

Bishops Lydeard and Cothelstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Statutory Consultation – Responses Summary

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
<b>Consultation Bodies</b>		
<b>Bishops Hull Parish Council</b> (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Bishops-Hull-Parish-Council.htm">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Bishops-Hull-Parish-Council.htm</a> )	General	Feel the plan is a very thoroughly prepared document.
<b>Greenslade Taylor Hunt</b> (acting for Kings Estate)(Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Greenslade-Taylor-Hunt.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Greenslade-Taylor-Hunt.pdf</a> )	Housing	Clients fully support the identification of land off Taunton Road and Hither Mead for residential development. Clients hope to ensure through a disposal of the land in due course to a carefully selected developer with a suitable reputation for building quality housing that the eventual development of their land provides a positive lasting legacy for the village
	Policy H1	The need to provide housing for older people is generally supported. Concerned with reference to energy efficiency standard Code level 4. Reference now redundant – suggest removal of reference.
	Policy H2	-Support the identification of the need to provide affordable housing for local families within policy reference is made to ‘adequate provision’ but this is not defined. Suggest it may be helpful to provide some additional clarification to the effect that provision is assessed in discussion with the Borough Housing Enabling Lead. -Reference to energy standard code level 4 should be removed as Policy H1 above. -Note reference to TDBC’s Affordable Housing SPD which itself contains guidance on design, quality and sustainability standards – suggest that policy is reworded to the effect that affordable housing is provided on a similar basis to that envisaged within the Council’s SPD on this matter so as to meet the basic condition that the NP is in general conformity with the Strategic Policies in the Development Plan.
	Policy H3	Welcome the identification of the requirement to produce a development brief to guide the development of the allocated sites in consultation with the Parish Council and for subsequent adoption by TDBC.
	Policy H5	Again welcome requirement to produce a development brief – refer again to the Code 4 as in H1 and H2

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
<b>Holcombe Rogus Parish Council</b> (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Holcombe-Rogus-Parish-Council.htm">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Holcombe-Rogus-Parish-Council.htm</a> )	General	No comments to make
<b>Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners</b> (acting for Royal British Legion) (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Nathaniel-Lichfield-and-Partners.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Nathaniel-Lichfield-and-Partners.pdf</a> )	Appendix A – record of engagement in NP process	Request that Appendix A Statement of Community Involvement is amended to reflect all of NLP / RBL previous involvement in the NP process.
	5.1 Housing	<p>-Sites identified in the TDBC SADMP are still draft allocations as they have not been through an Examination in Public. The document has not been adopted and the allocations within it are currently emerging policies.</p> <p>-NPPF states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the Strategic Policies however, the emerging allocations in the NP are being fully relied upon to deliver BL housing requirement are only proposing to deliver 150 dwellings (in addition to the scheme for 11 units at the Paddock) The NP is therefore promoting less than the up to 200 units as stated in the core strategy.</p> <p>-The two sites that form the draft allocations are physically constrained and therefore cannot provide more than 150 unites (paragraph 5.1.2)</p> <p>-The visually prominent sites which are partly within the flood plain are not the most suitable location for the proposed residential development. The provision of 150 units fails to fully meet the areas Objectively Assessed Need.</p> <p>-On this basis, on behalf of RBL, we request that the NP should promote further development to help meet the needs for a mix of housing at BL</p>
	Proposal to allocate RBL site	<p>-NLP put forward reasons for allocating RBL site and make reference to the TDBC response to allocating the site for housing.</p> <p>-Suggest that the statement by TDBC no longer stands as an allocation of the RBL site need not be at the expense of the Council's preferred site. The draft NP does not provide sufficient land to meet the up to 200 dwelling figure in the Core Strategy and NLP argue that there is therefore a need to</p>

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
		allocate the RBL site within the NP to meet the 200 figure without impacting on the village, encroaching on open countryside or increasing flood risk.
	Policy H1	RBL supports the intention of policy H1 however as drafted policy is unclear. There is no definition or clarity provided as to what 'adequate provision' entails nor how a dwelling would be suitable for occupation for older people, or what the range of age is covered by the term 'older people'
	Policy H2	RBL supports the intention of policy however as drafted policy is unclear. There is no definition or clarity provided as to what 'adequate provision' entails nor how a dwelling would be suitable for occupation for local families. The policy should be redrafted to encourage a mix of housing based on site specific circumstances.
	Policy H2	Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 – government has withdrawn the code for sustainable homes – reference to it should be removed and instead 'achieve energy efficiency to new government technical standards' should be added.
	Conclusion	Request that RBL site is allocated for housing that could potentially comprise a mix of private residential development and sheltered accommodation / homes for people over 55. This allocation will help meet the housing requirement within the area as well as helping to achieve the Parish Council's objectives within the NP to provide housing for older people.
<b>Oake Parish Council</b> (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Oake-Parish-Council.htm">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Oake-Parish-Council.htm</a> )	General	Supports proposed plans and wishes success in achieving goals.
<b>Taunton Deane Borough Council</b> (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Taunton-Deane-Borough-Council.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Taunton-Deane-Borough-Council.pdf</a> )	General	Hard work commended in producing plan. Acknowledged that the plan already reflects consultation that the NP group has had with TDBC. NP appears to be in conformity with national planning policy and local adopted and emerging development plans. As drafted officers have no significant concerns about the content or effectiveness of the plan. Small number of items which officers suggest should be amended to strengthen and make the plan more effective before its submission to TDBC.
	SEA	TDBC commissioned Lepus Consulting Limited to undertake an initial screening of the draft plan, report notes that although there are matters which would likely require a full environmental assessment under the SEA directive, these have been assessed in the TDBC SADMP SA which incorporates the requirements of the SEA directive. Therefore as currently drafted Lepus have

<b>Ref / Name of consultation body</b>	<b>Relevant Section</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>
		recommended that the NP should be screened out of the SEA process.
	Policy H3 and H5 and Masterplanning / Schematic diagram	Officers recommend that the current policies H3 and H5 be strengthened to contain additional details on such matters as flooding, affordable housing, TPO's, density, height of dwellings, access and highways. Officers also recommend that the accompanying illustration could contain more details. These changes could improve the effectiveness of the plan and the allocation.
	Cothelstone	The plan covers the joint parish of BL and Cothelstone but omits any policy steer for Cothelstone. An opportunity exists for the NP Group to produce a conservation appraisal, in conjunction with the Council's Heritage Officer.
	Policy H1 and H2	Evidence base – it is not clear if beyond the evidence of residents there is an objective evidence to support the policies
	Policy E2	Instance where policy wording may have given unintended consequences. Requirement in policy E 2 for the marketing of public houses for at least two years – the risk is that the building will remain empty, deteriorating and becoming an eyesore. Reference to TDBC guidance states 12 months.
	Policy TR1	Requires all new dwellings to include one charging point for electric / hybrid vehicles. TDBC did not receive support to pursue this as a requirement in its SADMP, to the knowledge of TDBC it has not been viability tested. To impose a financial burden on a new development which has not been tested is counter paragraph 173 of The Framework.
	Policy TR1	States that transport infrastructure is to be built concurrently with new development and be operational before the relevant development is occupied – may be instances where this is not possible – offsite infrastructure may be reliant on CIL or other sources of funding.
<b>Somerset County Council Acoustics Specialist</b> (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Somerset-County-Council-Acoustics.htm">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Somerset-County-Council-Acoustics.htm</a> )	5.1.6 and 5.1.23	To achieve any significant traffic noise reduction by the planting of trees would require extensive dense woodland. Landscape bunding may offer a better approach to noise reduction with reduced requirement for land take and bunding might be successfully incorporated into proposed woodland development.
	Policy E1	It may be helpful to provide an outline of the guiding principles to be adopted for the consideration of noise. Inclusion of a reference to the Noise Policy Statement of England (Defra 2010) might be considered as this is a significant document with respect to noise and planning that has been superseded by the NPPF.
	Policy TR1	May give rise to additional bus stops. Suggest consider avoiding potential low frequency engine noise disturbance that might be created when buses are located close (within 10 metres) of dwellings.
<b>Somerset County</b>	General	The Plan looks good, it is well constructed, detailed and clearly reflects a significant amount of time

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
<b>Council</b> (Full version available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Somerset-County-Council.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Somerset-County-Council.pdf</a> )		and discussion.
	Planning Policy	Flag the presence of mineral resources in the Parishes of Bishops Lydeard and Cothelstone. These resources should be considered within the Neighbourhood Plan making process, noting that the SCC adopted minerals and waste plans also form part of the development plan. SCC requests that the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the location of the sand and gravel resource (as within a Minerals Safeguarding Area) and the benefits of understanding the viability of prior extraction as part of survey work to ensure further well informed scheme. Also suggestion that the Neighbourhood Plan could provide an opportunity to begin dialogue at a local / Parish level for any interest in quarrying local sandstone in support of paragraphs 5.1.35 and 5.1.36
<b>West Somerset Railway PLC</b> (Full version available at: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/West-Somerset-Railway-PLC.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/West-Somerset-Railway-PLC.pdf</a> )	General	WSR embarking on major site redevelopment plan for station area and in the process of completing a scoping study paper on the establishment of services between Bishops Lydeard and Taunton – this will be available in late Autumn. Negotiations on train services between BL and Taunton is progressing so a united WSR/BL PC / TDBC/ SCC front is important. One major issue is question of access from A358. Traffic through broadgauge business park is not ideal and may need to seek alternative arrangements if capacity and throughput are increased. Car parking for WSR a major problem Outstanding issues resultant to the Taylor Wimpey planning consents and their reluctance to comply are a major concern and need to be resolved as a matter of urgency
	Transport Infrastructure	Access to and from the A358 is a challenge now – any future development as set out in NP will only exacerbate traffic flow issues; if through trains are also arriving and departing via Taunton / BL rail link then action to ease out possible pinch points should be considered within the plan
	5.2.1	Suggest final sentence: <i>“One of the largest employers locally is the world renowned West Somerset Railway, a heritage railway running between Norton Fitzwarren and Minehead.”</i> is deleted and replaced with: <i>“The West Somerset Railway is one of the largest employers locally and the longest standard gauge heritage railway in the United Kingdom. Services normally operate over the 20.5 miles (33.0km) between Bishops Lydeard and Minehead. During special events some trains continue a further two miles south of Bishops Lydeard to Norton Fitzwarren where a main line connection allows occasional through trains to operate to and from the national network.”</i>

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
	5.2.16	Suggest “ <i>The WSR runs through the village with Bishops Lydeard currently forming the southern terminus of what is one of the most visited tourist attractions in the county.</i> ” is deleted and replaced with: “ <i>Bishops Lydeard station is the southernmost terminus of the WSR dispatching and receiving trains to and from Minehead, and occasionally Bishops Lydeard receives trains onto the WSR from the national network</i> ”
	5.2.18	Line 2 suggest the phrase “such as a restaurant” is deleted. With the emerging BL Station plan the building of a restaurant may not be helpful.
<b>Residents</b>		
<b>1</b>	5.1 Housing	Document unclear about new housing development and conversion of the land and mansion at Sandhill Park that will provide at least 50 new dwellings after the mansion is converted into apartments, and its outbuildings such as barns and workshops
<b>2</b>	5.1.30 Schematic Diagram	Concern over vehicles speeding off A358 up Taunton Road and onto Hither Mead. Design of road for new housing development should reflect this issue.
	5.1.36	Concern over practicalities of wooden window frames particularly in terms of maintenance. Suggestion that triple glazing should be used for housing close to A358 more susceptible to traffic noise day and night.
	5.3.7	Note that Hatch Green also operate bus service through the village Concern over the contribution that buses and lorries make to pollution Accepts point that parked vehicles act as a mechanism to slow motorists driving through the village but cars are still damaged, trampoline regularly damaged and important services like buses and coop lorry struggle
<b>3</b>  (Full version of residents 1, 2 and 3 comments available: <a href="http://www.bishopshlydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-">http://www.bishopshlydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-</a>	3.3	Concern that public houses in village may reduce further to only one with rumours that the Lethbridge Arms is to be bought privately and flats built on the car park
	3.28	Should include the pharmacy as an important facility
	3.26	Pharmacy should be added as a strength
	5.1.3	Many older people in larger family houses would like to move to bungalows but not necessarily smaller
	5.1.7	Not all older / retirees require small dwellings
	5.1.30 Schematic Diagram	More attention to the back to back arrowed road / vehicle access just above slip roads needs to be applied. Proposal could lead to traffic chaos / danger (unless village becomes a 20mph zone)

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
<a href="#">residents-1-2-3.pdf</a>	5.1.35	Strongly agree but the majority of residents were against 3 storey development but this is not stated
	5.1.36	Windows wood not plastic impractical – much of conservation area have plastic replacement windows and not all in character
	5.2.9	Hope that the Parish Council does have the power to contain commercial / industrial premises to acceptable levels
	5.2.18	A restaurant could kill off the Lethbridge / Bird in Hand
	5.3.1	Health and Wellbeing – should some attention be made to speed limits / traffic calming
<b>4</b> (Full version of comments available: <a href="http://www.bishopslыеard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-4.pdf">http://www.bishopslыеard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-4.pdf</a> )	5.1 Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Proposed development on Greenfield Sites currently used for pasture land and rearing cows and sheep. Further sales of farmland should be discouraged and alternatives such as viable small holdings considered.</li> <li>-A large amount of houses and people will put strain on existing roads and services e.g. doctors' surgery, parking, A358. Cycle / pathway into Taunton necessary although unlikely to reduce traffic significantly though will be useful during unsocial hours when no bus services etc available</li> <li>-All houses and bungalows should have own driveway / garage etc. Allocated parking does not work well.</li> </ul>
	5.3 Transport Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The promised roundabout off the A358 into Station Road should be in place before further construction takes place</li> <li>-Pathways where none exist and one pedestrian crossing are needed with any house building owing to existing parking and traffic problems in Taunton Road particularly by post office.</li> <li>-More parking on roadways will cause more problems for necessary transport such as coop lorry and bus services. Parking of tyres on pavements should be avoided.</li> <li>-A marked "Bus Stop" painted on the roadway along the top of Hither Mead by existing bus shelter near the proposed green space should preserve this area for vehicles parking and visiting.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b> (Full version of comments available: <a href="http://www.bishopslыеard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-5.pdf">http://www.bishopslыеard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-5.pdf</a> )	General	Plan recognises existing problems in the village but doesn't seem to address any of them
	5.1 Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Plan only relates to BL housing development but gives no details about possible dwellings per acres</li> <li>-Steps needed to avoid buy to let</li> <li>-Off road parking for all new housing must be specified</li> <li>-What is the lifespan of this building work? Where will contractors vehicles park?</li> <li>-No mention is made in plan to restrict parking in Hither Mead and adjacent streets – especially around bus stops</li> </ul>
	5.3 Transport Infrastructure	-Infrastructure should be approved before adding any more housing.
<b>6</b>	5.1 Housing	-Before any more houses are built doctors' surgery, school and more parking

Ref / Name of consultation body	Relevant Section	Summary of comments
Full version of comments available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-6.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-6.pdf</a> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Concern over capability of Musgrove to cope during peak periods with new housing proposed in borough</li> <li>-Village feel should be maintained – BL shouldn't feel like a small town</li> <li>-Concern over AONB in future</li> </ul>
<b>7</b> Full version of comments available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-7.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-7.pdf</a> )	Policy H3 Point 9	Provision of a skate park – request careful consideration of where this may be placed happen sooner rather than later. Suggest area away from housing because of visual and noise impact of facility
<b>8</b> Full version of comments available: <a href="http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-8.pdf">http://www.bishopslydeard.org.uk/docs/neighbourhood-plan/Comments-received-from-residents-8.pdf</a> )	General	Concern over proposed increase in housing in the village and impact it will have on facilities and quality of life.
	Objective 6 – and 5.3 Transport Infrastructure	<p>Concern over the ambition of the plan and design of future housing to reduce traffic in centre of village.</p> <p>Some contradiction in NP – ambition to reduce car usage and then noting importance of the private car.</p> <p>Concerns over paragraphs 5.3.11 and 5.3.12 as proposals are not addressing concerns; plan has not provided a proper solution but dodged issue.</p> <p>Suggestion that traffic problems can only be improved by either moving co-op or creating a bypass</p>