplicated slash (/)	Parishioner		Noted	Amend text accordingly
72	27	Para 7.5		Observation: Third bullet - remove the word "is"	Parishioner		Noted	Amend text accordingly
73	28	Policy ECEM2		Priority: First bullet should be appended with the words "including residential dwellings". This clarifies that business activities should not impact of the health and well being of residents within the Parish.	Parishioner		Noted. Check Policy wording.	Amend ECEM2 to be clearer re impacts upon amenity.
74	28	Policy ECEM3		Priority: The 3 bullets from Policy ECEM3 are equally applicable to policy ECEM2 and should be included. Alternatively, the linkage between the two policies should be clarified - currently the introduction text to each policy suggest that they are independent and relate to different business applications.	Parishioner		Noted, Check Policy Wording	Amend ECEM 2 and 3 and associated wording for clarity
75					Parishioner			
76	28	Policy ECEM4		Observation: Final bullet is not a bullet but a paragraph in its own right. Remove bullet point.	Parishioner		Noted. Check Policy Wording	Amend ECEM 2 and 3 and associated wording for clarity
77	28	Policy ECEM4		Observation: The final bullet appears to be promoting the creation of additional farm shops within the village. Can the village support another farm shop, and how does Goose Slade Farm feel about the plan encouraging competition? Suggest rewording, possibly changing "farm shops" to "amenities". Holiday cottages, for example, would contribute to the rural economy.	Parishioner		Noted. Opposition to business competition is not a material planning consideration. See policy amendments.	Amend ECEM4 accordingly
78	30	Para 8.1		Observation: Should say "community have been", not "has been".	Parishioner.		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
79	30	Para 8.2		Observation: As the local bus service is predominantly used by Bus Pass holders, is the service viable going forward? Does the amount of money which the Government reimburses the service provider for concessionary travel cover all costs? Do we need to do more in order to protect the service for those who need it?	Parishioner		Not within the remit of the NP. Noted and thank you for your comment	
80	30	Para 8.6		Observation: The route from the school to Tellis Cross should be regularly swept in Autumn/Winter to remove mud and leaf litter (which reduces the width of the walk way), particularly opposite Coker House entrance where the path passes under large trees. This could be a standing arrangement with the SSDC Lengthsman, or with County Highways.	Parishioner		Not within the remit of the NP. Noted and thank you for your comment	
81	31	Policy ECT1		Observation: Fourth bullet. Is inclusion of appropriately lit route in conflict with policy ECH2 - "compatible with character"? Much of the Parish is not lit.	Parishioner		Noted. Check Policy wording	Checked Policy wording and amended accordingly,
82	31	Policy ECT1		Observation: Fifth bullet should be amended to include "dog waste bins".	Parishioner		Noted. Check Policy wording	Check Policy wording and amend accordingly
83	31	Para 8.9		Observation: Can more detail be provided on the second bullet please? - "active participation in relieving congestion".	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Check text and amend accordingly
84	31	Para 8.9		Observation: Third bullet suggests that there is already a speed limit covering the whole Parish. As per our comment on policy EC2, further details are required on how the proposed speed limit would be implemented and enforced. Clarification on the current situation would be useful.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Clarification required as per 21
85	31	Para 8.11		Observation: Can it be clarified why the Village Hall is not being used fully for parent parking? Should we be considering making provision for a walkway from the Village Hall past the Sawmills, noting that currently many of the businesses park on the road outside their premises?	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Check text and amend accordingly
86	31	Para 8.13		Observation: Same comments as previously given on Policy EC2 and Para 8.9 also applicable here - further details are required on how the proposed speed limit would be implemented and enforced. Clarification on the current situation would be useful.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	See 21 above
87	32	Policy ECT2		Observation: Bullet 1. Same comments as previously given on Policy EC2 and Para 8.9 also applicable here - further details are required on how the proposed speed limit would be implemented and enforced. Clarification on the current situation would be useful.	Parishioner		Noted. Check Policy wording	See 21 above
88	32	Para 8.16		Observation: This paragraph appears misplaced, appearing between paragraphs which are talking about traffic. Suggest moving into own sub-section.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
89	32	Infrastructure		Priority: There is no discussion regarding road drainage. Highways drains, and the maintenance and unblocking of these, are extremely relevant to traffic and road infrastructure. This infrastructure is important in preventing surface flooding, a problem which the Parish currently suffers with (e.g. at Sawmills). This should be considered further.	Parishioner		Noted. Not within the remit of the NP.	
90	32	Para 8.18		Observation: Should read "mains drainage" and not "main drainage".	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
91	34	Para 9.2		Observation: Final sentence - comma missing between cinema and health.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
92	34	Para 9.4		Observation: Believe that this should be under the title "The Pavilion". The paragraph currently follows on from one under the title "Village Hall".	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
93	34	Para 9.7		Observation: It should be made clear that the Sandhurst Road convenience store is also the closest Post Office to the Parish.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
94	34	Para 9.7		Observation: It should be made clear that all the alternative retail provision, including Goose Slade Farm are not accessible by foot for most Parishioners.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
95	34	Para 9.8		Observation: This paragraph is out of date and needs revising.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
96	36	Policy ECCF1		Observation: Missing "(" between "protected" and "as". Also, bullets 2, 3 & 4 appear to have a space in front of each statement - makes the bullets out of alignment with the first and last.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend Policy accordingly
97	36	Policy ECCF2		Observation: Red House and Yeovil Court Hotel are not included despite being mentioned in paragraph 9.9. These should be included.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend Policy accordingly
98	36	Social & Health		Observation: No mention is made on the number of clubs and meetings which are regularly held in the Parish and are well supported. It is vital that these are maintained and continue to be supported.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text. The PC have endeavoured to consult and engage with established clubs/groups and this is discussed in detail in the Consultation Statement.	Amend text accordingly
99	38	Section 10		Priority: This section should take into account the protection of applicable biodiversity designations and the Waterframe Work Directive designation of the River Odd.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text. See 54 above	Amend text accordingly
100	39	n/a		Observation: There is no page number 39. Expect that this is because the Map is covering both pages 39 and 40. However, in order for this to work correctly in a booklet, the map needs to start on an even numbered page.	Parishioner		Noted. Check editing	Amend editing accordingly
101	40	Map		Observation: The map would be better positioned as an appendix, then referenced accordingly within the body of the report.	Parishioner		Noted. Check editing	Amend editing accordingly
102	42	Policy ECCN3		Priority: The sixth bullet should be amended to include prevention of surface water pollution. Run off from roads into surface water drains discharge directly into the Parish watercourses (e.g. River Odd) and can have negative impacts on these.	Parishioner		Noted. Check Policy wording	Amend Policy accordingly
103	42	Landscape Objective		Observation: Believe that the title to Paragraph 10.8 is appearing in the bottom of the box.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
104	42	Para 10.8		Observation: Second sentence - Remove unnecessary comma between "and" and "banks".	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
105	43	Para 10.10		Observation: Space required between "in" and "Neighbourhood"	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
106	44	Policy ECCN6		Observation: Title - Changes" in "Greenspace" to lower case.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
107	44	Policy ECCN6		Observation: Duplicated "s" in "Greenspace" in first sentence.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
108	47	Para 10.11		Observation: Clarify that Grade 1 is an England and Wales classification. Scotland and Northern Ireland have a different classification system. The statement of 4% only applies to England and Wales, not the whole UK.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
109	47	Para 10.11		Observation: Consider adding a reference to the source which states that 4% of land (in England and Wales) is Grade 1.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
110	49	N/A		Observation: Believe that the statement "To cooperate regarding developer ..." should precede "SCC, SSDC & ECPC", and not "SCC" as currently positioned.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
111	49	Para 11.2		Observation: First sentence - Change the word "below" to "within" as Appendix 1 starts on page 52.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text.	Amend text accordingly
112	49	Para 11.2		Observation: The second sentence mentions a "Neighbourhood Development Plan". This is the first use of this terminology. Should this be "Neighbourhood Plan" or "Development Plan" (as detailed elsewhere)?	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
113	49	Para 11.3		Observation: The final sentence should finish "five years or so".	Parishioner		Noted. Check editing	Amend text accordingly
114	51	Timeline		Observation: Will all responses, including those from statutory bodies, be publicly available following completion of the consultation? Consider adding clarification on this.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
115	52	Appendix 1 Table		Observation: "Examine speeds issues ..." should include Yeovil Road (Triangle to Tellis Cross).	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
116	52	Appendix 1 Table		Observation: "Address parking ..." should be clarified by including the areas of concern (Main Road and Yeovil Road).	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
117	52	Appendix 1 Table		Observation: It is assumed that " Village Centre" in the "Poor quality of surfacing ..." issue relates to North Coker. Add clarification.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
118	52	Appendix 1 Table		Observation: Remove the word "both" before "Finger Posts" in the "Improve signage" issue.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
119	52	Appendix 1 Table		Observation: The Parish Design Guide is not mentioned in the table, but is listed in Policy EC2. Details need to be added to the table.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
120	53	Appendix 1 Table		Observation: Space required between "Responsible" and "Body" in the header row.	Parishioner		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
121	43/44		10.1	Local Green Space (LGS) – In addition to the LGS listed, I consider that the green space between the Tellis Cross and the Chantry should be included in LGS. This is the strip of farmland between the two locations (south of Tellis Cross and its play area and north of the Chantry buildings). It has mature trees and has the appearance of parkland, which includes a rural right of way. It has relationship between North Coker House and the Chantry buildings and the farmland to the east. This area was highlighted by the SSDC Conservation Unit as an area that might be given consideration in any future review of the North Coker Conservation Area.	Parishioner		COMMENT NOTED WILL REVIEW NP	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
122	41	10.6		Although I accept that the Conservations Areas should not be part of the Neighbourhood Plan I am concerned that the large number of respondents at the Open Day event (Oct 2015) who replied positively to the suggestion of the Parish Council working with SSDC to explore an extended Conservation Area will feel let down. Id like to see the working read - that the Parish Council will actively engage with SSDC to explore extended Conservation Areas.	Parishioner		Noted. Local planning authorities are obliged to designate as conservation areas any parts of their own area that are of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Local planning authorities also have a duty to review past designations from time to time to determine if any further parts of their area should be conservation areas. It is not within the remit of the NP to designate a Conservation Area, nor is it to direct the Parish Council to engage with SSDC to explore extension of the Conservation Area. The PC do recognise that the Conservation Area boundary is an on going issue.	this issue is already addressed in the plan
123	5 & 39			Our comments are set out below and suggest that some further consideration be given to the chosen geographic boundary of the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan Form of the East Coker Parish From a Neighbourhood Plan point of view, East Coker Parish could be looked at as having three broadly different areas, as follows: - The core village areas of East Coker and North Coker - Intervening and surrounding green countryside - Land adjoining the southern urban edge of Yeovil either allocated in the South Somerset Local Plan for development (as in the case of the Keyford YSUE) or contained in the current HELAA (Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment) as potential future southerly expansion areas for Yeovil. The HELAA East Coker information is publicly available and was published in the Western Gazette only a fortnight ago. The East Coker Neighbourhood Plan boundary The ECNP as drafted covers the entire Parish and encompasses all three of the broad areas set out above. The Plan could have been drawn with a tighter boundary just covering the core village areas, or alternatively with a wider boundary to cover both the village areas and the surrounding countryside, but excluding land adjoining Yeovil's urban edge. Any one of these three alternative boundaries would be acceptable, provided that the text of the Plan addresses the issues pertinent to each of the broad geographic areas included within it. The Plan's Approach Although the references to the YSUE in the Plan are fully acknowledged, the main thrust of the Plan as drafted is to cover issues in the East Coker and North Coker villages, while generally remaining silent on any future expansion of Yeovil. As such, the Issues set out in Appendix 1 such as parking issues, grit bins, play areas, sound systems, etc. would be wholly appropriate and comprehensive if the Plan's boundary was tightly drawn around the villages. If the ECNP continues to include the land along Yeovil's southern boundary then the future expansion of Yeovil is something that perhaps should be addressed within the document.	John Bishop - Charles Bishop Limited, Hendiford, Yeovil		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix A (CS25)
124				The supporting text set out within the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) does not provide a sufficiently robust, evidence-led approach to justify the subsequent policies. A clearer relationship between what evidence has been established, and how this results in specific wording of the policies is required throughout the draft NP (see below for specific details).	SSDC		Noted. Check text. A portfolio of information and documents that support the development the NP, demonstrating that all the information is up-to-date and provides a clear picture of the existing 'state' of the Parish, is on the website. The evidence base contains two elements: • community engagement – the views of the local community and other stakeholders who have an interest in the future of the area • research/fact finding - evidence that the choices made by the plan are supported by the background facts (such as Census data)	The plan has been amended since the Regulation 14 draft.
125				The East Coker NP Area includes the south western edge of Yeovil (including the Keyford Sustainable Urban Extension) which is in the parish of East Coker. The policies in the draft NP clearly seek to inhibit further large-scale growth of the south western edge of Yeovil. The Neighbourhood Planning Group should recognise that as the District's principal settlement, it is highly likely that Yeovil will need to grow in the future and accommodate additional residential and economic development. The Early Review of the Local Plan is underway and evidence already demonstrates that additional housing will be required across the district to support population growth to 2034. The Spatial Planning team will begin to work on options to accommodate this additional housing and 360 degree searches of appropriate settlements will be undertaken to establish potential sites/locations for development. The Neighbourhood Planning Group should not be seeking to constrain parts of the town from future development through this Neighbourhood Planning process as it is not in the spirit of sustainable development advocated in the NPPF. This could also result in community expectations not being met.	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix A (CS25)
126	10	2.15		This seeks to inhibit further large-scale growth of Yeovil. Please see general comments above.	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix A (CS25)
127				The term "modest growth" is referred to. Can you define "modest growth" as the term can be subjective.	SSDC		Noted.	The overall aims and objectives for housing in the Parish are addressed within the text of the plan.
128	16	Housing Objective		The Housing Objective refers to "appropriate housing", can you define this term.	SSDC		Noted.	The overall aims and objectives for housing in the Parish are addressed within the text of the plan.

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
129		16	Agricultural Objective	The Agricultural Objective is to resist the development of the highest quality agricultural land. Planning Appeals have demonstrated that this can be difficult and the Neighbourhood Planning Group should be aware of this.	SSDC		Noted. Check objective wording.	Paragraph 112 of the Framework requires: "...the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land..." to be taken into account. amend objective to read: Protect high grade agricultural land in order to increase sustainability of food supplies. This objective has appeared in a number of neighbourhood plans which have been made.
130		18	Policy EC1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development	The Policy requires developers and applicants to demonstrate how they have proactively engaged and consulted East Coker Parish Council and other community groups/or residents directly affected by their proposal.	SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording.	This paragraph has appeared in similar policies of made plans, having had regard to national policy and advice. To improve wording add Proportionate to the scheme, developers and applicants should demonstrate how they have proactively engaged and consulted East Coker Parish Council and other community groups and/or residents directly affected by their proposal.
131		18	Policy EC1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development	Whilst the NPPF (paras 188-195) refer to pre-application engagement and SSDC obviously encourages developers to speak to the community about projects, especially residential schemes, requiring applicants to do this is difficult. It is unlikely that the Council would refuse an application purely on the lack of pre-app.	SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording.	See detailed Plan Amendments Appendix B (CS26)
132		18	Policy EC1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development	Suggest rewording Policy EC1 to encourage proactive engagement rather than require it.	SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording	See detailed Plan Amendments Appendix B (CS26)
133	21-22	6.6-6.11		These paragraphs which seek to set out the methodology for deriving ECNP's "fair share" of housing development are not clear. As with the Local Plan, policies within the Neighbourhood Plan should be underpinned by robust, objectively assessed data. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) note that many neighbourhood planning groups produce Housing Needs Assessments in support of their plans, setting out the evidence to verify their housing policies. Is there such a paper supporting the ECNP housing policies?	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 and Housing appendix A
134	21-22	6.6-6.11		Paragraph 6.7 uses 2011 Census data and a Household Occupancy figure of 2.1. Previous comments from the District Council (email from Jo Wilkins dated 6th December 2016) have raised the issue of using up-to-date data such as the 2014 based Household Projections and 2014 Subnational Population Projections. The ECNP group have acknowledged this and will revise at Regulation 15 stage. A revision of the baseline from 2011 to 2014 as suggested by the Council will undoubtedly amend the figures.	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above & housing appendix
135	21-22	6.6-6.11		Paragraph 6.8 suggests an 8.5% increase in population and dwellings in East Coker between 2011 and 2028. What is the evidence for this growth? The methodology as set out in the plan does not reflect the PAS Guidance "Housing Needs Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans" http://www.pas.gov.uk/documents/332612/0/PASNP/Scd2a9da-dc5e-4c5c-a982-e2f4a23d3fcc nor is there any evidence supporting the figure of 65 dwellings over the plan period.	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above. & Housing appendix
136		24	Policy ECH1: Housing Provision	This Policy seeks to inhibit further large-scale growth of the south western edge of Yeovil. The Neighbourhood Planning Group should recognise that as the District's principal settlement, it is highly likely that Yeovil will need to grow in the future and accommodate additional residential and economic development. The Early Review of the Local Plan is underway and evidence already demonstrates that additional housing will be required across the district to support population growth to 2034. The Spatial Planning team will begin to work on options to accommodate this additional housing and 360 degree searches of appropriate settlements will be undertaken to establish potential sites/locations for development. The Neighbourhood Planning Group should not be seeking to constrain parts of the town from future development through this Neighbourhood Planning process as it is not in the spirit of sustainable development advocated in the NPPF. This could also result in community expectations not being met.	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
137		24	Policy ECH1: Housing Provision	It has previously been stated by the Council (email 6/12/16) that Policy ECH1 should refer to a minimum requirement rather than an absolute as this is in line with the Local Plan approach to housing requirements. The minimum requirement relates to the application of Local Plan Policy SS2 and recognition of issues surrounding the national requirement for local authorities to demonstrate a 5 year land supply.	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
138		24	Policy ECH3: Provision of Amenity Space	The Policy seeks to tackle an issue that has been wrestled with nationally for some time. The Local Plan has no standards of this type so it would be inconsistent to include them here. Additionally no standards are offered in the policy, the use of words such as 'suitably' and 'reflects' still leave the determination open to assessment which is where we are now.	SSDC		Policy to be reviewed and amended accordingly	The Basic Conditions requires general conformity to the strategic Policies of the development plan for the area. National guidance contained in the 'Technical housing standards-nationally described space standards' (March 2015) refers to space inside dwellings. There is no strategic policy in the LP relating to internal and external space standards. The NPPF sets out the need to seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings as one of the core planning principles in paragraph 17. Consultation results have highlighted the need to provide appropriate housing for the community. Propose alternative policy: All new development will be expected to achieve the provision of the following: 1. Sufficient internal space in housing for everyday activities and to enable flexibility and adaptability by meeting nationally described space standards; and 2. External amenity space should be: a) functional and safe; and (b)easily accessible from living areas; and (c)orientated to maximise sunlight; and (d)of a sufficient size and functional shape to meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers; and (e) designed to take account of the context of the development, including the character of the surrounding area.
139	24	6.17		Although the 2016 Act defines Starter Homes as an affordable housing product, and the White Paper further supports their contribution to meeting affordable needs, they have yet to be formally included in the definition. The current NPPF definition still applies as stated in previous Council email (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted. Check text	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
140	24		6.17	Suggest including the words 'up to' before '80%' when describing starter homes.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
141	24		6.17	Housing Associations are not the only provider of rented affordable accommodation; suggest the inclusion of Almshouses or Community Land Trust.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
142	24		6.17	The provision of 'warden-assisted' homes is subject to the County Council agreeing the revenue subsidy to provide a warden, therefore these can be difficult to achieve unless provider is private developer.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
143	24		6.18	Housing Associations are not the only provider of rented affordable accommodation; suggest the inclusion of Almshouses or Community Land Trust.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	Amend text accordingly
144	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		Policy ECH4 requires 67% of affordable housing for rent or shared ownership "with the balance for 'starter homes' that will be required in line with national policy".	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
145	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		As part of the early review Local Plan a number of pieces of evidence base have been produced. The Council published a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in October 2016 which identifies an Objectively Assessed Housing Need to 2034: https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/862544/somerset_final_shma_oct2016_revised.pdf	SSDC		See 1 above and Housing Appendix	See 1 above and Housing Appendix
146	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		This includes the need for affordable housing. The need for affordable housing identified in the SHMA for South Somerset is:	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
147	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		• 11% intermediate housing	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
148	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		• 10% affordable rented, and	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
149	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		• 79% social rented.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
150	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing			SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
151	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		Does the neighbourhood planning group have any local evidence to support the mix of affordable housing required by Policy ECH4 as opposed to that identified in the current SHMA?	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above and see 127 above. <i>Amend text and Policy accordingly.</i>
152	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing			SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
153	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		As stated above the Council can have regard to 'starter homes' as part of the intermediate element of affordable housing once Government have finished legislating for them – but it should be noted that even the Government have reigned back and suggested a mix of ownership options rather than just starter homes in the White Paper.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
154	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		100% affordable housing schemes should not be ruled out, especially on small sites.	SSDC		Noted. Check text	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly.
155	25	Policy ECH4: Affordable & Social Housing		Policy ECH4 refers to Appendix 2 which details the definitions and criteria of local need and connection and cascade arrangements. The local connections criteria differ from the Council's criteria. The Council does not use the first bullet point as criteria. The Council would not stipulate 15 years in the third bullet point. The Council would not include armed forces/ex service personnel with no connection. Suggest revising criteria in line with Council's own policy. Additionally, landlords apply their own local connections criteria. Given this, the ability of the Neighbourhood Plan to enforce their criteria is limited.	SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording.	See 1 above. Amend text and Policy accordingly. Check local connection criteria.
156	25	Appendix 2		Additionally, landlords apply their own local connections criteria. Given this, the ability of the Neighbourhood Plan to enforce their criteria is limited.	SSDC		Noted	Noted
157	25			The SHMA highlights that local connection criteria cannot be applied to starter homes how does this link to the application of Policy ECH4?	SSDC		Noted. Check Policy wording	See suggested Policy amendment above 155
158	25			The cascade arrangement proposed (4 weeks advertising at various intervals) is not normal practice and can result in void periods for the landlord of up to 12 weeks. The Council can effectively undertake the cascade filtering in a single advert cycle with no need for delay – priority is given to those with connection with the target village and only when there are none would the landlord then look at bids from those from doughnut ring – but all those bids can be made simultaneously.	SSDC		Noted	See suggested Policy amendment above 155
159	25			The cascade arrangement proposed (4 weeks advertising at various intervals) is not normal practice and can result in void periods for the landlord of up to 12 weeks. The Council can effectively undertake the cascade filtering in a single advert cycle with no need for delay – priority is given to those with connection with the target village and only when there are none would the landlord then look at bids from those from doughnut ring – but all those bids can be made simultaneously.	SSDC		Noted	See suggested Policy amendment above 155
160	25			This is unlikely to work in practice due to the potential financial burden placed on the landlord. Suggest revising cascade.	SSDC			See suggested Policy amendment above 155

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
161		25 Policy ECH5: Conversion of Rural Buildings		Policy ECH5 attempts to positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of the area. The 'rural areas' referred to in the policy are not defined, suggest adding clarity to the policy by defining what is the rural area i.e. outside built form of settlement.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	National policy supports the sustainable re-use of rural buildings for economic and residential uses (no sequential test required), requiring development to be sustainable and recognise the intrinsic beauty of the countryside. Development must be well designed and achieve a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Specifically in relation to residential conversions national policy states that they should lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting. Alternative single Policy on Conversions may require re-jig of text but more reflective of NPPF POLICY : Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside - The conversion of redundant or disused rural buildings of substantial and permanent construction which positively contribute to an area's rural character for residential, tourism or employment uses will be supported where: (a)A suitable access to the building is in place or can be created without damaging the surrounding area's rural character and the road network can support the proposed use; and (b)The building can be converted without significant alteration, extension or rebuilding; and (c)The design will retain the original character of the building and its surroundings; and (d)The development will retain any nature conservation interest associated with the site or building, and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible. Text needs to include the open countryside is defined as outside the physical boundaries of existing settlements.
162				In light of Policy ECEM4: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Business, should the policy seek a business reuse first?	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	When considering LP POLICY EP3: SAFEGUARDING EMPLOYMENT LAND Employment land and premises* will be safeguarded and planning permission will not be granted for development to alternative uses unless it can be demonstrated that the loss would not demonstrably harm the settlement's supply of employment land/premises and/or job opportunities. Applicants will be expected to submit a marketing statement with the planning application, which demonstrates that the site/premises has been actively marketed for a maximum of 18 months or a period agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to application submission. Changes of use will not be permitted unless: - The proposed use is compatible with existing surrounding uses and not detrimental to the operation of existing businesses in the area; - Adequate access exists or can be achieved to serve the proposed development; - The proposal would result in significant environmental improvements or enhancements to the character of the area; and - The site is not in an unsustainable location for the land use proposed. *Class B1 Business Use, Class B2 General Industrial Use, and Class B8 Storage or Distribution Use of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended. NPPF discourages the long-term protection of allocated employment sites where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose, and requires local planning authorities to have regard to market signals. If there is no interest in the site as a result of marketing, the potential of the site for mixed use development including employment must be considered in preference to the total loss of employment. PROPOSED POLICY: Proposals that would result in the loss of business space at Halves Lane, East Coker must : i) demonstrate there is no market demand through active and continued marketing for a maximum of 18 months or a period agreed by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Parish Council, prior to application submission; or ii) demonstrate that there is no loss of economic performance of the site or location through the provision of better quality employment space allowing for mixed use of the site that incorporates an employment generating use; or iii) The land / premises is / are no longer suitable to continue as business use when taking into account access / highway issues, site infrastructure, physical constraints, environmental considerations and amenity issues.
163		27 Policy ECEM1: Retention of Local Employment at Halves Lane		The policy is poorly worded - what does no longer appropriate mean? Suggest rewording the policy to refer to a vacant site where there is no demonstrable reuse (following marketing) which is a more robust approach.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Checked Policy wording and amended accordingly,
164		28 Policy ECEM3: Promotion of Diverse Businesses		Although in line with national guidance, Local Plan Policy EP7 does not support new build live/work units where new residential development would not normally be permitted. This is based on local evidence that illustrates that live/work practices do not work in reality. EENP policy appears in line with Local Plan as refers to units within established built form of villages/settlements.	SSDC		Noted .	
165		28 Policy ECEM4: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Business		Question the ability to secure employment uses when Policy ECH5 supports residential conversion.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	objectives of the policy are still considered valid.
166	30	8.2		Please reference the evidence base used.	SSDC		Noted . Check text.	Amend text accordingly
167	31	8.9		Need to qualify that travel planning relates to new developments of a certain size.	SSDC		Noted . Check text.	Amend text accordingly
168		32 Policy ECT2: Highway Safety		These highways matters are for discussion with the County Council. There are however, little projects that developers may be encouraged to fund as part of complying with the spirit of Local Plan Policy SS2.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	The highways schemes have been discussed with Somerset Highways Authority during the Plan preparation process. Para 8.17 highlights the need to work in partnership, which is fundamental to success. All development should provide safe and suitable access to the site for all people and not cause a significantly adverse impact on the local road network that cannot be managed or mitigated. Development proposals that minimise car parking other than in designated parking areas and discourage on street-parking will be supported.

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
169	32	Policy ECT3: Car Parking in New Development		Policy ECT3 has implications for parking standards by reducing the ability to park on street. How practical is this policy? Where do visitors park, or do all schemes require visitor parking? We cannot have any policy that is inconsistent with the Somerset County Council Parking Strategy. You cannot stop people parking in the highway even if they have on-plot parking. Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in particular hotspots could be encouraged.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	
170	36	Policy ECCF2: Protection of Community Assets		Suggest inclusion of the following wording after “18 month period”, to make policy less onerous and more in line with Local Plan Policy EP15 - “or a period agreed by the Local Planning authority in conjunction with the Neighbourhood Planning group”.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	See new Policy
171	38	Policy ECCN1: Listed Buildings		The policy needs to refer to the harm to the “significance” of a heritage asset as the test as to whether a proposal should receive support. Where there is harm the proposal can be approved if the harm is outweighed by public benefit. This will accord with the policy language of the NPPF.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Development proposal will be expected to maintain the special character and appearance of East and North Coker Conservation Area, especially positive elements in any Conservation Area Appraisal.
172	41	Policy ECCN2: Design in the Conservation Area		The policy should refer to local colours / hues and the contribution they make to local distinctiveness. It should avoid referring to Ham stone specifically, as the local rubble building stone is not Ham and is the more prevalent material. The last part of the policy suggests that a scheme will be successful if a few token local materials are used. A more general reference to the use of a palette of high quality materials that respond to the local distinctiveness of the area has the potential to achieve the same result, but is less restrictive.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Development must maintain and enhance East Coker Parish's distinctive natural and historic character. Development should demonstrate a design process that has clearly considered the existing context, and how the development contributes to the social, economic and environmental elements of sustainability through fundamental design principles of: i) being of an appropriate scale, density, layout, height and mass; and ii) provide continuity with the existing built form and respect and work with the natural and historic environment; and iii) provide building structures that can be easily altered, particularly internally, to respond to both climate change and changing social and economic conditions; and iv) does not contribute to or suffer from adverse impacts arising from noise, light or air pollution, land instability or cause ground water pollution; and v) utilise unsustainable construction methods, minimises the sue of non-renewable resources and maximises the sue of recycled and sustainably sourced materials; and vi) incorporate the principles of Secured by Design (SBD); and vii) undertake community engagement, involvement and consultation in the design process proportionate to the scheme; and viii) protect individuals and property from: a) overlooking and unreasonable loss of privacy; and b) overshadowing and overbearing impacts; and c) unreasonable noise and disturbance.
173	42	Policy ECCN3: General Design		Bullet Point 2 – will benefit from rewording; layout, scale etc. are not ‘qualities’.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	
174				Bullet Point 3 – the intent is not clear.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	
175	43	Policy ECCN4: General Landscape Character		Amend wording at end of 1st paragraph to read ‘..maintaining a legible gap...’ . Current wording is open to challenge, and has no Local Plan policy into which it keys.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	In addition reference to comment 15. Amend policy and insert: maintaining a legible gap between the villages, Yeovil and Keyford and their separate identities. - last sentence of para 1.
176	43	Policy ECCN5: Heritage Assets		This policy needs clarifying. It looks like an attempt to cover other designations such as scheduled monuments, and undesignated assets like the sunken lanes. This needs to be clearer. The NPPF is clear about the various designations and undesignated assets. The policy should refer to the harm to the “significance” of a heritage asset as the test as to whether a proposal should receive support.	- SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	The PPG states that “Local lists incorporated into Local Plans can be a positive way for the local planning authority to identify non-designated heritage assets against consistent criteria so as to improve the predictability of the potential for sustainable development”. (Reference ID: 18a-041- 20140306) “Local Heritage Listing Historic England Advice Note 7” (2016) sets out Historic England’s guidance on local listing of heritage assets. This advises that communities can play a key role as a Neighbourhood Plan may indicate buildings and sites which merit inclusion on the local list. However the guidance explains that identifying potential properties is only the first stage of the process of preparing the local list. Identified sites then have to be assessed and ratified by the local authority following consultation with property owners and the local community before the list is published. Text to clarify - Non listed heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets, these can include non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. New TITLE - NON LISTED HERITAGE ASSETS - Proposals affecting buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets should ensure they are conserved, having regard to their significance and degress of any harm of loss of significance.

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
177		44	Policy ECCN6: Local Greenspace	The aspiration loosely ties with elements of Local Plan Policy EQ2, but it would be better if the wording states ... and the areas managed for their landscape...' as 'protection' cannot be assured.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	There is no single national definition of green space; it can include a wide range of land including public parks, sports and recreational areas, allotments, cemeteries and areas with nature conservation importance. National guidance and Local Plan policies seek to protect and enhance green infrastructure to support healthy lifestyles and to enhance the local environment. The NPPF provides local communities the opportunity to designate areas that are locally important as Local Green Space. 3.55 NPPF paragraph 76 enables local communities to designate Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans for special protection which will rule out new development on them other than in very special circumstances. Paragraph 78 states that the local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. An example of a made policy The areas shown in x on the following page and listed in schedule x– Local Green Spaces on p x are designated as Local Green Spaces. Development on these areas will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances. Where development on designated green space is permitted, any harm to the site's character, accessibility, appearance or general quality will be compensated by the community benefiting from an equivalent or superior replacement green space or funding of an alternative community facility. . Another example of a made policy: The following areas are designated as Local Green Space....list....Development on land designated as Local Green Space will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where it can be clearly demonstrated that the development will not conflict with the purpose of designation.
178		45	Policy ECCN7: Views & Vistas within the Parish and Local Landscape	Policy ECCN7 has not been amended despite the Councils comments suggesting that the policy needed revising to be clearer regarding the extent of the area being protected and the evidence base supporting their identification (email 6/12/16). Additionally, this policy is open to challenge – most are general views, some quite arbitrary. The 'protection' of views has no explicit Local Plan or NPPF basis, nor is there an evidence base that makes a reasoned case for its inclusion. A general policy that states support for the conservation of 'designed' views relative to heritage assets; and open land where integral to the setting of Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, would have greater credibility.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	The views and vistas to be defined as long and short distance views on the map e.g. The short range views are along the roads in the older part of the village which is designated a conservation area and the main entrance roads into village. The long range views are of historic assets from points outside the village. This approach has been adopted in other made plans and supported by evidence from Conservation Area Appraisals. evidence map schedule and text can be amended to amplify justification of views and conformity with development plan, this can be addressed with proposed POLICY : Development should consider the visual impact of proposals on key views (see proposals map on page x and described in the following schedule) and minimise adverse impact on these views through the careful consideration of the design, siting and layout of proposals.
179		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Para 112 of NPPF states Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. East Coker has a high proportion of grade 1 land and this policy is regarded as appropriate
180		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	The best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will be protected from development not associated with agriculture or forestry. Planning permission for development affecting such land will only be granted exceptionally if there is an overriding need for the development and either:
181		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	1. Sufficient land of a lower grade (Grades 3b, 4 and 5) is unavailable or available lower grade land has an environmental value recognised by a statutory wildlife, historic, landscape or archaeological designation and outweighs the agricultural considerations. Or
182		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	2. The benefits of the development justify the loss of high quality agricultural land.
183		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	If best and most versatile land needs to be developed and there is a choice between sites in different grades, land of the lowest grade available must be used except where other sustainability considerations, including intrinsic nature conservation value of a site, outweigh land quality issues. E.g. Planning permission will be refused for development on Grade 1 agricultural land unless it:-
184		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	a) involves the development of land for the purposes of agriculture and forestry; or it
185		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	b) involves the development of local community facilities, and informal open space where this meets an exceptional and identified community need.
186		47	Policy ECCN8: High Quality Agricultural Land	As stated previously this policy does not accord with paragraph 112 of the NPPF (6/12/16).	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	For criterion b) it must additionally be proven that lower grade agricultural land is not available (Grades 2, 3, 4, 5). A sequential approach should be taken whereby land of lower quality is developed in preference to higher grade agricultural land. For example Grades 3b, 4, and 5 to be developed in preference to Grades 1, 2, 3a and then Grades 2 and 3a in preference to Grade 1.
187		47	Policy ECCN9: Wildlife Habitats	Policy appears to be onerous and not in accordance with paragraph 118 of the NPPF which allows development to occur with suitable mitigation or compensation measures. Suggest revising policy.	SSDC		Noted . Check Policy wording	Suggestion made omitting Policy in reference to SSDC POLICY EQ4: BIODIVERSITY All proposals for development, including those which would affect sites of regional and local biodiversity, nationally and internationally protected sites and sites of geological interest, will:
188								· Protect the biodiversity value of land and buildings and minimise fragmentation of habitats and promote coherent ecological networks;

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
189								· Maximise opportunities for restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats;
190								· Incorporate beneficial biodiversity conservation features where appropriate;
191								· Protect and assist recovery of identified priority species; and
192								· Ensure that Habitat Features, Priority Habitats and Geological Features that are used
193								by bats and other wildlife are protected and that the design including proposals for lighting does not cause severance or is a barrier to movement.
194								Where there is a reasonable likelihood of the presence of protected and priority species development design should be informed by, and applications should be accompanied by, a survey and impact assessment assessing their presence. If present, a sequential approach to the design of the proposal should be taken that aims first to avoid harm, then to lessen the impact, and lastly makes compensatory provision for their needs.
195								Development will not be allowed to proceed unless it can be demonstrated that it will not result in any adverse impact on the integrity of national and international wildlife and landscape designations, including features outside the site boundaries that ecologically support the conservation of the designated site.
196				Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A303 to the north west of the plan area. It is in the context of these responsibilities that our comments are made.	Steve Hellier - Highways England		Noted .	
197				We note that the Plan area includes the proposed Southern Yeovil Urban Extension site at Keyford which has been allocated in the adopted South Somerset Local Plan for mixed use development, including up to 800 dwellings. We therefore understand that as this site is covered by Local Plan policies, it has not been considered specifically within the Neighbourhood Plan. This scale of development has the potential to impact on the operation of the SRN and we therefore look forward to working with the District Council and potential developers in the assessment of traffic impact and the mitigation measures which may be necessary to support these proposals as they come forward.	Steve Hellier - Highways England		Noted.	
198				In terms of the proposed policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, we are satisfied that these are unlikely to impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. This response does not however prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the appropriate policy at the time	Steve Hellier - Highways England		Noted. Thank you for your comments	
199				Having inspected the draft plan they confirm that they have no comments to make.	Terry Sneller, Local Plan Team Leader, Dorset Councils Partnership		Noted	
200				We are impressed by the Plans vision to address local needs while protecting and enhancing the areas unique history and heritage. We note this is a general underpinning theme, and reflected explicitly in the policies f Section 10 on the Built and Natural Environment. In that the plan is not specifically allocating identified sites for development there are no detailed comments that we wish to offer. We would therefore only want to congratulate your community on its progress to date and wish it well in the making of the plan.	David Stuart - Historic Places Advisor		Noted. Thank you for your comments	
201								
202				The Plan is extremely well laid out and it is obvious a lot of work and consultation has gone into its production. It covers all the issues and sets out the village and its ethos extremely. Well done to all who have been involved. I do have a couple of comments though. If anything the Plan concentrates overly on housing and perhaps not quite enough on the community facility aspects of the village. Perhaps the reference to the absence of a village shop could have been more positive, as I believe this is achievable with the will of the community behind it to make it happen. Other villages and communities have made this happen. Secondly I was a bit disappointed that the only photograph of the outside of the village hall on page 34 was so small. This is such a brilliant facility and one which many villages would give their eye teeth for, as the saying goes, that I would have liked to see it being given more prominence. These comments apart your plan is brilliant. This is a Plan your village and community can be proud of and I look forward to hearing the results of the consultation.	District Councillor		Noted. Thank you for your supportive comments.	
203								

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
204	5,7,8,18,32, 52,53		1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 5.4, 8.18 and Appendix 2	In Sections 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5 & 2.8 are many good words that include consideration of the health of the local society, using sound science responsibly and respecting human rights as well as the principles localism, SS2 putting it nearly that 'proposals' should generally have the support of the local community following robust engagement and consultation. If the plan is to mean anything then its primary objectives and purpose are clearly paramount and the parts of the plan need to be consistent with those (i.e. well-being, compatible with Human Rights, ensuring a strong, healthy and just society, using sound science responsibly...) However, mentioned in 3 other areas of the plan (p18, para 5.4, p32, para 8.18 and Appendix 1 'improve comms across parish') is the concept of extending mobile reception or coverage. They way this is typically achieved is by adding more mobile masts in the community either as 'telegraph pole, lookalikes or atop buildings such as churches. There does not seem to be a strong DEMAND conveyed in the Plan for such a direction which is a very good thing, but if increased mobile coverage is followed up as able, this would be inconsistent with the plan purpose and objectives and will assuredly result in the death - knell of the community. The reasons for this are set out as follows. Refer to appendix	Parishioner		1 Noted	
205	5		1.4	Not included into his draft but to be included in the final plan will be a 'basic conditions' statement. I understand from discussions with your consultant at the last open session (11/3/17) that this will include statements to verify compliance with various national and local policies that have precedence. Considering, for example, the current pressure on the Government to free up more green belt land for development it is assumed that the robustness and durability of this plan could still be subject to amendment permitted into the flow down from the scope permitted within the legislative order of precedence.	Parishioner		The Local Plan is currently under review, which may have implications on the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The NDP is tested against the Basic Conditions including: has appropriate regard to national planning policy, contributes to sustainable development, is in general conformity with strategic policies in the South Somerset District Local Plan 1006-2028, is compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements.	
206	7		2.2	I was informed by your consultant that consideration of the EU obligations had little or no material impact on the development of the neighbourhood plan. Thus Brexit would not appear to have material impact either.	Parishioner		Noted	
207	16		4.2	Conservation Objective - To support the retention and enhancement of the existing Conservation Areas in East and North Coker' This key statement noted for reference with respect to comments below.	Parishioner		Noted	
208	18	EC2		"Footpaths and signage, including linking the villages and the new community at Keyford". It is not clear what benefits this would bring to the objective stated in Sect. 4.2 (reference above). Linking urban and rural areas can bring readily visible benefits to the inhabitants of the urban area. Considerations against the Conservation Objective would be the possibility of: Increased vandalism, greater dog mess, increased littering, inappropriate usage (trailbikes on footpaths)	Parishioner		Noted.	
209	18	EC'		"Speed restriction signs at the entrances to the Villages". Again, at the last open session I was informed that speed limit restriction signs could be placed at the entrances to the village and these would remind drivers of the need for speed control in our residential area. These would be beneficial but would not be legally enforceable. An enforceable limit would require legal institution and would most likely require a greater increase in street furniture (repeated signs, lighting, etc.) The latter would be unwelcome and contrary to the Section 4.3 objective.	Parishioner		Noted.	A working group from the Parish Council will have speed/traffic issues as a responsibility and will report back to Council
210	21	6.4 to 6.6 and 6.10		"The District Council's Local Plan Housing Strategy limits housing growth in Rural Settlements to approximately 14% of the district wide requirement... Development in the Parish... Should be in broad conformity". Clearly there is a non-conformity or major disconnect here caused by the distortion of the Keyford development to the parish of East Coker. In consideration of the practicalities, the policy to plan for a lower percentage growth in the parish, excluding the Keyford numbers as expressed in 6.6, would seem to be entirely logical, further, this should be limited to appropriate small developments that demonstrate sufficient benefits both to the rural community/environment and meeting the objective of Section 4.2 in conservation areas. The contradiction now appears in 6.10 which refers to the aspiration being "higher than would be expected in many Rural Settlements". Vibrant Rural Settlement - Yes.... Creeping urbanisation - No thank you.	Parishioner		Noted.	
211	30	8.7		Disabled access is vital and important consideration which should be given good support. Careful implementation will be required to ensure that it is done in a sensitive manner to avoid possible detriment to the rural environment as reference in comments w.r.t. EC2, above.	Parishioner		Noted.	
212	31	ECT1		Great care needs to be taken over the lighting of routes with respect to the potential loss of "dark skies" in the rural area in general and the effect on the conservation area in particular.	Parishioner		See comment 28	
213	31	8.9 and 8.13		There are currently no speed limits/signs in the village (except national regulation and in local areas such as 20 mph near the school, etc.). Signs at entry and exit might improve safety. Has the Parish Council evaluated the successfulness of alternatives such as speed limited chicanes at entry and exit? An advantage might also be the reduction in 'rat run' usage through the village. A disadvantage might be the problems posed to large delivery vehicles and farm tractors/trailers.	Parishioner		Noted.	
214				Footnote: Whilst the plan will never please all the people all the time, I would like to complement the team for the obvious effort put into it by them and many others (not mentioned). It is a quite comprehensive but a few apparent conflicts need to be resolved.	Parishioner		Noted and thank you for your supportive comments	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
215	2	Foreword		Congratulations - at last the signs of a document nearing the final version. Whilst it may be difficult to identify all the individuals and organisations (other than the Parish Council) who have contributed over many years to this document, I believe it deserves a stronger statement of recognition and thanks to all those who have done so! To quote Isaac Newton "If I have seen further than others, it is by standing upon the shoulder of giants".	Parishioner		Noted and thank you for your supportive comments	
216	8	2.6	 In which East Coker Parish Council and other East Coker organisation and individuals fully participated.	Parishioner		Noted.	wording amended
217	10	2.14		East Coker Parish Council and other East Coker organisation and individuals participated...	Parishioner		Noted	wording amended
218	10	2.15		East Coker Preservation Trust	Parishioner		Noted	wording amended
219	10	2.17		This statement gives the impression that the nature of the footpaths between the village and the Keyford area may be changed in the future. It has already been suggested in the development proposal for Keyford that part of the Monarch's Way will be pave. This approach is not conducive to the conservation and landscape objectives of the Neighbourhood plan.	Parishioner		Noted	
220	13	3.5		Parish Newsletter - Do you mean the East Coker Society Newsletter? If you do, then please say so.	Parishioner		Noted	wording amended
221	18	5.4		Potential Future Projects. Footpaths and signage, including linking the villages and the new community at Keyford, see comment for 2.17. Speed restriction signs at the entrances to the village , is there evidence that this will make any difference and have other approaches been considered, bearing in mind that too much signage detracts from the nature of the rural settlement?.	Parishioner		see comment 215 and further action.	
222	22	6.1		Why express a projected populating growth that is higher than other rural settlements? This just sets an unrealistic need for housing, which is already catered for in the Keyford Urban Extension. Has sufficient consideration been given to the increase of older people in the projections?	Parishioner		See Housing Appendix A	
223	30	8.7		It is commendable to consider the provision of footpaths for people with disabilities, but this needs opt be done in accordance with the conservation and landscape objectives, i.e., not introducing paving inappropriately.	Parishioner		Noted. Policy ECT1 refers to an application demonstrating "appropriately surfaced and lit routes", details of which would be submitted ad considered at plannign application stage.	
224	31	ECT1		This policy contradicts Objectives in Section 10 and policies such as ECCN4, ECCN5. There seems to be too much focus on establishing links between Keyford and East Coker Village, which seems to indicate inappropriate increased urbanisation.	Parishioner		Noted. Policy ECT1 refers to cycle routes and bridleways, helping to encourage sustainable measures of connectivity.	
225	31	8.9		Speed limit signs will merely indicate the permissible speed, which is inappropriately high for most of the roads in the village and will not be enforceable.	Parishioner		Noted. Not within the remit of the NP to enforce speed signs.	
226	31	8.1		Have school staff been asked to use car parking spaces within the school or at the Village Hall rather than occupying space on the road? This would at least set an example to parents.	Parishioner		Agreed	
227	31	8.11		The use of the Village Hall car park for school use needs to be encourage much more by the School and the parents Teachers Association.	Parishioner		Noted	
228	31	8.12		If the village Hall Car Park is not being utilised, then it is not appropriate to tarmac further green fields for School parking purposes.	Parishioner		Noted	
229	31	8.13		See comment for 8.9	Parishioner			
230	32	ECT2		See comment for 8.9	Parishioner			
231	39	Section 10 map		The map of the parish needs a title and reference. There are numerous omissions not his map, including existing footpaths and location of approved planning applications. The Monarch's Way needs to be labelled and marked distinctly (as on OS maps) from other footpaths as this is of major historical significance. it is an important asset and therefore needs opt be mentioned in the text.	Parishioner		Noted	
232	41	10.6		The statement relating to 'statutory responsibilities for the District Council....' gives the impression that the Parish Council are not interested in pursuing any extensions to the 2 conservation areas. In 2015 the neighbourhood plan sub committee were invited and authorised by the Parish Council to work with the District Council in reviewing the Conservation Areas. It should not be left for the Distract Council to progress alone!	Parishioner		Noted	
233	45-46	'		Include a further proposed view and vista from Patchlake Cottages towards pavyotts and Darvole.	Parishioner		Agreed. New vists to be included	
234	47	ECCN8		It is outrageous that SSDC have agreed to development of Grade 1 agricultural land. Future generations will suffer from the loss of such a vital resource. With this in mind, remove ' unless there is no practicable alternative and the importance of the development outweighs the need to protect the best and most versatile land'	Parishioner		See comments 184 and 185. Paragraph reflects National Planning Policy Framework.	
235				Dark Skies - There is no reference anywhere to the importance of retaining our existing dark skies. This is one of the key attributes of our rural are and provides the distinction from urban areas. A policy is required about light pollution.	Parishioner		Noted	See detailed plan amendments Appendix B (CS26)
236	54			Regular Newsletters - these are published and distributed by East Coker Society. ECPC contribute content.	Parishioner		Noted	
237	54			Monthly film nights have been set up and run by East Coker Hall Charitable Trust since 2016.	Parishioner		noted	
238				Typos and omissions - I have marked up a copy of the document. It would make sense to identify further proof reading of the final plan by a team who have not been involved in the document preparation.	Parishioner		Noted.	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
239				<p>20 Housing Objective It is noted that the housing objective set out in the Neighbourhood Plan aims 'to encourage the delivery of appropriate housing, including affordable housing, to meet the whole life needs of the local community of East Coker'. It is of course key that the the housing needs of the East Coker community area met and that the Neighbourhood Plan provides for such current and future accommodation. This specifically relates to the need for housing in rural settlements. However, as detailed in comments made below in response to draft Policy ECH1, it is considered that the East Coker Parish area should actually have a wider housing role. Due to its geographical proximity to the defined Yeovil Development Area, the very northern reaches of the Parish Boundary have a role to play in accommodating growth associated with the Strategically Significant Town of Yeovil, which is the prime focus for new development, according to the adopted Local Plan (Policy SS1). In light of this its is recommended that the stated Housing Objective of the Neighbourhood Plan be revised to reflect the dual roles of the Parish area in relation to new housing. 24 6.13 It is noted that reference is made to proposals in the area which are at the pre-application stage. For clarity we set out below a summary of the latest position in relation to our client's site, which is currently the subject of pre-application discussions with Council officers. Current Pre-Application Discussion for Land to the East of Holywell The site being promoted by our client, land to the East of Holywell, is at the pre-application stage (ref. 17/00941/PREAPP) and is currently being considered by South Somerset officers.</p>	Brooke Smith Planning	The complete form is Appendix 2 as the drawings are within text but would not copy over	Noted	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan amendments Appendix B (CS26) where reference is made to strategic housing growth in Appendix A and to affordable housing in Appendix B. The East Coker Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating sites for development and therefore any future application would be considered in the context of the currently adopted Local Plan and general Neighbourhood Plan policies.
240				<p>Figure 1 below is the Neighbourhood Plan map from page 38 of the Plan. Added to this is annotation showing Land to the East of Holywell (shown shaded in blue). As can be seen, the site lies in the very northern part of the Parish. This site is being promoted by our client for residential development. For assistance there is, included at figure 2, a larger scale version of this plan showing the proposed site boundary in more detail. Also included on both plans, and shaded in brown, is the planning application area for the adjacent Bunford Heights residential scheme, which has been granted consent (ref. 13/01869/OUT). It is considered that our current proposals should be seen in context with the adjacent existing development along West Coker Road, Helena Road and the consented scheme to the north. Figure 1 – Neighbourhood Plan (annotated with pre-application site) Figure 2 – Extract of Neighbourhood Plan (annotated with pre-application site) This current site boundary forms part of a larger parcel of land which has previously been considered for residential development at planning appeal. Whilst that appeal for the larger scheme was dismissed, the Inspector's comments and previous advice from officers indicated that a reduced scheme may be considered acceptable and as such our client is proposing submitting an outline application relating to the eastern section of the site. A masterplan for the site is included below (figure 3). The indicative layout shows a scheme of up to 95 units, a landscape screening belt on the western site of the site, amenity space and links to public recreational routes. Detailed vehicular access arrangements are also proposed to the north of the site</p>	Brooke Smith Planning		Noted	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan amendments Appendix B (CS26) where reference is made to strategic housing growth in Appendix A and to affordable housing in Appendix B. The East Coker Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating sites for development and therefore any future application would be considered in the context of the currently adopted Local Plan and general Neighbourhood Plan policies.
241				<p>Figure 3 – Proposed Indicative Masterplan This revised site area reflects the Inspector's conclusions in the appeal decision that: 'The Council accepts that, in visual terms, the eastern part of the site would be acceptable in principle for residential development and from my observations, I agree.' (paragraph 14 appeal decision APP/R3325/W/15/3003376). The other key issue raised by the Inspector was the need for further assessment work to assess the cumulative impacts on the local highway network from nearby future developments, including the Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) at Keyford. Our transport consultants have reviewed this point and have liaised with the County Council to update the transport assessment work to reflect the latest projected traffic figures in the area, which include the SUE forecast traffic. Specifically they have obtained traffic flow data from the YSTM2 (as approved by both South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council) which has been utilise to assess the impacts of the committed SUE at Keyford. Their findings show that the proposals can be accommodated without detriment to the safe operation on the local highway network. In light of the above it is considered that this reduced site represents a developable and deliverable residential site, which would make an appropriate additional to the southern edge of Yeovil, whilst preserving the open rural gap between the West Coker Road area and North Coker Village. The proposals will provide a range of affordable housing to meet local need, along with contributions to other social facilities.</p>	Brooke Smith Planning		Noted	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan amendments Appendix B (CS26)
242				<p>Additionally, while the proposals are currently at an outline stage, future detailed design will reflect the local distinctiveness of the area and be of a high quality design, providing amenity space and landscaping. 24 Policy ECH1 Housing Provision The currently proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policy ECH1 is considered appropriate in relation to housing provision for the villages of the Parish (East and North Coker), and, as set out in the policy, reference is made to the need to conform with Local Plan Policy SS2 'Development in Rural Settlements'. Policy SS2 sets out that development will be strictly controlled and limited to that which meets identified housing need, particularly for affordable housing However, it is noted that Local Plan Policy SS1 'Settlement Strategy' recognises Yeovil as a Strategically Significant Town and the prime focus for development in South Somerset. As shown on the adopted Local Plan Yeovil Map (Inset 15), attached as figure 4, the northern edge of East Coker Parish (boundary shown as red line) either includes or abuts the urban area of Yeovil, which forms part of Policy SS1. The area shaded yellow on the plan is noted as 'Development Area' in accordance with Policy SS1. Furthermore, Policy SS5 'Delivering New Housing Growth' confirms that</p>	Brooke Smith Planning		Noted	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan amendments Appendix B (CS26)

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
243				the urban framework of Yeovil will be a key location for new housing.	Brooke Smith Planning		Noted	
244				<p>Figure 4 – Yeovil Map (Inset 15) In light of the adopted Local Plan policy it is considered that new residential development proposals in the northern area of the Parish, both within or immediately adjacent to the currently defined Development Area, should be considered as contributing to the Yeovil Strategically Significant Town area. Accordingly, it is maintained that the restrictive rural housing figures set out in Policy ECH1 should not be applied when considering sites adjacent to the Yeovil Development Area. The Policy should be amended to address this point. For such residential development sites to be considered positively as part of the Yeovil Development Area, it is suggested that it the sites should be well related to the existing Development Area of Yeovil, not be connected to the villages of the Parish and their development should not result in any merging of villages with Yeovil town itself. 24 Policy ECH2 General Housing Considerations The aims of the three bullet points included in this policy are supported and it is considered that new residential development should be designed to be in accordance with these points. It is highlighted that the development of the site East of Holywell would accord with the criteria. The proposals will provide a range of affordable housing to meet local need, along with contributions to other social facilities. In deed the proposed development would provide in the region of 33 new affordable homes. Additionally, while the proposals are currently at an outline stage, any future reserved matters would follow the design aims of the policy and reflect the local distinctiveness of the area. 24 Policy ECH3 Provision of Amenity Space The aim to provide suitably sized internal space in new residential schemes is supported, as is the provision of private amenity space that reflects the size of the properties proposed. Again, the development of the site East of Holywell would accord with these aims. This would be secured through the detailed design of units and amenity space, should outline consent be granted.</p>	Brooke Smith Planning		Noted	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan amendments Appendix B (CS26)
245				<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interest would be affected by the proposal made. Natural England doe not have the resources to get involved in all neighbourhood plans and will prioritise our detailed engagement to those plans that may impact on internationally or nationally designated nature conservation site, and or require Strategic Environmental Assessment or screening for Habitats Regulations Assessment. We have considered the draft East Coker Neighbourhood Plan, which in our view appears to be a generally positive document that reflects local aspirations, demonstrates a good understanding of the Parish and is in broad accordance with national and local planning policies. According to our records, there are no national or international designated sites or nationally protected landscapes within or immediately adjacent to the East Coker area, there are however a number of locally designated sites and other important green spaces within the Parish and we are pleased to note the draft plan recognises the importance of these local assets and seeks to protect and enhance them wherever possible. overall we would expect the draft plan to result in positive gains for biodiversity and achieve wide ranging benefits for wildlife and for the local community and visitors to the area. Natural England particularly welcomes policies ECCN 4, 7 and 9 relating to landscape character, views and vistas and wildlife habitats. natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry commision has published join advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans and development proposals. Local environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment. A list of local records centre is available at www.alerc.org.uk. 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.</p>	Natural England, Somerset, Avon and Wiltshire Area Team		Noted	
246				<p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the first draft version of the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan (ECNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p>	Gladman Developments Team		Noted 246 - 283	Much of Gladman's representation is a recitation of naitional planning policy and guidance which is understood. With regard to the points made about strategic housing growth, see Housing Appendix A (CS25)and detailed Plan amendments in Appendix B (CS26) with regard to other policies. Further consideration is also being given to the proposed Local Green Space policy and regard will be given to the comments made by Gladmans when the revised and next version of the Plan is produced for Regulation 15. Thsi response applies to all the comments by Gladman 246-283
247				Gladman requests to be added to the Parish Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
248				Gladman would like to offer their assistance in the preparation of the neighbourhood plan for the submission version of the neighbourhood plan and invite the Parish Council to get in touch regarding this.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
249				Legal Requirements	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
250				Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the ECNP must meet are as follows:	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
251				(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
252				(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
253				(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
254				(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations. National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
255				The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
256				At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
257				The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
258				The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
259				Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
260				Paragraph 49 of the Framework is clear that 'relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites'. This applies not only to statutory development plan documents but is also applicable to emerging neighbourhood plans. This has also been confirmed in the High Court.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
261				Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
262				Planning Practice Guidance	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
263				It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
264				On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
265				On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
266				Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
267				reservations regarding the ECNP's ability to meet basic condition (a) and (d) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response. Relationship to Local Plan	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
268				The current development plan that covers the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan area and the development plan which the ECNP will be tested against is the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 to 2028, adopted in March 2015. Within this plan both East Coker and North Coker are classed as Rural Settlements which are considered as part of the countryside to which national countryside protection policies apply.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
269				However, due to the proximity of the Neighbourhood Area to Yeovil, the largest settlement in South Somerset, the plan should not be presented in a way that may have the effect of restricting development coming forward on the edge of Yeovil.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
270				East Coker Neighbourhood Plan				

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
271				Gladman raises concerns with several policies currently contained within the plan and submits that as written these policies do not meet the basic conditions. These concerns will be detailed below.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
272				Policy ECH1: Housing Provision	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
273				This policy sets a target for 65 additional new dwellings for the Parish within the plan period without specifying whether this is a minimum or maximum figure. The wording of this policy should be modified to state this will be regarded as a minimum or at least, in order to have regard to the flexible approach of the Framework in significantly boosting the supply of housing.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
274				If it were to be a maximum it is considered that the plan would not meet basic condition (a) as the examiner of the plan should not find it appropriate to make the plan having regard to the Framework and its objectives of significantly boosting the supply of housing.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
275				It is also not considered appropriate to set a level of growth for the Parish which is adjacent to Yeovil, the largest town in South Somerset. Suggesting a level of growth could result in restricting development coming forward on the edge of Yeovil that would otherwise be perfectly sustainable. PPG states:	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
276				'All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.'	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
277				Therefore, Gladman recommends deleting the dwelling target to comply with basic conditions (a) and (d). Policy ECH4: Affordable and Social Housing	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
278				This policy seeks for affordable housing on all sites more than 10 dwellings and only in exceptional circumstances will off site provision or a commuted sum in lieu of onsite provision be acceptable. This does not accord with the Framework; the only exceptional circumstances test refers to Local Green Space. In terms of affordable housing the Framework is clear that affordable housing needs should be met on site unless offsite provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified, this is not as restrictive as an exceptional circumstances test.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
279				Policy ECCN 6 Local Green Space	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
280				This policy designates areas as Local Green Space however Gladman contends that this policy is not appropriately worded to accord with the Framework. The policy fails to mention that development of LGS can be considered appropriate in very special circumstances. Gladman suggests this policy be modified to reflect this as it is currently considered a more restrictive policy than the Framework.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
281				Conclusions	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
282				Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the ECNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
283				Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a) and (d). Setting a housing target could mean that sustainable development is restricted from coming forward on the edge of Yeovil and the wording of several policies does not accord with the Framework.	Gladman Developments Team		see 246 above	
284				Savills has provided planning advice to the Wessex Farms Trust (WFT) for a number of years. WFT is the owner of part of the southern Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) which is also known as Keyford and sits on the edge of Yeovil. The site is allocated for comprehensive development in the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and once completed will include 800 new homes, business space, a primary school, a health centre, and a neighbourhood centre. A planning application has been submitted for the whole of the site and is currently being considered by the District Council (SSDC).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		Noted 284 - 301	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan Amendments Appendix B (CS26). It is not accepted that the Plan boundary should be changed at this late stage in the plan process. The proposals map has been rechecked ahead of the next publication of the Plan at Regulation 15 stage. This response applies to comments 284-301
285				The East Coker Draft Neighbourhood Plan (ECDNP) recognises this position and devotes some time to the Keyford site. We have reviewed what it says at this draft stage and would like to make a small number of comments that should improve the Plan and its performance. These short comments fall under five headings and are set out below. I trust this an acceptable format – but please let me know if you would like me to complete the forms instead.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
286				The Neighbourhood Plan Area	Savills Wessex Farm Trust			
287				The first two points concern the area that the Neighbourhood Plan covers.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
288				On one hand we appreciate the rationale for extending the Plan area to the whole of the Parish (as this can inform the reaction of the District Council to the overall concept). However, from a review of the ECDNP, it is clear that its primary focus is on the villages themselves, with less attention given to wider issues about the Parish or its relationship with Yeovil (or its other neighbours).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
289				This theme is reinforced by the references to the key planning policy framework for the ECDNP. Putting to one side the SUE, the early parts of the ECDNP concentrate on Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (SSLP). That policy relates to rural settlements and is linked to Policy SS1 which sets out the settlement hierarchy in South Somerset. East Coker and North Coker are obviously rural settlements and therefore Policy SS2 applies, but the whole parish is not1.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
290				1 This is important because Policy ECH1 of the Plan makes no distinction between settlement and parish. It should just apply to East Coker and North Coker, although ECH1 probably doesn't need to be in the ECDNP at all given that it is effectively already in the Local Plan (or other planning guidance).	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
291				On this basis the ECDNP could cover a smaller area and perform the same function (or meet the same objectives). Inclusion of the Keyford site	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
292				This point (about extent), is especially relevant to the treatment of the Keyford site. As the ECNDP acknowledges, there has been substantial discussion about the SUE and its overall planning status is firmly established. The ECDNP also recognises that the Keyford site accommodates growth for the whole of Yeovil (and is in the form it is to meet the town's requirements and not East Coker's or North Coker's). The development will be subject to national and local planning policy and the development management process – which have the same quality objectives and requirements that the ECDNP plan repeats.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
293				A number of suggestions could be made in this light. However, because of the ECDNP's focus (and function) and because the Keyford site is already subject to quality control (that is at least equivalent to that proposed now), as a starting point we recommend that the Plan Area is reconsidered generally and/or that the Keyford site is removed from it.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
294				Policy ECH1				
295				This approach should also resolve our third comment, which concerns policy ECH1. As it stands, this policy excludes the SUE but provides no other guidance on where the additional development it refers to may take place. That process will presumably come from the application of policies in the SSLP. The policy also fails to make provision for a review of the SSLP (between now and 2028 when both plans will expire). If this policy needs to be in the ECDNP (and we are not sure it does – see footnote on previous page), then we recommend that such a reference is added to the end.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
296				The Need for Policies ECCN1, ECCN2, ECCN3, ECCN4, ECCN5, ECCN8, and ECCN9	Savills Wessex Farm Trust			
297				This approach could help to shorten other parts of the ECDNP too. At the moment most of the Policies in section 10 do not add anything to controls already in place through the SSLP or national planning policy and guidance. The following table identifies which policies in the Local Plan and paragraphs within the NPPF cover the various matters set out in policies ECCN1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9:	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
298				Neighbourhood Plan Policy South Somerset Local Plan Policy NPPF Paragraph Number	Savills Wessex Farm Trust			
299				Whilst policies ECCN6 and ECCN7 do add a local or extra dimension, the above policies could therefore be removed. Proposals Map	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
300				Our final comment is a request for some changes or additions to the proposals map. Assuming that the references made within the document are to the plan that is on pages 39 and 40 of the ECDNP, then we recommend that it is checked to ensure that all of the features it should show are actually shown. At the moment we think that some may be missing (or could benefit from extra explanation). In addition, and if our recommendation, above (about extent) is accepted then the boundary of the plan could be changed.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	
301				These comments are meant to be helpful and I hope they are clear. If you need to discuss any of the matters raised do please call or contact me.	Savills Wessex Farm Trust		see 284 above	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
302				<p>The Neighbourhood Plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. This should include specific policies that introduce the flexibility to respond to reviews of the March 2015 South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) to ensure that the Strategically Significant Town of Yeovil as defined by Policy SS1 is not un-necessarily constrained. The Neighbourhood Area Application was submitted in 2013 before the adoption of the March 2015 SSDC Local Plan with its Policies SS5 and YV2, confirming the YSUE. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan for consultation (DNHPc) contains policies that distinguish between the YSUE (as defined by LP policy YV2) and the remainder of the Neighbourhood (e.g. Policy ECH 4 in respect of access to affordable housing). This highlights the internal dissonance of the DNHPc as to the nature of the Neighbourhood, seeking on the one hand to characterise the Neighbourhood as a Rural Settlement (which it is acknowledged that the village is defined in the Local Plan) whilst on the other hand encouraging pedestrian and cycling links between the villages of North Coker and the YSUE which is included within the Neighbourhood Plan. One is left wondering whether this is a Plan for the Village or the Parish. 7 2.3 The quotation from the NPPF is slightly misleading, as this quotation is actually the 5 guiding principles of set out in the "UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future" How this translates into planning is set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF and how planning is to respond to the presumption in favour of sustainable development is set out in paragraph 14 18 Policy EC1 The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. It does not therefore make sense to qualify the Presumption in Favour of sustainable development by reference to the Neighbourhood plan which must take the presumption into account. By inference Neighbourhood Plan policies should not conflict with the Presumption.</p>	Abbey Manor Group Ltd		Noted comments 302 - 309	See Housing Appendix A (CS25) and detailed Plan Amendments Appendix B (CS26). This response applies to all representations 302-309
303				<p>24 ECH 1 65 dwellings does not appear to have been objectively assessed as the housing need for East Coker parish, rather a proportion of the anticipated housing growth at District Local Plan level. As can be seen from an analysis of the census data the population of East Coker in common with a number of rural areas is decreasing and the percentage of older residents is increasing. To maintain sustainable rural communities, areas need to ensure that they have a good mix of younger and working age population, without this the school, community facilities and wider rural economy will suffer. This Policy has focussed on the numbers of dwellings to be provided without consideration of the national trend for households to become smaller (thereby needing more smaller dwellings) or the needs of the Parish in sustaining its economy and existing facilities. Planning Policy Guidance states that Neighbourhood plans should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area. East Coker needs to take into account the strategic needs of Yeovil and South Somerset not just up to the end of the lifetime of the current district wide local plan, but beyond, by considering future needs and priorities, East Coker could plan proactively for the future. 24 ECH 2 This policy is restrictive, without an objectively assessed local Housing need, the Policy should not focus solely on the delivery of housing for one section of the population despite it being a majority 24 ECH 3 This policy is vague and not evidence based. It encourages lower density of development which in turn leads to a greater land use for development, something which is not being encouraged at a National level.</p>	Abbey Manor Group Ltd		see 302 above	
304				<p>25 ECH 4 The definition of Affordable Housing is to restrictive (e.g. no Discount Market, Homebuy etc) and does not allow for change with National policies such as the Current Housing White paper This Policy clearly overlaps with National and Local Plan policy. It should be made clear where it differs from these policies and justification provided. Is not in accordance with national policy and has not been tested as to whether it meets the requirement for policies to be viable. 6.22 The repetition of the local plan policy of pepper-potting does not take account of the needs of registered providers to be able to effectively manage their properties ECH 5 Repeats policies contained within district and national policy guidance. 28 ECEM 2 This policy only provides for new business development on land already in employment use, this is overly restrictive and does not encourage rural diversification. The requirement to use sustainable construction and renewable energy techniques will add to the cost and not support local growing businesses. ECEM 3 Why are only social enterprises supported, why not other businesses ECEM 4 overly restrictive. A1 (retail) is a planning use, we wonder why the Neighbourhood Plan should distinguish between private and community provision.</p>	Abbey Manor Group Ltd		see 302 above	
305				<p>36 ECCF 1 The supporting text suggests that improved facilities would be welcome at Tellis Cross and the recreation ground, however the policy is overly restrictive in that it does not support any development of the area of land associated with the facilities even if as a result better facilities could be provided and funded.</p>			see 302 above	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
306				With restrictions on local government budgets, a scheme which provides improved facilities could be the only way of delivering those facilities. It should also be noted that the land at Tellis Cross does not belong to any publically funded body but is held on a short term lease to South Somerset District Council. We therefore also suggest that the wording of the second paragraph is changed to "Proposals to enhance, improve or retain" 36 9.16 Having highlighted a key issue for the community – that a larger proportion of the population is over 65 and with the predictions from the census data suggesting that this will not improve over time, it is disappointing that there is no policy objectives to support adaptations to properties, accommodation for carers, etc etc 36 ECCF 2 This policy repeats a local plan policy which is not recommended. Whilst these assets have been identified has the community applied to list the assets which would provide more control than this policy 38 ECCN 1 Repeats National and Local Plan policy	Abbey Manor Group Ltd		see 302 above	
307				42 ECCN 3 This policy is overly restrictive and has not been tested to see whether or not it has an adverse impact on the viability of schemes The meaning of Bullet point 3 is not clear The NPPF states "If the policies and proposals are to be implemented as the community intended a neighbourhood plan needs to be deliverable. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that the sites and the scale of development identified in a plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened". This has not been tested by the Neighbourhood plan 55 Appendix 2 The list of Criteria in Appendix 2 should be identified where they differ from Local Plan Policy, and the need for departure fully justified. We fail to understand why Yeovil has not been included within the list of surrounding parishes.	Abbey Manor Group Ltd		see 302 above	
308				We write in response to the Neighbourhood Plan consultation on behalf of Abbey Manor Group Ltd that has a controlling interest in the current Tellis Cross Play area. We have completed the enclosed forms in respect of policies ECCF1 and ECH1. Abbey Manor Group Ltd have made separate more general comments concerning the Neighbourhood Plan. As you will be aware, we are preparing plans to develop the existing play area that is leased to the District Council. The development would involve the permanent transfer of the parkland opposite North Coker House to the Parish Council (or another appropriate body) in lieu of developing the existing play area. This would provide a permanent and improved play area and parkland for the community to enjoy. These representations centre on the fact that Policy ECCF1 of the Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted does not provide sufficient flexibility to enable provision of enhanced play facilities at alternative suitable locations. We trust that these representations will be taken into account. 36 ECCF 1 This policy seeks to protect existing sport and play facilities from development. It identifies the existing temporary play area at Tellis Cross Play Area as one such location of the proposals map. Tellis Cross Play area is leased to the District Council by Abbey Manor Group Ltd and as such policy ECCF 1 seeks to enact controls over this temporary play area that it can't control. As the Parish Council are aware, we are preparing plans to develop the existing play area that is leased to the District Council. The development would involve the permanent transfer of the parkland opposite North Coker House to the Parish Council (or another appropriate body) in lieu of developing the existing play area. This would provide a permanent and improved play area and parkland for the community to enjoy. These representations centre on the fact that Policy ECCF1 of the Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted does not provide sufficient flexibility to enable provision of enhanced play facilities at alternative suitable locations.	WYG - on behalf of the Abbey Manor Group Ltd	The map is an appendix 4	see 302 above	

Row number	Page No.	Section	Para / Policy	Comment	From Whom	Matrix Appendix Number for relating documents	Steering Group Reponse	Further Actions
				<p>There are a number of options available to amend Policy ECCF1 and/or the proposals map to introduce more flexibility where play area improvements can be achieved. These amendments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delete reference to the protection of the Tellis Cross Play Area from Policy ECCF1 and the proposals map.• Identify the parkland opposite North Coker House as a suitable replacement and enhanced play area, improved drainage and parkland should the Tellis Cross play area be developed.• Amend the wording of Policy ECCF1 to add the following bolded text: Any proposals for built development that are on sites used for these amenities but not associated with these uses and/or will result in the loss of these facilities, will not be supported unless an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements. This amended text is copied verbatim from the Sport England guidance in relation to development on playing fields. This test is an established planning consideration that is taken into account by Local Planning Authorities when considering development proposals of playing fields or any other recreational land. The advice from Sport England can be found at the link below: https://www.sportengland.org/media/3497/a-sporting-future-for-the-playing-fields-of-england-planning-policy-statement.pdf <p>45 ECCN 7 The proposals map identifies the parkland opposite North Coker House as an important public view and vista, identified as viewpoint 8 on the proposals map. It is this parkland that we propose to transfer to the Parish Council (after drainage works have been carried out) to provide an enhanced play area. We enclose a plan to show indicatively how the parkland could be enhanced to provide a much better play facility and recreational area open to the public than the current Tellis Cross Play area. This shows an informal kick about area to replace the one Tellis Cross Play area, vehicular access for maintenance only and various paths and play equipped areas. We believe that the play area proposals would enhance the landscape value of the parkland in accordance with policy ECCN7. Transferring the parkland to the Parish Council would seem an ideal way of ensuring protection of this view/vista. 24 ECH 1. This Policy seeks to cap new developments to 65 additional dwellings, over the period April 2011 – March 2028 inclusive, subject to any change in higher level policies. It states that Applications will only be approved if they can demonstrate that they meet local need, conform to Local Plan policies SS2 and HG5 and other Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies. Our concerns with this policy is that there is no evidence to quantify the 65 dwelling figure or what would constitute evidence that a particular development would meet local need. Ideally a housing needs survey should be used to demonstrate the precise housing needs for the Parish in terms of both affordable and market housing, including the size (number of bedrooms) of properties required.</p>	WYG - on behalf of the Abbey Manor Group Ltd	The map is an appendix 4	see 302 above	
309								
310				Martin Salzer comments are an appendix (5)		5		