



Iminster Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 14 consultation report

8th October 2021:
Report amended following INP Development
Group meeting on 6th October 2021



Report Prepared by ECA for Iminster
Town Council Neighbourhood
Plan Development Group. 2021



Contents

Chapter One	Introduction	4
Chapter Two	How we consulted	8
Chapter Three	Who we consulted	12
Chapter Four	Findings	20
Chapter Five	How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan	28

Appendices

A	Consultation leaflet
B	Statutory consultee responses
C	Written representations
D	Summary of questionnaire responses

LIST OF ILMINSTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES

Environment and Leisure	Policy ILM1	Conserve and enhance Ilminster’s historic landscape setting
	Policy ILM2	Conserve and enhance Ilminster’s ecology, species and habitats
	Policy ILM3	Enhance and connect our local green open spaces with a ‘Green Chain’
	Policy ILM4	Enhance recreational facilities for our growing community
Economy, Tourism and Heritage	Policy ILM5	Allocate an Ilminster Environmental Enterprise Zone to the west of Ilminster
	Policy ILM6	Enhance Ilminster’s economy, tourism and heritage
	Policy ILM7	Promote high quality design
Access and Movement	Policy ILM8	Encourage shoppers and visitors into Ilminster’s town centre
	Policy ILM9	Safe, interesting walking and cycling routes
	Policy ILM10	Welcome people to Ilminster
	Policy ILM11	Preserve and enhance the historic market town centre
Homes and Places for Living	Policy ILM12	Amount and Location of new homes
	Policy ILM13	Types of new homes
	Policy ILM14	Allocated or small brownfield sites
	Policy ILM15	Design and layout of strategic sites

I. Introduction

1.1 This report has been prepared by ECA and has been amended following discussions at the Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan Development Group on 6th October 2021.

1.2 Ilminster Neighbourhood Forum started work on a neighbourhood plan in 2018 and formal consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan was undertaken between June and August 2021 in accordance with Regulation 14 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

1.3 This report sets out the findings of the consultation, summarises the main issues raised and describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan to adhere to these requirements.

1.4 The Neighbourhood Plan proposes 15 policies shown on the next page (set in full in Appendix A), which are covered in four themes. These are:

- Environment and Leisure
- Economy, Tourism and Heritage
- Access and Movement
- Homes and Places for Living

1.5 This statement has been prepared by ECA Community Interest Company on behalf of the Town Council, in order to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15 (2) of Part 5 of the Regulations states that where the qualifying body submit a draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Planning Authority (South Somerset Council) the following information must be set out in a Consultation Statement:

- (a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- (b) an explanation of how they were consulted;
- (c) Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- (d) a description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood plan.


1.6 Following the collation of the comments received and discussions with South Somerset Planning Officers, INP Development Group have made various amendments to the plan, which generally reflect the comments that have been received in the consultation. These will be published

in the next version of the plan (Regulation 15). Whilst some of the changes to the plan are significant, there is unlikely to be a need for a further Reg.14 consultation.

The following sections clearly set out how Ilminster Town Council, as the 'Qualifying body' has met the statutory requirements of Section 14 of the Regulations which state that the qualifying body must:

- (a) publicise in a manner which is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work and carry out business in the neighbourhood area;
- (i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;
- (ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;
- (iii) details of how to make representations; and
- (iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;
- (b) Consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considered may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and
- (c) send a copy to the local planning authority

1.7 Details of the proposals for the neighbourhood plan were published widely through the Town Council website, media, direct emails and a leaflet to every household. A summary of the policies is shown above and the policies map is shown adjacent.



2. How we consulted

PUBLICITY

2.1 The consultation period and associated open days and events were published on the web site, leaflets and local press before and during the consultation period.

2.2 The Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan was published clearly on the Ilminster Town Council web site. Leaflets and questionnaires were also available to download and the questionnaire was available to complete online and also hard copies were available at the library and in the Town Council office where hard copies of the plan and the evidence base could be reviewed.

2.3 Facebook, was also used to keep people up to date with the consultation exercise. The Facebook page is followed by 635 people and is continually updated. An article was printed in the Chard and Ilminster news on the 23rd June 2021. This outlined the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan and why it is important to contribute to the process.

2.4 An A3 fold out leaflet 'Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan 2020 2036 & Ilminster Design Guide' was designed and published by the Town Council. A total of 10,000 leaflets were printed and distributed to residents, businesses and local schools.

2.5 The leaflet summarised how Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan Development Group (Development Group) on behalf of the Town Council, wrote the plan and included a map of the neighbourhood plan area and a list of the proposed policies. The leaflet also communicated where people could view the plan and provided details of the open days and where people could obtain more information. A copy of the leaflet can be found at Appendix B.

2.6 South Somerset Council provided the Development Group with the list of statutory and non-statutory consultees. This is attached as Appendix C. They were consulted by email and given an opportunity to provide comments in writing.

VIEWING THE PLAN

2.7 Printed versions of the plan and questionnaires were available from Saturday 26th June to Monday 9th August 2021 in the following locations and events:

- Ilminster Library – Tuesday 930am–430pm, Wednesday 930am–12pm and Friday 930am–430pm.
- Ilminster Experience (IMEX) Saturday 26th June 9am–3pm – Silvers St and Sunday 27th June 10am–3pm – Recreation Ground
- Town Council Office Saturday 10th July 11am–3pm
- Presentation of the Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan Wednesday 30th June 2021 6pm–8pm at the Shrubbery Hotel, Station Road
- Market House Ilminster Saturday 24th July 2021 between 11am–3pm.

QUESTIONNAIRES

2.8 A questionnaire was prepared for people to complete at each of the neighbourhood plan consultation venues and Fun-days and were also available to download from the website. The questionnaire was also published on the Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan website for people to complete online. **A total of 416 questionnaires were completed.** The findings are summarised in section 2, 6 and in the appendices.

FUNDING AND RESOURCES

2.9 The consultation programme was funded by Ilminster Town Council and Neighbourhood Planning Grants via. Locality.

2.10 Whilst the grants funded ECA to devise and manage the consultation process and run the open days, much of the success of the consultation must be attributed to the many volunteers from the Neighbourhood Plan Development Group who gave their time freely.



3. Who we consulted

STATUTORY CONSULTEES

3.1 A list of statutory consultees who were directly consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan via email on 25th June 2021 is attached as Appendix C.

3.2 This list includes, amongst others, Natural England, the Environment Agency (EA), Historic England and neighbouring local authorities and their parish councils. They were requested to respond by the 9th August 2021.


NON-STATUTORY CONSULTEES

3.3 A list of non-statutory consultees who were directly consulted on the Plan is also set out in Appendix C to this report. This list includes local amenity and business groups such as local schools, health centres etc.

RESPONDENTS

3.4 Over 304 responses were received to the online questionnaire and 114 to the postal questionnaire and 6 separate comments were received in the written representations. A copy of all the consultation responses, excluding the completed questionnaires, is included in the appendices. A copy of the results of the questionnaire is enclosed as Appendix D. A copy of Statutory Consultee responses is attached as Appendix E. A copy of non-statutory consultee responses is enclosed as Appendix G.

3.5 As part of the consultation process, South Somerset Council provided detailed comments on the Plan. All responses received, have been summarised in a table included in this report. The table summarises the consultation response received, the INP Development Groups response and an indication of the changes that have been made to the plan.



Results of the consultation

4.1 This section reviews the results of the consultation events, open days, online and paper questionnaires and statutory consultee comments.

Online questionnaire results


4.2 All of those who attended the event were asked to fill out a questionnaire in order to collate the responses. Each of the Neighbourhood Plan vision and mission, themes and policies responses shall be addressed in turn.

The Vision and Mission for the Iminster Neighbourhood Plan

Vision: To be one of the most desirable market towns in which to live, learn, work, play and visit.

Mission: To create a stimulating, attractive, healthy, safe and sustainable environment through well-considered and balanced development that respects Iminster's unique heritage and rural location, while embracing creativity, technology and innovation, for the community to thrive in a sustainable environment.


4.3 An analysis of the questionnaires completed shows that 77.7% of those who responded agree or strongly agree with the vision and mission. Some responders were concerned that the vision did not go far enough to address issues of the environment, sustainability and landscape however the vast majority of responders agreed.



Environment and Leisure


ILM 1 - Conserve and enhance Iminster's historic landscape setting

4.4 This policy requires all development proposals to preserve views of buildings and the countryside including 20 views shown on the map. Responders were asked which of the views identified were considered to be important.




4.5 Views considered important were from Beacon Hill and across and through Shudrick Lane. Views of Mitchells Hill were not considered as important and scored the lowest.

266 responses




ILM2 – Conserve and enhance Ilminster’s ecology, species and habitats

4.6 Responders were asked to rank the importance of the biodiversity conservation techniques mentioned in the policy. The results show that all were considered to be very important. However the majority felt the retention of existing significant hedgerows and trees was the most significant method.



ILM3 – Enhance and connect our local green open spaces with a ‘Green Chain’

4.7 ILM 3 (b) discusses the requirements on developments. Overall all elements were considered to be important. However increasing biodiversity was considered to be the most important. A few responders felt that use of green spaces were unimportant however this was greatly outweighed by those that felt it was very important.




ILM4 – Enhance recreational facilities for our growing community

4.8 The questionnaire asked if new recreation facilities should be provided along Canal Way and delivered through contributions from developments. Of those that responded 67% that there was a benefit to this to a total of 189 people however 24.5% were neutral on this point.

ILM4 requires planning applicants to contribute towards the delivery of new recreation facilities adjacent to Canal Way. HOW STRONGLY DO YOU AGREE?

282 responses




Economy, Tourism and Heritage

ILM 5 - Allocate an Iminster Environmental Enterprise Zone to the west of Iminster

4.9 ILM5 allocates an area of land to the west of Iminster for an Environmental Enterprise Zone. There were a number of proposals that would support this provision as facilities to support the business in the enterprise zone. Cycle and walking facilities including parking, cycle hubs and connection to National cycle network. Business hubs for self-employed and small businesses, Development to enhance local landscape character, and Public access routes to open countryside were all considered important elements of the policy.

4.10 Large scale sport or leisure facilities and visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities had responses which were either only slight important or not important at all.



1. Cycle and walking facilities including parking, cycle hubs and connection to National cycle network.
2. Business hubs for self-employed and small businesses
3. Development to enhance local landscape character
4. Public access routes to open countryside
5. Large scale sport or leisure facilities
6. Visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities

ILM6 - Enhance Iminster's economy, tourism and heritage

4.11 ILM6 seeks to enhance Iminster's Economy, Tourism and Heritage. Responders were asked how Iminster was best described. The top answer was a unique historic market town at 39.6% as well as a beautiful place in which to live, work, play and learn at 31.1% and that Iminster connects people to the historic and natural environment at 14.6%. Following this it is an attractive centre for shopping, leisure and recreation as well as a more dynamic place for business, enterprise, creativity and innovation and a visitor destination.




▲ 1/3 ▼

ILM7 – Promote high quality design

4.12 ILM7 promotes High Quality Design in all new development. Responders were asked what is the most important issue of which high quality craftsmanship came out as the most important closely followed by strong relationship between the built environment and landscape.

4.13 The conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings and improved walking and cycling connections between urban and rural landscape came out similarly with just over 150 responders stating that it is very important. Diversity of streets, blocks, plots and active street frontages and materials were next most important with those responding stating that they are either very or of medium importance. Adhesive relationship scored the lowest however the majority of responders believed it to be either very important or of medium importance.




1. Adhesive relationship between streets and public spaces
2. Density of streets, blocks, plots, and active street frontages
3. Selective materials available to builders
4. High quality craftsmanship and quality of construction for high-quality finish
5. Conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings
6. Strong relationship between built environment and its landscape settings
7. Improved walking and cycling connections between urban and rural landscape

Access and Movement


ILM8 – Encourage shoppers and visitors into Iminster’s town centre

4.14 ILM8 aims to bring visitors into the town centre and this question aims to ask what elements to encourage this were the most important. All points were considered to be important by the majority of responders. Car park and road improvements were considered to be very important as buses. The vast majority felt that pedestrians and cycle friendly streets were still considered very important however less than cars and buses.




ILM9 – Safe, interesting walking and cycling routes

4.15 This policy requires developers to create safe, interesting walking and cycle routes. Over 160 responses felt that safe walking and cycling routes with wide pavements were important. Over 150 felt that CIL money should be used to improve the green chain through the town. Of less importance however still very important was the improvements to the cycle network.



ILM10 – Welcome people to Iminster


4.16 ILM10 allocates six road junctions on the edge of the town, as ‘gateways’ for improvement and to be made safer. ‘Bay Hill and Townsend’ and ‘Ditton Street to East Street and Shudrick’ had strong responses for improvement. Responses to ‘East Street and Butts’, ‘North Street and Hill Street/Butts’ and ‘New Road, Station Road and West Street’ achieved a majority in agreement however with a less impressive response. Finally ‘Station Road and West Street’ received a response that was still considered important but most felt it was of moderate importance.



1. East Street and Butts
2. Bay hill and Townsend
3. North Street and Hill St/Butts
4. New Road, Station Road and West Street
5. Station Road and West Street
6. Ditton Street and East Street to Shudrick

ILM 11 – Preserve and enhance the historic market town centre


4.17 ILM11 promotes the preservation of the Town centre. All aspects of this policy were considered to be important. Nearly all responders felt that the amenity spaces had importance as well as suitable access and servicing. Public realm enhancements had more responses with moderate importance although the vast majority still felt that it was very important. The majority (Over 180 responses) felt that a shared surface approach was important however 50 responded stating it was not important.



Home and Places for Living

ILM 12 – Amount and Location of new homes


4.18 ILM12 allows for the Local Plan target of 839 additional homes to be built between 2016 and 2036. There is a resounding objection to the provision of 59 houses in the vicinity of Shudrick Lane with almost 200 objecting to it. The remaining locations gained support from responders.



- REF:10 - Canal Way - 400 houses
- REF:12 - Land to the rear of New Wood House, The Beacon - 15 houses
- REF:15A - Land South of Shudrick Lane - 20 houses
- REF:17 - Greenway farm, west of Listers Hill - 44 houses
- REF:19 - Land east of Winterhay Lane - 35 houses
- REF:21A - West of Winterhay Lane adjacent to farmland- 7 houses
- REF:21B - Adjacent to Winterhay lane in the South - 45 houses
- REF:22A Land east of Winterhay Lane - 15 houses
- REF:23 The Swan - 2 houses
- REF:24 Gooch and House go, Market, East St - 14 houses
- REF:25 - Station Road - 50 houses
- REF:26 - Land east of Playing Field, Shudrick Lane - 29 houses
- REF:31 - Land east of Greenway, Listers Hill - 44 houses

ILM13 – Types of new homes


4.19 ILM13 requires a mix of housing types. Almost 150 responders felt that affordable housing was very important and 75 felt it was of medium importance. The vast majority felt that 2/3 bedroom bungalows and 3 bedroom houses were lacking in Ilminster. The 1 bedroom flats and 2 bedroom flats or houses was still considered to be important but not as important. There were fewer who felt that 4 bedroom houses were important however it still attracted 150 votes as being important as opposed to 75 that felt it was not.



1. Up to 6% one-bedroom flats
2. 14% two-bedroom flats or houses,
3. 25% two- or three-bedroom bungalows
4. 40% three-bedroom houses
5. 15% four-bedroom plus houses or live-work units
6. Affordable Housing in accordance with the Adopted Local Plan.

ILM15 – Design and layout of specific sites

4.20 This policy is a specific design policy for the large, strategic development sites, such as the site South West of Canal Way. The results outline that there is a resounding agreement with the requirements of developers in line with this policy.




1. Contribute positively to area's character, scale, layout, height and form
2. Reduce reliance on fossil fuels with provision of on-site renewable energy
3. Incorporate sustainable landscaping and associated management plans
4. Incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
5. Provide well-designed, substantial landscaping with amenity space
6. Provide cycle and pedestrian routes linking to existing routes
7. Prevent an overspill of resident and visitor parking beyond development site

Design guide


4.21 The design guide requires all developments to comply with certain parameters, such as installing certain styles of roofs and windows, traditional building materials and for new homes to have sustainable design features, such as solar panels. Of the responders 184 strongly agreed and 58 moderately agreed. A total of 87.1% agreed with this requirement.

The design guide requires all developments to comply with certain parameters, such as installing certain styles of roofs and windows, tradition...panels. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS?
278 responses



4.22 Every element of the design was considered important to control. Very few responders answered don't know or not important to any element. Density, character, appearance and parking received over 200 very important votes. Gardens, size of dwelling and gaps between buildings received over 150 very important votes. Layout was considered the least important in ranking at just shy of 150 very important and 90 medium importance however even this response overall option was supported in the main.

HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO CONTROL THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS OF BUILDING DESIGN?



Paper questionnaire results


4.23 This section reviews the results of the paper questionnaires. Each of the Neighbourhood Plan vision and mission, themes and policies responses shall be addressed in turn in this section.

The Vision and Mission for the Iminster Neighbourhood Plan

Vision: To be one of the most desirable market towns in which to live, learn, work, play and visit.

Mission: To create a stimulating, attractive, healthy, safe and sustainable environment through well-considered and balanced development that respects Iminster's unique heritage and rural location, while embracing creativity, technology and innovation, for the community to thrive in a sustainable environment.


4.24 An analysis of the paper questionnaires completed shows that 64.1% of those who responded agree or strongly agree with the vision and mission. The second part of the question asked for comments on the neighbourhood plan. Full details are responses can be found in appendix ?. The comments referred to




Environment and Leisure

ILM 1 - Conserve and enhance Iminster's historic landscape setting

4.25 This policy requires all development proposals to preserve views of buildings and the countryside including 20 views shown on the map. Responders were asked which of the views identified were considered to be important.




4.26 Views considered important were from Bay Hill, Townsend and across and through Shudrick Lane. Views Riec sur Belon Way and Station Road were not considered as important and scored the lowest.




ILM2 - Conserve and enhance Iminster's ecology, species and habitats

4.27 Responders were asked to rank the importance of the biodiversity conservation techniques mentioned in the policy. The results show that all were considered to be very important. However the majority felt the retention of existing significant hedgerows and trees was the most significant method.




ILM3 - Enhance and connect our local green open spaces with a 'Green Chain'

4.28 ILM 3 (b) discusses the requirements on developments. Overall all elements were considered to be important. However increasing biodiversity was considered to be the most important.



4.29 ILM4 – Enhance recreational facilities for our growing community


4.30 The questionnaire asked if new recreation facilities should be provided along Canal Way and delivered through contributions from developments. Of those that responded 67.8 % felt that there was a benefit however 16.9% were neutral on this point.



Economy, Tourism and Heritage

ILM 5 – Allocate an Ilminster Environmental Enterprise Zone to the west of Ilminster

4.31 ILM5 allocates an area of land to the west of Ilminster for an Environmental Enterprise Zone. There were a number of proposals that would support this provision as facilities to support the business in the enterprise zone.




1. Cycle and walking facilities including parking, cycle hubs and connection to National cycle network.
2. Business hubs for self-employed and small businesses
3. Development to enhance local landscape character
4. Public access routes to open countryside
5. Large scale sport or leisure facilities
6. Visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities

4.32 Cycle and walking facilities including parking, cycle hubs and connection to National cycle network. Business hubs for self-employed and small businesses, Development to enhance local landscape character, and Public access routes to open countryside were all considered important elements of the policy. Large scale sport or leisure facilities and visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities had responses were important but only moderately so.

ILM6 – Enhance Ilminster’s economy, tourism and heritage


4.33 ILM6 seeks to enhance Ilminster’s Economy, Tourism and Heritage. Responders were asked how Ilminster was best described. The top answer was a unique historic market town at 83.6% as well as a beautiful place in which to live, work, play and learn at 73.8% and that Ilminster connects people to the historic and natural environment at 36%.



ILM7 – Promote high quality design

4.34 ILM7 promotes High Quality Design in all new development. Responders were asked what is the most important issue of which high quality craftsmanship came out as the most important closely followed by strong relationship between the built environment and landscape.

4.35 The conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings and improved walking and cycling connections between urban and rural landscape came out similarly with results showing that it is very important. Materials were also considered to be very important. Density and relationship between streets and spaces were medium to very important.




1. Adhesive relationship between streets and public spaces
2. Density of streets, blocks, plots, and active street frontages
3. Selective materials available to builders
4. High quality craftsmanship and quality of construction for high-quality finish
5. Conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings
6. Strong relationship between built environment and its landscape settings
7. Improved walking and cycling connections between urban and rural landscape

Access and Movement


ILM8 – Encourage shoppers and visitors into Iminster’s town centre

4.36 ILM8 aims to bring visitors into the town centre and this question aims to ask what elements to encourage this were the most important. All points were considered to be important by the majority of responders. Car park and road improvements were considered to be very important.




ILM9 – Safe, interesting walking and cycling routes

4.37 This policy requires developers to create safe, interesting walking and cycle routes. All options were considered to be very important with over 50 responses felt that safe walking and cycling routes with wide pavements were important.



ILM10 – Welcome people to Iminster


4.38 ILM10 allocates six road junctions on the edge of the town, as ‘gateways’ for improvement and to be made safer. ‘Ditton Street to East Street and Shudrick’ and ‘Bay hill and Townsend had a strong response for improvement. Responses to ‘East Street and Butts’, ‘North Street and Hill Street/ Butts’, ‘New Road, Station Road and West Street’ and ‘Station Road and West Street’ received a response that was still considered important but most felt it was of moderate importance.



1. East Street and Butts
2. Bay hill and Townsend
3. North Street and Hill St/Butts
4. New Road, Station Road and West Street
5. Station Road and West Street
6. Ditton Street and East Street to Shudrick

ILM 11 - Preserve and enhance the historic market town centre

4.39 ILM11 promotes the preservation of the Town centre. All aspects of this policy were considered to be important. Nearly all responders felt that the amenity spaces had importance as well as suitable access and servicing. Public realm enhancements had more response with moderate importance although the vast majority still felt that it was very important.




Home and Places for Living

ILM 12 - Amount and Location of new homes

4.40 ILM12 allows for the Local Plan target of 839 additional homes to be built between 2016 and 2036. There is a resounding objection to the provision of 59 houses in the vicinity of Shudrick Lane with most objecting to it. The remaining locations gained support from responders with site 12 The Beacon only gaining marginal support.


ILM12 allows for the Local Plan target of 839 additional homes to be built between 2016 and 2036. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ON THESE SITES FOR HOUSING shown in blue on the map?



- REF:10 - Canal Way - 400 houses
- REF:12 - Land to the rear of New Wood House, The Beacon - 15 houses
- REF:15A - Land South of Shudrick Lane - 20 houses
- REF:17 - Greenway farm, west of Listers Hill - 44 houses
- REF:19 - Land east of Winterhay Lane - 35 houses
- REF:21A - West of Winterhay Lane adjacent to farmland- 7 houses
- REF:21B - Adjacent to Winterhay lane in the South - 45 houses
- REF:22A Land east of Winterhay Lane - 15 houses
- REF:23 The Swan - 2 houses
- REF:24 Gooch and House go, Market, East St - 14 houses
- REF:25 - Station Road - 50 houses
- REF:26 - Land east of Playing Field, Shudrick Lane - 29 houses
- REF:31 - Land east of Greenway, Listers Hill - 44 houses

ILM15 - Design and layout of specific sites

4.41 This policy is a specific design policy for the large, strategic development sites, such as the site South West of Canal Way. The results outline that there is a resounding agreement with the requirements of developers in line with this policy. Although cycling and pedestrian routes and overspill parking did not score as highly they were considered very important.




1. Contribute positively to area's character, scale, layout, height and form
2. Reduce reliance on fossil fuels with provision of on-site renewable energy
3. Incorporate sustainable landscaping and associated management plans
4. Incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
5. Provide well-designed, substantial landscaping with amenity space
6. Provide cycle and pedestrian routes linking to existing routes
7. Prevent an overspill of resident and visitor parking beyond development site

Design guide

4.42 The design guide requires all developments to comply with certain parameters, such as installing certain styles of roofs and windows, traditional building materials and for new homes to have sustainable design features, such as solar panels. Of the responders all 4 strongly agreed.

4.43 Every element of the design was considered important to control. Very few responders answered don't know or not important to any element. Density, gardens, appearance and gaps between buildings received the highest scores.



Online and Paper questionnaire open ended questions

4.44 Comments received on both the online and paper questionnaire were very similar or repeated and so both of the open ended question responses have been analysed together. There are comments in the open ended questions that are not relevant to the topic being discussed. Only relevant comments have been summarised in this section.


Vision and mission

4.45 Comments were asked on the neighbourhood plan vision and mission. Full details are responses can be found in appendix F. The comments referred to the town having a sustainable focus based on transport, travel and commuting, environmental issues such as climate change and biodiversity as well as ensuring that the town focuses on social infrastructure needs and the need to be self sustaining.

4.46 Many comments were received in relation to the Shudrick Valley which is not mentioned in the vision and mission and so were not relevant to the write up of this section. It will be addresses in a later section

ILM 1 - Conserve and enhance Iminster's historic landscape setting

4.47 Responders have suggested views as part of the comments made to the questionnaire. Many were suggested and they are shown on the map below. Views in and around Herne Hill, Pretwood Hill, of the Minster and across Shudrick Valley were repeatedly considered to be the most important. These areas have significant or sensitive allocations adjacent to them.



ILM3 - Enhance and connect our local green open spaces with a 'Green Chain'

4.48 An open ended question was asked of part (a) of the policy. The results of this were that the loop should take in all of Iminster with walking/cycling links and link with the south of the town with external links to the surrounding villages.

4.49 It was felt that cycling on some paths may be difficult, with safety concerns due to access and dangerously narrow with tight corners. Concerns were raised regarding cycling and pedestrians sharing the access and it was felt that good signage and management needed to ensure that the paths could be used. Effective maintenance routine was sited for litter, dog mess and, in particular, ensuring control of bushes, trees & undergrowth.

4.50 The counter opinion to this was to not urbanise the walking paths and others felt that wilder areas need to be kept as such for wildlife. Habitat creation and protection was not considered to be strong enough with a proposal to "green" all areas not just the green corridors to improve the environment and biodiversity.

4.51 Overall it was felt to be incredibly important for health and well being and great to walk traffic free around Iminster, promoting greener activities and active travel. Others siting it is one of the most effective way to reduce carbon emissions, as well as supporting well-being.

ILM4 - Enhance recreational facilities for our growing community

4.52 The questionnaire asked if new recreation facilities should be provided along Canal Way and delivered through contributions from developments. Of those that responded 67% that there was a benefit to this to a total of 189 people however 24.5% were neutral on this point.

4.53 Further comments were asked of this section and most wanted details of specific recreational needs of local residents with a community consultation undertaken.

4.54 Most felt having a year round indoor leisure centre with a swimming pool would be a huge benefit to the town however others were concerned about running costs. Concerns were focused on why money was being directed to Canal Way only. Some felt that Iminster has sufficient leisure facilities and others felt that resources would be better directed towards maintenance of existing facilities such as the tennis courts.

4.55 Facilities were asked to be fully accessible and of good quality. Many people commented that the plan should be encouraging all age groups to exercise with the provision of adult exercise equipment, as part of an exercise trail with static exercise equipment, and chess boards etc. Others

felt that the youth club should be moved to this location. A wild play area for children for imaginative play was suggested.

4.56 Environmental impact of the provision of a scheme should be assessed for its impact on wildlife. Trees also came up in comments, seeking to ensure that hedgerows and trees were retained. Further tree planting and a community orchard were suggested as was a dog walking area. Planting was suggested to be native and trees protected by covenant or TPO.

4.57 The impact of the development in terms of noise and light pollution were cited as an existing problem. With concerns raised over intensifying the use of the site. Concerns were also raised over traffic and resulting noise and air pollution. Parking was considered important particularly for disabled people. Also toilets and food & drink provision were referenced to be provided in the facility.

ILM6 – Enhance Ilminster’s economy, tourism and heritage

4.58 Many have stated that they like Ilminster to remain as it is with one person stating ‘Perfect – just the way it is!’. Concerns were raised that if Ilminster is developed it will lose its identity as a small market town with a friendly community atmosphere. There is a recognition for the need to travel for certain facilities due to the rural location however there is a mixed response on this due to sustainability arguments and carbon emissions from car use.

4.59 Employment and different business were encouraged as well as access and shop variety. Many felt Ilminster should be for mainly independent traders offering a wide choice of goods, keeping the large chains away.

4.60 Many felt space should be provided for start-up and scale-up businesses in different sectors, including shared office spaces, meeting rooms, and workshops for creative and light industrial sectors. A mix of office and home working providing flexible business “hub” facilities.

4.61 Encouraging tourism had a mixed response with some believing that visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities would happen naturally. Others felt it needed encouraging in terms of facilities provided as well as accommodation and making the town more attractive or less run down. General and coach parking was mentioned as being important to encourage tourists for a convenient and easy access to the town.

4.62 A few mentioned the cultural offerings that Ilminster has. In the form of a theatre, the Warehouse, and other cultural facilities such as the Meeting House Art Centre as well as a number of pubs and other social and community facilities. The plan would be enhanced through enhancing this policy or providing a separate bespoke policy, supporting these facilities, and protecting them from unnecessary loss.

ILM7 – Promote high quality design

4.63 Using local materials with sustainable building methods and materials is a comment made by residents. Green technologies such as solar Panels, air source heat pumps, grey water systems, car charging, heating and water systems and fibre broadband are suggested. Buildings must be future proofed and consider accessible design.

4.64 A harmonious aesthetic that contributes to the past and future heritage of the town without resulting in historic pastiche designs or cheap façades. Mass produced housing and high-quality craftsmanship were not considered to go hand in hand however both were considered to be needed. Concern were raised of trade-off between high quality finishes when building affordable housing. Individual designs were preferred rather than all looking the same. A desire to have no more estates of ‘nasty little boxes’ was raised by one concerned resident.

4.65 Concerns were raised in relation to having design policies that were too specific and restrictive. Flexibility in the interpretation of what is good, high-quality design. The guide was considered very prescriptive by 1 resident stating, for example in principle 2 that ‘Fronts of development, should be bound by railings, low walls or hedges and buildings should be set back behind planted front gardens.’ This detail was not considered feasible to achieve across all potential development sites in the Town.

4.66 Some higher density areas were believed to be needed so that dwellings are more affordable. However, one responder felt that low density would be better.

4.67 Many responded saying that brownfield sites and existing buildings should be put into use before any allowance of building new dwellings. The aesthetics of all buildings should be considered including old properties and industrial/business premises aesthetics fit in with the town character.

4.68 Traffic was cited as concern with the capacity of the town to provide for more vehicles. Further road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster are addressed with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles.

4.69 Definitions of some terms in the text such as ‘adhesive relationship’, ‘selective materials’, ‘density of streets’, and ‘active street frontage’ were believed to be needed.

ILM10 – Welcome people to Ilminster

4.70 This question sought suggestions of additional gateways. Some comments made in this section had no regard to gateways. More definition of what a gateway is may be required. Such as a 'node' or 'junction'. All relevant gateways suggested have been mapped on the next figure.

4.71 Hort Bridge, Tesco petrol station, Southfields Roundabout, Bay Hill & Townsend, High Street/ Butts down North Street, Winterhay Lane to station Rd, Ditton Street to Shudrick Lane, Canal Way junction to Ditton St, Beacon at Cemetery and Herne Rise were named as junctions or gateways.



ILM 11 – Preserve and enhance the historic market town centre

4.72 One residents seeks to pedestrianize whole town centre from East Street to Silver Street. Sitting it would have benefit residents and tourists but would need to be an easily accessible car park. However other residents states pedestrianizing would detrimentally impact on trade. Most shared concerns for loss of parking as parking is felt to be lacking.

4.73 Some state to make it parking free except for deliveries to shops and others state more car-parking is needed. Electric vehicle charging points were considered to be an option for some. A requirement for an accessible car park and support and consideration for disabled access and manoeuvrability and disabled parking. More seating is needed for the elderly and disabled in the

centre. Concern detrimental impact on trade for the shops in town if there is any loss of on street parking spaces because passing trade reliance.

4.74 Facilities to encourage cafés pubs and restaurants to permit us of external space e.g. pavements and the Market House are welcomed. Replacing tarmac with more attractive materials would be an improvement as would outside spaces. Pedestrianised area would make the central area inviting and comfortable and addresses the congestion in Ilminster.

4.75 Many feel that the town centre in Ilminster the traffic works well. There is plenty of opportunity for people to linger and talk, as they do, all the time, the traffic is slow moving, and drop off's are easy. Many believe it would slow down traffic, making the town centre safer and quieter. Others raise concerns that the shared surface areas are not relaxing and do not deter cars and is dangerous for sight/hearing impaired people.

4.76 Some feel the policy does not address the issue of traffic which simply goes straight through the town rather than to or from it. It is felt that this needs discouraging. Concerns that Traffic along this route will endanger pedestrians and cyclists and could cause long delays at busy times. Further concerns that engines idling for longer will increase air pollution.

ILM12 to 15

4.77 Comments stated that any large housing development must have sufficient infrastructure amenities, parking, and link in with the town centre. Due to increased housing in the town such as a need for Doctors, Dentists, and provision of extending and providing for existing schools. Adequate parking and road networks were felt to be hugely important. Suggestions were that roads should be wide and tree lined and use permeable surfaces. There was a specific move to refer to the green Ilminster comments. One responder commented to discourage car use by provide alternatives.

4.78 Sustainability was mentioned requiring that houses are built on brownfield sites. Others going further requiring that all new development should be built to be eco-friendly, low-carbon, energy and water efficient and climate resilient from sustainable materials. Further ensuring appropriate sizes that last with good sized gardens for children to play. A specific comment was to stop the design of 'nasty little boxes!' referring to poorly designed affordable units.

4.79 Affordability came up as a concern for many with some stating that it is important to have more community housing. There was a desire to have a balanced mix of housing types for existing residents plus range to attract new people including families, bungalows for elderly population. Concerns were raised over young people to be able to afford to move onto property ladder and for new professionals bringing business and opportunities into Ilminster. There was a move to have this mix spread throughout the development sites. A few comments requested that self-build and community house building projects were considered and provided for.

4.80 One responder stated that the principle of policy ILM12 which seeks 20% of new homes to be Building Regulations M4(2) compliant, meeting Lifetime Home Standards was disproportionately high. They recommend that elsewhere 10% was reasonable. Furthermore, provision needs to be made in the policy that it is acceptable to provide 'adaptable' M4(2) units rather than fully 'accessible' from the outset.

4.81 There is a fear from some responders that Ilminster will become a dormitory town with no economic benefit as residents need suitable local jobs provided in the town. One comment stated that if people are to work from home, there must be reliable fast fibre optic connectivity.

4.82 To combine 'four-bedroom plus houses' and 'live-work units' above (ILM13) was considered misleading by one responder. Whilst live-work spaces are increasingly vital for a thriving, mixed-use community, four-bed+ housing may be entirely unsuitable (especially if they conform to the trend for generic, insipid and low quality 'executive-style homes').

4.83 Protecting the natural environment was mentioned by many with responders requesting that only brownfield sites were used or at least prioritised over other sites. Many stated that development shouldn't be building on flood zone due to the constant flooding risk issues in and around Ilminster with fears over drainage from further housing and climate change predicting that this issue will get worse. Water conservation solutions should be part of the development. Green spaces should be provided and be wildlife friendly, bio-diverse and ecologically valuable (i.e. not a patch of lawn and garden shrubs or trees packed in too tightly to thrive and support ground flora) with hedges replaced like for like. One person stated that they would have no problem with housing developments 17 and 31 if that area was incorporated into the green chain as it currently it lies outside.

4.84 In terms of the site allocations, the Shudrick Valley sites received conflicting responses. Several responders oppose the Shudrick Valley ecosystem due to wildlife, water source in the form of a stream, springs and marshland. Others object due to the history of the site in terms field patterns dating back to Medieval times and others refer to it as a sacred ancestral spring and water source. A government Inspector in 2017 dismissed the site at appeal in part because of its significance as part of the Conservation Area. However the site was allocated in the emerging local plan and residents were confused between this allocation for 220 and the neighbourhood plan allocation of sites 26 and 15A. Some responses requested that site 26 should included which is on the south side of Shudrick Stream and would level up with the houses at the back of Tesco's but not 15a.

4.85 Other comments supported Shudrick Lane as residential and expressly stated that the whole of 15 should be developed. One stated that the land between Tesco and Knott Oak should be allocated for housing to deliver a new through route in and out of the town to reduce the traffic build up around the library junction. This area of land is the Shudrick Valley and the road would go beyond the remit of the suggested allocation in the neighbourhood plan. One comment specified that they do not agree with the reduced site area shown on Shudrick Valley, nor with the proposed 'Suggested Number' of homes on the site; 20 on site ref. 15A and 29 on Site ref 26.

4.86 Concerns have been raised that the Strategic Environmental Assessment provided as part of the evidence base for the plan incorrectly assesses the Shudrick Lane site by failing to consider the actual extent of developable and available site area. This is also due to lack of consideration of the agricultural land value of the site (Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land [BMAG]). Table 4.5 suggests there is a 'likely adverse effect' on land soil and water resources largely as the site is Grade 3a land. However whilst much of the site is classed as BMVAG, much of it is actually not conducive to modern day farming practices. The land at the Site is divided into a number of small fields, the largest of which extends to less than 3 ha (approximately 7 acres). The smallest field extends to around 0.2 ha. Fields are divided by mature hedges, trees and a watercourse. Unless the hedges and trees are removed, the practical use of large, modern farm machinery in these fields will be constrained by the historical pattern of land management. Whilst large parts of the Site are BMVAG, this classification is no higher than other non-allocated land around the edge of the town.

4.87 The area only reflects a small area at the northern most part and means only part of the sites constraints and opportunities have been appraised. The emerging Plan allocates the site for 220 dwellings and has its own Sustainability Appraisals and Evidence base documents, providing 49 units is not supported by the same evidence base. Concerns are raised that the capacity of the site at Shudrick Lane is in danger of conflicting with paragraph 13 of the NPPF by seeking to limit development on a site that is already identified as contributing towards the strategic policy objectives.

4.88 Paragraph 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states: 'The application of the presumption has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies'. The plan can not conflict with adopted policies, however the emerging plan is not adopted. Notwithstanding this, if the Local Plan is adopted after the Neighbourhood plan, the policies will be superseded.

4.89 Some comments were opposed to site 10 on Canal Way which is a current application and allocated in the local plan. Comments requested that any proposal should not intrude on Herne Hill. Site 12 was considered not suitable for housing due to subsidence issues and The Beacon is mentioned as liable to moderate risk of landslide.

4.90 The Horlicks site (Ref: 25) was cited as a preference for development. Horlicks and the Rose Mills site were considered perfect by responders for light industrial development and housing however others stated it would be better to designate most of it for housing with a good cycle path. Some responders raised concerns over flooding on this site.

4.91 Site 19, 21A and 21B at Winterhay Lane were considered to be too prominent in the landscape, viewed from all along Beacon Road, and in particular from the Beacon footpath which is recognised as an important view. Concerns were raised on flooding of the river Isle, the road network into Winterhay Lane being insufficient. Winterhay Green and Manor Farm are of historical importance due to

their medieval origin, and grade II listed buildings.

4.92 Site 12 near to New Wood was described as being below a large number of houses on the east side of Beacon Road. It was considered by 1 responder to be an important inlet of countryside into the town, and is extremely visible from many points in the distance.

4.93 Suggested alternative sites included Dillington Estate land above Bay Hill (site 18 in the site assessment) for a smaller allocation than it was assessed for, Daido car park (site 30) which is brownfield. Other brownfield sites along Station Road near the Powermatic factory were suggested instead of building on green sites.

4.94 Some comments outlined that the target number of houses were not welcomed with many not understanding that this has been allocated by the district council and is not for negotiation. Others raised concerns that the plan map is difficult to read, or relate to an OS map.

Design guide

4.95 Comments such as 'I wish!' and 'What an excellent chance to build sustainable green housing that is varied, well designed and uses good materials in keeping with the town' gave exemplary praise of the guide. However, others were more sceptical that the guide was enforceable at planning stage.

4.96 Sustainability and the environment were considered important and believed to be the priority by some at the top of this list rather than the last section. Innovation in building design and materials in a way that supports local distinctiveness in a sustainable manner. Buildings should be designed with the future in mind, e.g. Electric car charging points built in, solar energy, heating from geothermal heat pumps, rainwater, harvesting, electric vehicle charging, recycling area, cycle paths, swift bricks, hedgehog tunnels. Carbon neutral buildings was the preference of many and should support affordable energy conservation strategies.

4.97 Well-being was an important topic with light, air, private and public green spaces, and trees planted, to maximise carbon storage and provide a therapeutic living environment. It was agreed that not everyone wants a garden, but green spaces provide views and outside space for flat dwellers. Space between gives light and an opportunity for communities to and social interactions to develop, to have access sunlight or space to play.

4.98 Variety of housing types were suggested to provide for all needs reflecting the needs of current and future residents. As well as the provision of decent homes with good sized bedrooms and proportionate gardens. Space and density was considered important, and not too dense, developments should not be cramped to maximize profit. Layouts should be appealing and not at odds with existing unique buildings and spaces of Ilminster.

4.99 It was felt important by some to control design but not restrict or hamper innovation either. Avoiding bland and homogeneous 'cookie cutter' designs. A sympathetic style that does not repli-

cate but is of high quality. New building should reflect local character and be built using local materials avoiding box houses built with the cheapest fake materials. It should fit in with this historic town. Buildings should be in keeping with the style of houses in the town, to retain the historical character of Ilminster

4.100 A few comments believe that large scale development should not be allowed to encourage formulaic design. It was suggested to limit developers to a maximum of 30 houses in any one development to ensure this.

4.101 Sufficient parking was cited as a concern with at least 2 cars needed for family housing. Wide tree lined streets with grassed areas were suggested with additional parking areas. Road widths that allow fire engines through were an important standard to maintain. Parked cars on roads blocking passages were difficult and dangerous. Storage in the form of garage spaces and for parking as well as bin storage was considered important.

4.102 One comment cited that designs must make for provision for increasing age and disabilities e.g. wide doors. Provision of affordable housing or the school was not mentioned but it was felt that it should be.

5. How we addressed the issues raised and amended the plan

5.1 All the information collected from the events, representations from statutory consultees, online and paper questionnaires were analysed and considered by ECA and the Neighbourhood Plan Development Group.

5.2 This feedback is critical as it provides the Neighbourhood Plan Development Group with an indication of how likely the Neighbourhood Plan will succeed at Examination and Final Referendum stage.

5.3 The comments are set out in full in the Appendices and summarised below. Suggested amendments in response to these comments are listed below.

General comments

Amendment 1: Align time frame with local plan review to 2040 on the cover, pg 4, 1.1, 3.2.6, 3.6.2, 8.2, 8.7.6, ILM12, 11.4.1, pg.112, pg.112. South Somerset District Council (SSDC) request that the Neighbourhood Plan period is amended to 2020-2040. The Current Local Plan is for the period 2006 to 2028 and the Local Plan Review (LPR) will be for the period 2020 to 2040. We suggest that there would be benefits of aligning the Neighbourhood Plan with the Local Plan Review (LPR) period and has no implications for housing supply as Policy ILM12 is now to be removed.

Amendment 2: Amend pg. 4 to reflect that Policy ILM12 will be deleted (Paragraph 3). The figure of 839 additional dwellings allocated for Ilminster, will be amended by SSDC at the next stage of the LPR process, based on the most up to date housing monitoring data and the Government's standard methodology for calculating housing need. Reg 19 consultation of the LPR is anticipated in mid-2022. SSDC has no objection to the INP proceeding on the basis of the 839 dwellings as they do not wish to cause confusion or delay. However the INP will be out of date when SSDC does publish these news figures, which are likely to be higher than 839. If Policy ILM12 was to remain in the INP then additional housing sites may need to be allocated through the LPR process

Amendment 3: Amend Paragraph 1.3- 'emerging local plan' replaced with 'local plan review' in all instances.

Section 1.3 Any reference to 'Emerging Local Plan' should be replaced with 'Local Plan Review'.

Amendment 4: Table 1- remove reference to consultation on the NP boundary. Consultation on a Neighbourhood Area did not take place as this is not needed where the area aligns with a parish boundary.

Amendment 5: Figure 1- make the map less faint and provide a strategic map in corner.

It may be helpful if this map included an area wider than the parish to give more context. The base is also quite faint and difficult to read.

Amendment 6: Para 3.3.1 - Change 'INP Boundary' to 'INP Area' Any reference to 'INP Boundary' should be replaced with 'INP Area'.

Amendment 7: Para 3.6.2c - NPPG to National Planning Practice Guidance. To take account of recent changes to national guidance.

Amendment 8: Para 4.1.4 - refer to the proposed A358 Taunton as 'Southfields Duelling' and insert 'means' in the last sentence prior to 'public transport is very limited'. To take account of SSDC comments.

No Amendment: Para 4.2.2 - The Education Authority have confirmed that Swanmead building will continue to be used as a school. Comments received that the education system in Ilminster is set to be reorganised and the INP should consider the implications for vacant school sites. However this would seem premature as the town will grow in the future and the LEA has stated the site will still be needed for a school.

No Amendment: Table 5- to reflect the Evidence Base used for the INP which included the 2019 report on 5 Year Housing Land Supply. This is evidence base which the INP was prepared. SSDC states that the most recent 5 Year Housing Land Supply report will be published in Autumn 2021.

Amendment 9: Para 6.3 - AIM FOUR. Refer to Class E. To reflect changes to the Use Class Order.

Amendment 10: A number of changes to FIGURE 2: Proposals Map

- Reference to 'chain' changed to 'corridor'
- Red line needs to be bolder for the development boundary
- Change colour of green chain from orange to green
- Add additional junction improvements, as listed in Policy ILM10
- Canal Road Site in Key should be referenced as 'Outline planning permission approved, subject to S106 planning obligation'
- Remove allocated Sites, as Per ILM12
- Change reference to map as correct page number (38)
- Amend Development Area boundary to exclude allocated sites but include the Canal Way site

It is suggested that the Proposals Map may be trying to represent too much information on a single plan, making it a little confusing to understand.

Amendment 11: Para 8.5.1- needs amending in line with comments. A minor typo here with the full stop missing at the end of the paragraph.

No Amendment: Figure 4 - not relevant. It is not clear from this map whether any of the proposed protected views are affected by proposed site allocations in Neighbourhood Plan.

5.6

The Vision and Mission for the Iminster Neighbourhood Plan

The responses agreed with the vision and mission however some were concerned that the vision did not go far enough to address issues of the environment, sustainability and landscape. Comments referred to the town having a sustainable focus based on transport, travel and commuting, environmental issues such as climate change and biodiversity as well as ensuring that the town focuses on social infrastructure needs and the need to be self sustaining.

No Amendment: The vision and mission is considered to meet these criteria.

Amendment 12: Remove Aim 2 to reflect the deletion of Policy ILM12. No sites are being allocated in the INP now.

POLICY ILM 1 - Conserve and enhance Iminster’s historic landscape setting

Generally there was support for the views. Views considered important were from Beacon Hill and across and through Shudrick Lane, Bay Hill and Townsend. Suggested views were in and around Herne Hill, Pretwood Hill, of the Minster and across Shudrick Valley were repeatedly considered to be the most important. These areas have significant or sensitive allocations adjacent to them. Responders felt that the map was too faint. A number of other views were also suggested.

No Amendment: Due to topographic nature of the area and landscape there is a lot of views. The comments are covered in the policy in any case as it states ‘from all hills and roads’.

No Amendments are recommended to Policy ILM1 or its supporting text.

Policy ILM1

Conserve and Enhance Iminster’s Historic Landscape Setting

All development proposals (excluding householder developments*) must demonstrate how they:

- a. Preserve all views of Beacon Hill, Herne Hill, Pretwood Hill, River Isle and The Minster especially from main roads into Iminster and those from the twenty identified and protected views of Iminster shown on ‘Figure 5: Protected Views, Landscape Character and Designations’
- b. Enhance views and vistas, particularly those containing heritage assets, through public realm improvements and carefully managed developments
- c. Create new views and vistas, particularly of and from allocated housing sites on the edge of the built-up areas
- d. Conserve and enhance local landscape character and features, including trees, hedgerows and waterways
- e. Ensure all new development includes a strategic landscape plan and associated management for the whole site to include hard and soft landscaping which enhances the local landscape.

ILM2 – Conserve and enhance Ilminster’s ecology, species and habitats

Amendment 13: POLICY- Add in words ‘Corridor’ and water ‘quality’

Questionnaire responses support this policy however statutory consultees and written representations feel this policy could do with more text to support it. SSDC comment that the policy refers to ‘water quality’ rather than ‘water’ in the introductory paragraph and suggest the use of the term ‘Green Corridor’, rather than green chain.

Amendment 14: SUPPORTING TEXT- Include links to the Districts Phosphate calculator.

It would be helpful to reference either in the Plan or the supporting text the District’s Phosphates Calculator and published Position Statement: <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/services/planning/somerset-levels-and-phosphates/>

Amendment 15: Paragraph 8.7- add in a paragraph regarding Phosphate Levels. That the INP group are concerned about this but it is a strategic issue that needs to be addressed in the Local Plan Review following up to date guidance form the Government. It is acknowledged by the group that at the time of writing the guidance is not sufficient and they concur with the concerns raised in the consultation.

Amendment 16: Amend supporting text to include reference to the Evidence base, namely- South Somerset Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 Preferred Options Consultation (Regulation 18) Paragraph 14.44 states that the coverage of woodland in South Somerset is significantly below the County Average- 5% instead of 9% and the South Somerset Environment Strategy 2019 confirms a commitment to plant c.500 trees per year on SSDC Countryside sites to protect the environment and ecology; to reduce Carbon Emissions; and for a) South Somerset District and b) the Council to become carbon neutral’. Comments on this policy state that ILM2(a) may not be justified or achievable on site and it is not clear what evidence supports the planting of trees in accordance with this Policy. SSDC have commissioned evidence on Tree Canopy cover in the District and are proposing to include a policy in the LPR.

Amendment 17: Amend supporting text after 8.7.3 to reflect Natural England’s comments.

Natural England recommended that the following text is inserted into the next iteration of the Ilminster NP: ‘Given the sensitivity of the Somerset Levels and Moor Ramsar site to an increase in phosphate concentrations, it is a requirement that all developments contributing to the total wastewater burden in the Parish must achieve phosphate neutrality. Developments resulting in a phosphorus surplus, will be required to provide appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. Wetlands, reed beds) in agreement with the local planning authority. The requirement for mitigation will be commensurate with the scale of development and might be achieved strategically, particularly in the case of smaller developments.’

No Amendment: ILM12 now removed so no change to Policy ILM2 is needed in relation to allocation of sites. Natural England refer to the allocation of land for delivering phosphorous neutrality measures stating that whilst the plan Habitats Regulations compliant that this in itself is not a guarantee that suitable solutions will come forward to enable the housing being proposed to be delivered during the Plan period due to phosphorous levels hindering development in Somerset. Ilminster is served by a sewage treatment works with a relatively high consent limit of 5 mg/l with no plans for future improvements. This will make mitigation measures up to 10 times more difficult than some other localities with more efficient facilities. It may therefore be difficult to deliver the quantum of housing proposed at Ilminster. Further the HRA refers to the Nutrient Neutrality Methodology for Stodmarsh in relation to phosphorous – advice and Phosphate Budget Calculator for the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar site is now available.

No Amendment: A strategic issue which is outside of the expertise of the Neighbourhood Plan group. It will be covered in the SSDC local plan review.

Environment agency state biodiversity net gains should be achieved enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. How does the Neighbourhood Plan deliver environmental net gain? Water and waste water infrastructure is required. Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into developments. Soil depletion should be considered.

No Amendment: Outside scope of neighbourhood planning (the INP Development Group do however agree with these sentiments)

Green Ilminster propose an audit of the condition of the wildlife or biodiversity assets that we have and that this is repeated regularly so that we know if this is improving or declining? Tree planting programme should be put in place as a matter of urgency and partnerships with landowners sought to facilitate this. Community groups and individual initiatives in relation to tree planting is strongly acknowledged and explicitly supported and encouraged. Aspiration to seek opportunities for the development of a community wood or orchard and additional allotment space. Residents, building and landowners should be supported to play their part through gardening for wildlife, leaving wild areas wild, the erection of bird boxes and many other measures which can make a significant contribution to biodiversity. They propose that all sites identified for development should be independently assessed for the potential environmental impact.

Amendment 18: As Policy ILM12 is now removed paragraphs ILM2 (f) and (g) can now be removed. To ensure consistency and make Policy ILM2 relevant, consistent and concise.

A number of Amendments are recommended to Policy ILM2, which are shown below.

Policy ILM₂ (proposed)

Conserve and Enhance Ilminster's Ecology, Species and Habitats

All development proposals will demonstrate that they conserve or enhance biodiversity and consider designated local green space, flood zone, water **quality**, local wildlife sites, areas of high recreational amenity and the designated 'Green Chain corridor', as shown in Figure 2 – The INP Proposals Map and the Design Guide. Each development will be required to:

- a. Plant at least one new tree per new bedroom built
- b. Replace every tree, removed by development, with two trees
- c. Facilitate a Green Chain **corridor** either within or adjacent to the site where relevant
- d. Provide as a minimum, a 10-metre buffer zone adjacent to existing and new habitats
- e. Retain all significant trees and hedgerows, in addition to those with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs)
- f. ~~To meet the requirements of the Habitats Directive regarding allocated sites 25, 19, 26, 10, 31, the applicants should provide evidence that the development will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of Somerset Levels and Moors SPA/Ramsar through loss of functionally linked land. To prove this, a survey will be required to determine the habitats and current site use to verify if the land parcel is indeed suitable for supporting a significant population of designated bird species. Where habitats are suitable, non-breeding bird surveys will be required to determine if the site and neighbouring land constitute a significant area of supporting habitat. Bird surveys will need to be undertaken during autumn, winter and spring. If habitat within the site or adjacent land are identified to support significant populations of designated bird species, avoidance measures and mitigation will be required, and the planning application will likely need to be assessed through a project specific Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure that the development does not result in adverse effects on integrity~~
- g. ~~Given the sensitivity of the Somerset Levels and Moor Ramsar site to an increase in phosphate concentrations, it is a requirement that all developments contributing to the total wastewater burden in the Parish must achieve phosphate neutrality. Developments resulting in a phosphorus surplus, will be required to provide appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. wetlands, reed beds) in agreement with the local planning authority. The requirement for mitigation will be commensurate with the scale of development and might be achieved strategically, particularly in the case of smaller developments.~~

ILM₃ – Enhance and connect our local green open spaces with a 'Green Chain'

No Amendment: SUDS are covered in Policy ILM₁₃ (d). ILM 3 discusses the requirements on developments and overall all elements were considered to be important. Sustainable drainage (SUDS) was suggested to be incorporated within new development, green areas and infrastructure to enhance amenity, biodiversity, water quality and manage water quantity. These areas are ideal opportunities to showcase multifunctional SUDs features for a variety of benefits and educate the community on the importance of managing surface water runoff.

No Amendment: The extension of the Green Corridor to all the walking and cycling paths would not fulfil the purpose of the policy which is to focus investment into cycling and walking improvements to one route only. This is the only viable option.

An open ended question was asked and the results of this were that people suggested that the proposed route should take in all of Ilminster with walking/cycling links and link with the south of the town with external links to the surrounding villages with particular reference to site 17 and 31. Site 17 and 31 are now removed.

Amendment 19: Change 'Chain' to 'Corridor' and change words to reflect deletion of ILM₁₂

Amendment 20: Define Local Green Space in Paragraph 8.8 in accordance with NPPF. 102. Concerns have been raised by SSDC that the local green spaces are not justified in the context of the NPPF. We have reviewed the spaces and it is considered that they do meet the criteria and this needs explaining in the supporting text.

Amendment 21: Amend paragraph 8.8.4 to state that the Neighbourhood Portion of CIL will be used for the Green Corridor ('may' to be deleted).

Minor amendments recommended to Policy ILM₃.

Policy ILM₃ (proposed)

Enhance and Connect Local Green Open Spaces with a 'Green Chain-Corridor'

Site allocations All development will preserve and enhance existing local green spaces and the 'Green Chain' network by:

- a. Providing a well signposted 'Green Chain-Corridor' of designated local green spaces* and well signposted routes identified in The INP Proposals Map, where it does not compromise ecology, including safer road crossings and cycle facilities
- b. Providing more facilities and equipment to encourage greater use of local green spaces by all age groups
- c. Increasing biodiversity by attracting more flora and fauna, especially on the identified 'Green Chain-Corridor'
- d. Ensuring site allocations preserve and enhance existing, and create new, local green spaces and the 'Green Chain' Corridor network.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM4 – Enhance recreational facilities for our growing community

The questionnaire asked if new recreation facilities should be provided along Canal Way and delivered through contributions from developments and overall it was felt that there was a benefit. Concerns about running costs, provision of Canal Way only, resources being better directed towards maintenance of existing facilities such as the tennis courts. Or provision of adult exercise equipment, youth club should be moved to this location and include a dog walking area. Trees also came up in comments, seeking to ensure that hedgerows and trees were retained. Further tree planting and a community orchard was suggested. SSDC are concerned there is no evidence for this. However they reference a 2018 report which states in Paragraph 5.6 that ‘Ilminster, with a population of nearly 6,000, has no access to a sports hall within the town’.

No Amendment: Paragraph 8.9.1. confirms that this policy is justified and in accordance with the ‘Infrastructure Delivery Plan, South Somerset, January 2016’ (Paragraph 6.8)

Amendment 22: Amend Table 8 to reference SSDC’s Built Leisure Facility Needs Assessment and Strategy – <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/your-council/your-council-plan-and-strategies/planning-for-open-space-sport-and-recreation/>

No Amendments recommended to Policy ILM4.

Policy ILM4

Enhance Recreational Facilities for our Growing Community

To improve health and well-being, provide facilities for the rising population and reduce the need to travel. Planning applicants for the allocated sites covered in Policy ILM12 must contribute towards delivery of a new indoor recreational facility adjacent to Canal Way as shown on Figure 2 – The INP Proposals Map.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM 5 – Allocate an Ilminster Environmental Enterprise Zone to the west of Ilminster

Amendment 23: Change the name of the policy from Environmental Enterprise Zone to Environmental Employment Zone. SSDC confirm that Enterprise Zones are quiet specifically defined. Enterprise Zones are ‘an area in which state incentives such as tax concessions are offered to encourage business investment’. This is clearly beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, therefore the title of this policy is changed to ‘Environmental Employment Zone’.

Amendment recommended to Policy ILM5.

Policy ILM5 (proposed)

Allocate an Ilminster Environmental Enterprise Employment Zone to the West of Ilminster

Subject to other policies in the INP, within the Ilminster **Employment Environmental Enterprise Zone**, as identified on The INP Proposals Map (Figure 2), the following development is supported:

- a. Improved facilities for cyclists and walkers, including cycle hubs, visitor parking and new connections to public rights of way and the National Cycle Network
- b. High quality business hubs for the self-employed, micro and small businesses*
- c. Development that conserves or enhances the local landscape character, local distinctiveness, biodiversity and heritage assets
- d. Sustainable public access to the open countryside, its footpaths, cycle ways, nature reserves, open spaces and gardens
- e. A large scale sport or leisure facilities, subject to landscape constraints
- f. Visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities, such as camp sites.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM6 – Enhance Ilminster’s economy, tourism and heritage

No Amendment: Not needed

ILM6 seeks to enhance Ilminster’s Economy, Tourism and Heritage. Responders were asked how Ilminster was best described. The top answer was a unique historic market town.

Amendment 24: Policy ILM6 should be changed to allow for the provision of work space and meetings spaces of different types

Many respondents felt Ilminster should be for mainly independent traders offering a wide choice of goods, keeping the larger chain stores away. Many felt space should be provided for start-up and scale-up businesses in different sectors, including shared office spaces, meeting rooms, and work-shops for creative and light industrial sectors. A mix of office and home working providing flexible business “hub” facilities.

No Amendment: The comments were considered to be of interest, but not requiring a Amendment to the policy. Parking is addressed in Policy ILM8

Encouraging tourism had a mixed response with some believing that visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities would happen naturally. Others felt it needed encouraging in terms of facilities provided as well as accommodation and making the town more attractive or less run down. General and coach parking was mentioned as being important to encourage tourists for a convenient and easy access to the town.

Amendment 25: It is recommended that ILM6(g) is added to support the retention of entertainment venues which includes the Arts Centre

A few mentioned the cultural offerings that Ilminster has. In the form of a theatre, the Warehouse, and other cultural facilities such as the Meeting House Art Centre as well as a number of pubs and other social and community facilities. The plan would be enhanced through enhancing this policy or providing a separate bespoke policy, supporting these facilities, and protecting them from unnecessary loss.

No Amendment: Access arrangements in Silver Street are addressed in Policy ILM11

Green ilminster propose an enhanced market. Closing Silver Street would make this a more pleasant experience. This would require some investment in stalls, promotion and advertising.

Minor Amendments recommended to Policy ILM6.

Policy ILM6 (proposed)

Enhance Ilminster’s Economy, Tourism and Heritage

By preserving and enhancing its heritage assets and improving facilities to enhance the day and night time economy, Ilminster will have more to offer shoppers and visitors. Applications will be supported which improve Ilminster’s profile and performance as a:

- a. Unique historic market town
- b. Beautiful place in which to live, work, play and learn
- c. More dynamic place for business, enterprise, creativity and innovation such as flexible work shops, office spaces, business hubs or meeting rooms.
- d. Attractive centre for shopping, leisure and recreation
- e. Visitor destination
- f. Place that connects people to the historic and natural environment.
- g. Support the retention and enhancement of existing entertainment venues

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM7 – Promote High Quality Design

Amendment 26: Amend Design Guide to reflect the need to prioritise the use of sustainable building methods. Using local materials with sustainable building methods and materials is a comment made by residents. Green technologies such as solar Panels, air source heat pumps, grey water systems, car charging, heating and water systems and fibre broadband are suggested. Buildings must be future proofed and consider accessible design.

No Amendment: The potential allocation of areas of land around the town for renewable energy initiatives was considered by the Development Group during the drafting of the INP. It was concluded that such initiatives would be supported in principle, but due to their potential visual impact and the strategic significance of such projects, this could not be addressed in the INP. The sentiments were supported. Green Ilminster proposes that the Plan states clearly that initiatives for individual and community scale renewable energy projects will be supported subject to the considerations outlined in national policy and guidance.

No Amendment: The INP development Group agree with this comment, but no changes to the INP are necessary as Policy ILM12 is now being removed. However this is encourage in policy ILM14. Green Ilminster and others comment that brownfield sites and existing buildings should be put into use before any new building is allowed. The aesthetics of all buildings should be considered including old properties and industrial/business premises aesthetics fit in with the town character.

No Amendment: Heritage significance does not allow for more roads to be built. They would only be viable with significant levels of development. Signage and road safety cannot be addressed in the INP planning policies. Comments included that there is a need for increased capacity on roads and road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster needs to be improved with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles.

Amendment 27: Definitions of phrases to be included in the Glossary

Additional definitions to be included- ‘adhesive relationship’, ‘selective materials’, ‘density of streets’, and ‘active street frontage’.

Amendment 28: Amend Paragraph 9.5 to include the Ilminster Design Guide. As requested by SSDC.

Amendment 29: Table 9- Amend to state that the South Somerset Employment Land Review will be undertaken by SSDC. As requested by SSDC.

No Amendments recommended to Policy ILM7.

Policy ILM7

Promote High Quality Design

Ilminster’s historic environment will be sustained and enhanced and all development in the wider INP area will reflect its unique character.

Development must be in keeping with the identified characteristics of Ilminster, as set out below and in Appendix C – The Ilminster Design Guide:

- a. Exemplary urban design in the conservation area, where the relationship between streets and public spaces presents a high quality environment
- b. A fine, permeable, urban grain made up of streets, blocks, plots with many active street frontages which contribute to lively streets and public areas
- c. An extensive area of high quality architecture to create a harmonious townscape
- d. A limited palette of materials and the quality detailing skill of craftsmanship and authenticity of construction to present a coherent and high-quality finish
- e. Conversion of old buildings and the creation of new buildings, which will be easily adapted to a range of uses over time
- f. A strong visual relationship between the built environment and its landscape setting providing glimpses and views out of, within and into the conservation area and the green landscape setting of the town
- g. Improve walking and cycling connections between the conservation area, open countryside and other facilities
- h. In recognition of Ilminster’s rich archaeological resource, development proposals will be expected to be accompanied by an initial archaeological evaluation.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM8 – Encourage shoppers and visitors into Ilminster’s town centre

No Amendment: It is beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan to require a certain number of car charging points in the public realm. This is a Parking Standard and is addressed in the District wide parking standards. ILM8 aims to bring visitors into the town centre and this question aims to ask what elements to encourage this were the most important. All points were considered to be important by the majority of responders. Green Ilminster asked for more ambitious and explicit targets be set for recharging points in the town centre for both cars and cycles in addition to the wider town area where on street parking is common. Development should not be piecemeal but part of a coherent pattern.

Amendment 30: Amend wording to clarify that this policy relates to all new development across the plan area and that if it is adhered to development will be supported. SSDC are concerned that this should be in a Projects Appendix and not a planning policy and that it should relate to development in the town centre. It is contested that this can be a planning policy, based on examples of other adopted neighbourhood plans. It must relate to all development in the neighbourhood plan area, which is fairly small. Projects coming out of the neighbourhood plan will be considered by the Town Council.

Amendment recommended to Policy ILM8.

Policy ILM8 (proposed)

Encourage Shoppers and Visitors into Ilminster’s Town Centre

New Developments across the plan area Development proposals and infrastructure will be supported where it create or contributes to a safe, attractive and high quality, inclusive public realm, particularly in relation to Development must:

- a. Welcoming pedestrians – enhance the public realm and drop curbs at key gateways, in particular adjacent to The Market House, as shown in Figure 2 – The INP Proposals Map
- b. Welcoming cyclists – provide cycle-friendly streets, sensitively designed bicycle racks and signage and remove barriers on cycle paths
- c. Managing cars – reduce cars in the town centre by improving:
 1. Existing car parks – their quality, accessibility and reduce parking charges
 2. Paths and pavements – street signage, lighting, layout and accessibility
- d. Welcoming buses – provide bus stops in convenient locations for their users across Ilminster, with well-designed lighting and street furniture.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM9 – Safe, interesting walking and cycling routes

No Amendment: Changes outside the INP Area are beyond the scope of the INP. Respondents considered that connectivity with surrounding parishes and authorities is needed so that the network of cycle and walk ways is not developed in isolation. This includes addressing the obstacles of the A303 and A358.

Amendment 31: Amend criteria ILM12c to specify that this relates to the neighbourhood portion of the CIL as the Town Council can control what this is spent on. SSDC states that CIL spending is not a land use planning requirement and this should be deleted. This is contested, as there are examples of other neighbourhood plans where a very similar policy was adopted and not contested by Examiners and Local Planning Authorities. The Town Council oversees the distribution of the neighbourhood portion of CIL.

Amendments recommended to Policy ILM9.

Policy ILM9 (proposed)

Safe, Interesting Walking and Cycling Routes

New Developments Development sites as set out under Policy ILM12; will improve walking and cycling routes within development sites and on or adjacent to the proposed Green Chain Corridor (as shown Figure 2 – The INP Proposals Map) in accordance with Policy ILM10 by:

- a. Improving the National Cycle Network, Sustrans Route 33, with better signage, surfaces, road markings and priority at key junctions
- b. Providing safe walking routes, defined as ‘pavements and paths wide enough to meet demand, with dropped curbs at key junctions, sufficient lighting and safe road crossings’
- c. Prioritising Ilminster Town Council’s portion of the **neighbourhood funding element** of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be available to develop and maintain the Green Corridor Chain.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM10 – Welcome people to Ilminster

Amendment 32: List 11 additional junctions for improvements to crossings for cyclists and walkers on the proposals map (Figure 2) and amend Policy ILM10 (g).

ILM10 allocates six road junctions on the edge of the town, as ‘gateways’ for improvement and to be made safer. All gateway improvements were supported and additional gateways were suggested, as follows– Hort Bridge, Tesco petrol station, Southfields Roundabout, Bay Hill & Townsend, High Street/Butts down North Street, Winterhay Lane to station Rd, Ditton Street to Shudrick Lane, Canal Way junction to Ditton St, Beacon at Cemetery and Herne Rise were named as junctions or gateways.

Amendment 33: Definition of a Gateway added to the Policy.

More definition of what a gateway is may be required as many comments did not reflect the intention of the policy. Such as a ‘node’ or ‘junction’.

No Amendment: This policy is considered to meet the Tests of Soundness and contests

SSDC comments. SSDC states that these proposals are unlikely to be used in the determination of planning applications and should be listed as projects in the Appendices. This is contested, as there are examples of other neighbourhood plans where a very similar policy was adopted and not contested by Examiners and Local Planning Authorities.

Amendments recommended to Policy ILM10.



Policy ILM10 (proposed)

Welcome People to Ilminster

Improvements to the following Ilminster gateways* and road junctions, as shown in Figure 2 – The INP Proposals Map, are encouraged:

- a. East Street and Butts
- b. Bay Hill and Townsend
- c. North Street and High Street/Butts
- d. New Road, Station Road and West Street
- e. Station Road and Riec–Sur–Belon Way
- f. Ditton Street and East Street to Shudrick Lane.
- g. **Additional junctions which warrant improvements for pedestrians and cyclists are listed on the proposals map as a star and comprise: Hort Bridge, Tesco petrol station, Southfields Roundabout, Bay Hill & Townsend, High Street/ Butts down North Street, Winterhay Lane to Station Rd, Ditton St to Shudrick Lane, Canal Way junction to Ditton St, Beacon at Cemetery and Herne Rise.**

* Gateways are defined as entrance points to the town usually associated with a road junction, landmark building, views or a vista

ILM 11 – Preserve and enhance the historic market town centre

No Amendment: The requirement of a more accessible car park is beyond the scope of this Neighbourhood Plan.

ILM11 promotes the preservation of the Town centre. All aspects of this policy were considered to be important. Electric vehicle charging points were considered to be an option for some. A requirement for an accessible car park and support and consideration for disabled access and manoeuvrability and disabled parking.

Amendment 34: Figure 6– Existing Access and Movement amend Green Corridor to within the INP Boundary. As per SSDC comments.

No Amendments recommended to Policy ILM11.

Policy ILM11

Preserve and Enhance the Historic Market Town Centre

Proposals in Ilminster’s Town Centre will be supported where they provide:

- a. A high quality, vibrant market destination and local amenity space befitting its important heritage status
- b. Public realm enhancements which encourage people to linger and provide safe, level road crossings
- c. A shared surface approach where pedestrians have priority over vehicular traffic most of the time
- d. Suitable access and servicing arrangements for the market, businesses, residents and short-stay parking.

ILM 12 – Amount and Location of new homes

Amendment 35: Amend Paragraph 11.2.1, Aim Four- to refer to New Use Class E which now replaces Class B1. As per SSDC comments.

Amendment 36: Remove Policy ILM12 and renumber policies accordingly

Aim Two of the INP seeks to Allocate sustainable sites with good access to the countryside and town centre, to support Ilminster’s shops and services and promote recreational activity and well-being.

The INP Development Group undertook extensive investigation into the allocation of sites, commissioning evidence base and consulting with a range of interests. The sites listed in Policy ILM12 are the most suitable sites for development in Ilminster, in accordance with Aim Two.

However Draft Policy ILM12 is the most controversial policy in the plan and has generated considerable objection at reg.14 stage.

Whilst there are no technical planning reasons why any of the sites should not be allocated for development, it is considered beyond the scope of this Neighbourhood Plan and expertise and resources of the INP Development Group to pursue this policy to adoption. Significant amendments would be needed to address most of the concerns and additional development sites would need to be sought.

To retain the policy in the INP raises the risk of a failed referendum and risks all of the policies in the INP not being taken forward for adoption.

ILM12 allows for the Local Plan target of 839 additional homes to be built between 2016 and 2036. Conflicting written responses were received regarding the allocated sites, the majority are opposed to the Shudrick Valley site as well as others objecting to development on Winterhay Lane. Most of the remaining locations gained support from responders. The Environment Agency state that flood sensitive areas should be avoided. Section 19 Flood investigation report Ilminster should be reviewed when considering allocating sites in Ilminster as several of the allocated sites and the Environmental Enterprise Zone are located within areas of Surface water, fluvial and reservoir flood risk. Sites 15A and 26 in particular which need a sequential test in flood zones 2 and 3. Green Ilminster propose that if developers want to build in the Plan area that they are required to enter into meaningful programme of community consultation that is consistent with the scale of the development.

Deletion of Policy ILM12 and supporting text in Paragraph 11.4 is recommended.

Policy ILM12 (Delete Policy)

Amount and Location of New Homes

To meet the SSDC Local Plan target and housing needs of the Ilminster community, the INP supports the sustainable and phased development of up to 839 additional homes between 2016 and 2036 on the following sites, as identified on Figure 2 – The INP Proposals Map:

Proposed Development Sites and Number of Dwellings	Site Ref	Suggested Number
Canal Way		
Land to the rear of New Wood House, The Beacon		
Land south of Shudrick Lane		
Greenway Farm, west of Listers Hill		
Land east of Winterhay Lane		
West of Winterhay Lane adjacent to Daido Factory		
West of Winterhay Lane adjacent to Daido Factory		
Land east of Winterhay Lane		
The Swan		
Gooch and Housego, Market, East St		
Station Road		
Land east of Playing Field, Shudrick Lane		
Land to east of Greenway, Listers Hill		
Small sites completed/ committed*		
Total		

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM 13 – Types of new homes

No Amendment: The 20% Lifetime Home requirement is justified on the grounds that there is a high proportion of older people in Ilminster, Evidence is provided in the Housing Needs Assessment.

Concerns were raised over this policy, which seeks 20% of new homes to be Building Regulations M4(2) compliant, meeting Lifetime Home Standards was disproportionately high. They recommend that elsewhere 10% was reasonable. Furthermore, provision needs to be made in the policy that it is acceptable to provide ‘adaptable’ M4(2) units rather than fully ‘accessible’ from the outset.

No Amendment: The mix proposed is in accordance with the Housing Needs Assessment.

Amendments to the level of affordable housing is beyond the scope of the INP. Affordability came up as a concern for many with some stating that it is important to have more community housing. There was a desire to have a balanced mix of housing types for existing residents plus range to attract new people including families, bungalows for elderly population. Concerns were raised over young people to be able to afford to move onto property ladder and for new professionals bringing business and opportunities into Ilminster. There was a move to have this mix spread throughout the development sites. A few comments requested that self-build and community house building projects were considered and provided for. A provision of ‘live-work units’ as opposed to executive style homes of 4 beds needs addressing in the plan to make the affordable.

Amendment 37: Include reference to the NPPG. In accordance with SSDC comments.

Amendment 38: Amend Paragraph 11.5 to include a definition of a ‘Lifetime Home’ as defined by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Lifetime Homes Group in 1991 as ‘design criteria which ensure that homes are designed flexibly enough to meet the needs of most households with the minimum of adaptation’. There have been a number of comments asking what this criteria is about and more definition would assist in ensuring this policy is implemented. Also consider including a text box with the Five overarching principles and 16 criteria for accessibility and inclusive design.

Amendment 39: Delete ‘Up to’ in Policy IM13(a). This is considered to be confusing by some people who commented on the INP and it is recognised that there is a known need for 1 bedroom flats in Ilminster.

Amendment 40: Additional text after paragraph 11.6.1 to reflect NPPF 141(a) that there is a need to make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land. This is added partly in response to requests for a ‘Brownfield First Policy’ which cannot be included as it is contrary to National Guidance and strategic policies.

Minor Amendment recommended to Policy ILM13.

Policy ILM13: (proposed)

Types of New Homes

All new housing developments* will provide an adequate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure in accordance with the findings of the Ilminster Housing Needs Assessment (Aecom, 2019) or any subsequent update. Development will be expected to provide:

At least 20% of new homes built to accessible and adaptable standards will meet the requirements of Building Regulations M4(2) Meeting Lifetime Home Standards.

On sites of 20 or more dwellings, a target of 5% of homes provided as serviced plots for self-build and/or custom build homes. The developer must actively market the site for this purpose for 12 months. Thereafter, if unsuccessful, it can be developed as the open market demands. Evidence of the marketing for the self-build or custom build plots must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, clearly setting out the details of the marketing undertaken and demonstrate there is no market demand.

A suitable mix of sizes subject to the design being wholly in keeping with the character of the town, as follows:

- a. Up to 6%, one bedroom flats
- b. 14%, two bedroom flats or houses
- c. 25%, two or three bedroom bungalows
- d. 40%, three bedroom houses
- e. 15%, four-bedroom plus houses or live-work units
- f. Affordable Housing in accordance with the Adopted Local Plan and NPPG.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM 14 - Allocated or small brownfield sites

Amendment 38: Update to reflect the deletion of Policy ILM12 and that policy refers to all brownfield sites, not just small sites

There was overwhelming support for the use of brownfield sites over greenfield and to prioritise these sites. Some even going further to state that there should be no greenfield sites used at all until brownfield have been exhausted. Unfortunately this is not practical as it would mean that sufficient housing would not come forward due to the complicated nature of brownfield sites. An owner can not be forced to develop their site.

Amendment 39: Amend paragraph 11.6.1 to clarify that the Development Area relates to the Adopted Local Plan Development Area except it includes the Canal Way Site which has out-line planning permission subject to S.106 agreement. As per SSDC comments.

Amendment recommended to Policy ILM14.

Policy ILM14: (proposed)

Allocated or Small-Brownfield Sites

Within the INP Development Area*, as shown on Figure 2— The INP Proposals Map, there is a presumption in favour of all development on allocated sites as set out in Policy ILM12:

Any infilling within the Development Area* will be in strict accordance with The Ilminster Design Guide (see Appendix C) and consider the character of immediately adjoining properties and sites, including:

- a. Layout
- b. Density
- c. Gardens - front, rear and side
- d. Size of dwellings
- e. Character
- f. Appearance
- g. Gaps between buildings
- h. Parking.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

ILM15 – Design and layout of specific sites

No Amendment: Not suitable in all areas: This policy is a specific design policy for the large, strategic development sites, such as the site South West of Canal Way. The results outline that there is a resounding agreement with the requirements of developers in line with this policy. Comments stated that any large housing development must have sufficient infrastructure amenities, parking, and link in with the town centre. Suggestions were that roads should be wide and tree lined and use permeable surfaces.

No Amendment: This is addressed in the Design Guide and is beyond the remit of the policy:

Comments requested that all new development should be built to be eco-friendly, low-carbon, energy and water efficient and climate resilient from sustainable materials. Further ensuring appropriate sizes that last with good sized gardens for children to play. One comment stated that if people are to work from home, there must be reliable fast fibre optic connectivity.

No Amendment: This is addressed in policy IM15 (b). It will be addressed in the Local Plan

review as well: Green Ilminster recommend decarbonising our housing stock is considerable and should be clearly highlighted and acknowledged in the Plan. They recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan strongly and explicitly encourages zero carbon homes with high levels of energy efficiency in all new development, and that it potentially, creates binding energy efficiency targets/standards for new development.

No Amendment: No longer relevant as Policy ILM12 is deleted: Green Ilminster recommend priority is given to re-using, improving and re-purposing existing buildings while maximising the use of brownfield sites.

No Amendment: This proposal is beyond the scope of the NP: Green Ilminster propose that all applications for development state the anticipated Carbon Footprint and evidence efforts are being made to minimise this.

No Amendment: This proposal is beyond the scope of the NP: Green Ilminster propose that it would be valuable to designate one or some of the identified development sites to exemplars of carbon neutral development and to seek partnerships with developers or organisations such as Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development and the Energy Saving Trust for example that would support this with expertise and guidance.

No Amendment: This is set out in the Design Guide Green Ilminster propose that the Plan states that innovation in building design and materials in a way that supports local distinctiveness and the other objectives for good design and sustainable development will be supported.

6. How we addressed the issues raised and changed the plan

No Amendment: Refer to policy IM15 (d): Green Ilminster further propose that the Plan includes an explicit statement that developers build homes that are designed to last and that developments will be supported that adopt energy conservation strategies at all stages including in the construction phase (including the use of local materials to avoid transport impacts if at all possible). That they avoid using those materials most harmful to the environment. That building design maximises opportunities for natural lighting and ventilation to reduce energy use. That where hard surfacing is required permeable materials are used.

No Amendment: Noted, but beyond the scope of the INP: Green Ilminster propose that development work on the Environmental Enterprise Zone is treated as a priority to reduce the necessity of commuting.

No Amendment: Refer to policy IM15 (d): Green Ilminster propose that adaptation and mitigation be made a stronger theme of the Plan. New development must meet the highest standards of SUDS design and maintenance. Additionally, a programme of SUDS enhancements to existing properties and hard paved areas should be put in place to reduce storm run-off for example Tesco's car park. SUDS can be positive features of the local environment.

No Amendment: This proposal is beyond the scope of the NP: Green Ilminster propose that the Town Council begins an urgent conversation with local landowners so that tree planting can be undertaken in key areas that absorb water and stabilise the soil.

No Amendment: This is addressed in the Design Guide: Green Ilminster urge that all developments be designed taking into account best practice in water efficiency, such as water efficient fittings and appliances, water harvesting and storage features, and green roofs. Perhaps all major developments should be required to provide evidence of anticipated internal water use per person per day and evidence of how the development takes this into account and mitigates against it.

Amendment 40: Paragraph 11.8.3 to include additional evidence base. In accordance with SSDC comments- The latest Five –Year Housing Land Supply report was published in November 2020. This section should be updated and should also refer to the March 2021 Addendum.

Amendment 41: Table 12 and Paragraph 11.8.4- update to 2020. In accordance with SSDC comments- The Council's Brownfield Land Register was updated in 2020.

No Amendments recommended to Policy ILM14.

New development on the two Adopted Local Plan strategic sites, namely on land South West of Canal Way and Station Road (Site 10 and Site 25 respectively on Figure 2 – INP Proposals Map), must deliver high quality sustainable development in accordance with national and Local Plan policy. In addition, they will:

- a. Contribute positively to the area's character, scale, layout, height and form and conform with design and heritage policies as well as other policies in the INP.
- b. Reduce reliance on fossil fuels and reduce fuel poverty, with the provision of on-site renewable energy sources to meet a minimum of 10% of predicted energy use of the residential development.
- c. Incorporate sustainable landscaping with associated maintenance and management plans, in consultation with Somerset Wildlife Trust. Such sustainable landscaping will include minimal hard (non-permeable) landscaping and maximum net gain of native species (flora and fauna) for optimal biodiversity.
- d. Incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to include swales and ditches and ensure provision for their ongoing maintenance.
- e. Provide well-designed, substantial and sensitive landscaping within developments for amenity space –walking, playing and cycling – nature conservation and biodiversity gain, in particular: (i) along the site boundary (ii) in areas of ecological importance (iii) adjacent to waterways and (iv) adjacent to nature reserves.
- f. Provide high quality cycle and pedestrian routes within the site linking to existing routes, in particular to Ilminster's town centre to prevent a car dominated environment.
- g. Prevent an overspill of resident and visitor vehicle parking beyond the development site by providing a suitable number of car parking spaces within the site – garages, car park spaces and on-street parking – in accordance with the Somerset County Council Parking Strategy or any subsequent adopted policy documents.

Glossary

Amendment 42: Various amendments in accordance with SSDC comments:

CIL – suggest reference to Covid 19 and potential deferral is updated for Reg 16 version of the NP.

Emerging Local Plan Review (2016–2036) – the dates of LPR should be amended to 2020–2040.

HELAA – suggest this is amended to read: This is a high level document that assess the suitability, deliverability and viability of development sites within the SSDC area. Identification of potential sites within the HELAA does not imply that the sites will be allocated or planning permission would be granted if an application were to be submitted.

Ilminster Settlement Profile – suggest it is clarified that this is a document that was produced by SSDC.

Infrastructure Development Plan – not sure what this is – Councils are now required to produce annual Infrastructure Funding Statements <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/4027/infrastructure-funding-statement-april-2019-to-march-2020-final.pdf>

Local Development Plan (LDP) this should also cross reference the adopted Local Plan.

NPPF – this was updated in 2018 and 2019. Suggest insertion of 'last' before updated.

Self-Build Projects – suggest this is amended to Custom and Self-Build Projects.

Settlement Boundary – suggest this should cross refer to Development Area.

Somerset County Council – suggest this would benefit from the addition of 'such as highways and education'.

South Somerset District Council Five-Year Housing Land Supply Paper – Suggest this is amended to read: A report produced annually that sets out the latest five-year housing land supply position for SSDC. Details can be found on the SSDC web site.

South Somerset Employment Land Review (SSELR) – suggest this is amended to read: SSDC report that assess the future supply of and demand for employment land.

South Somerset Local Housing Land Supply – assume this refers to the Five-Year Housing Land supply rather than the HELAA?

Strategic Site: Assume this is INP definition of a strategic site?

MHCLG and Locality are not in alphabetical order. The description of Locality includes 'An' twice.

Design Guide

5.4 The design guide requires all developments to comply with certain parameters, such as installing certain styles of roofs and windows, traditional building materials and for new homes to have sustainable design features, such as solar panels. The vast majority agreed with this document. Sustainability and the environment were considered important and believed to be the priority by some

at the top of this list rather than the last section. Innovation in building design and materials in a way that supports local distinctiveness in a sustainable manner and buildings designed with the future in mind, e.g. Electric car charging points built in, solar energy, heating from geothermal heat pumps, rainwater, harvesting, electric vehicle charging, recycling area, cycle paths, swift bricks, hedgehog tunnels. Carbon neutral buildings was the preference of many and should support affordable energy conservation strategies.

5.5 Well-being was an important topic with light, air, private and public green spaces, and trees planted, to maximise carbon storage and provide a therapeutic living environment. Sufficient parking was cited as a concern with at least 2 cars needed for family housing. Wide tree lined streets with grassed areas were suggested with additional parking areas. Storage in the form of garage spaces and for parking as well as bin storage was considered important. One comment cited that designs must make provision for increasing age and disabilities e.g. wide doors.

Amendment: None required. Refer to policy ILM13 for sustainable access.

5.6 The inclusion of aspirations for greening river corridors for biodiversity improvements are encouraged, set back of development would create recreation and access for maintenance benefits. Any lighting should be set back and suitably designed with wildlife in mind. New development should be encouraged to create green / blue infrastructure and maintain habitats, for example creating wildlife corridors or green space, tree planting etc.) and advocating the use of green roofs. Blue/Green Infrastructure has a real opportunity to link with and deliver against Carbon Net Zero targets. The opportunity for carbon sequestration through wetlands, improved floodplain connection, wet woodlands, etc. should be considered within the approach for carbon net zero development.

Amendment: Agree should address this. Recommend amend design guide 3 (iii) to include text biodiversity, bats, hedgehog highways, lighting, etc. Partly addressed in ILM 15. Green ILminster could review and provide wording for an additional policy in the design guide.

5.7 Sustainable development and resource efficiency, waste minimisation and recycling is supported. New development should be carbon neutral in the future and level 4 of code for sustainable homes encouraged. Concept of water sensitive urban design is encouraged.

Amendment: Agree but not proportionate to the Neighbourhood Plan. Recommend amend design guide. Green ILminster could review and provide wording for an additional policy in the design guide.

The tree planting scheme for the whole town with detailed targets and site allocations is missing. Large-scale tree planting is vital for carbon capture flood control and for well being of the community and will soften the impact of any developments. It will enhance community spaces and goes hand in hand with the green chain.

Amendment: Agree refer to design guide. Green ILminster could review and provide wording for an additional policy in the design guide.

Appendices

A	Consultation leaflet
B	Statutory consultee responses
C	Written representations
D	Summary of questionnaire responses

We want to hear from you!

The consultation period is from **Saturday 26 June 2021, 9am to Monday 9 August 2021, 5pm.**

You can view the Iminster Neighbourhood Plan, the supporting documents, a small exhibition and complete a questionnaire at the following places during this six week period:

Online

- www.ilminster.gov.uk
- www.southsomerset.gov.uk

Iminster Library

- Tuesday 9.30am-4.30pm
- Wednesday 9.30am-12pm
- Friday 9.30am-4.30pm

Our open days and events:

- **Iminster Experience (IMEX):**
 - Saturday 26 June 2021, 9am-3pm - Silver Street
 - Sunday 27 June 2021, 10am-3pm - Recreation Ground
- **Town Council Office**
 - Saturday 10 July 2021, 11am-3pm
- **Presentation of the INP, with Q&As:**
 - Wednesday 30 June 2021, 6pm-8pm - Shrubbery Hotel, Station Road
- **Market House Iminster**
 - Saturday 24 July 2021, 11am-3pm



ECA

What is the Iminster Neighbourhood Plan (INP)?

The INP is a community-led, land-based plan, which will guide future development, regeneration and conservation within the town from adoption to 2036.

Development of the Iminster Neighbourhood Plan

The INP boundary was designated by South Somerset District Council (SSDC) on 1 June 2017 and follows the Parish boundary. Iminster Town Council is the qualifying body for leading the INP and in January 2019, the INP Development Group was established as a sub-committee to lead the preparation of the Plan. This group includes local residents, businesses and Town Councillors. The Iminster Town Council approved the INP on 23 March 2021 and agreed for it to go to consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

The INP is your Plan

The INP provides the community of Iminster with an opportunity to influence and determine the future development of the parish of Iminster. This pre-submission consultation draft is a call to action to everyone who lives, works or has an interest in Iminster, to read the Plan and provide feedback. When adopted, the INP enables people of Iminster to have a direct input into the future development of its parish, and planners and developers must consider the INP when examining new development proposals.

What does the INP include?

The INP includes a vision, aims and 15 policies, and follows four themes:

- Environment and Leisure
- Economy, Tourism and Heritage
- Access and Movement
- Homes and Places for Living.

With supporting information provided in four Appendices:

- (A) The Character of Iminster
- (B) Basic Conditions Statement
- (C) The Iminster Design Guide
- (D) Consultation Statement.

Evidence supporting the INP development includes consultation with the community and the following documents:

- Iminster Housing Needs Assessment
- Iminster Neighbourhood Plan, Site Allocations Assessment Report
- Iminster Parish Housing Needs Survey
- The Habitats Regulation Assessment
- The Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Iminster				
Neighbourhood				
Plan	2020 2036	&		
Iminster				
Design				
Guide				
Regulation 14 Consultation 26 June - 9 August 2021			This leaflet tells you how you can be involved in shaping our neighbourhood plan; do not miss this important opportunity.	
www.ilminster.gov.uk			@ilminstertowncouncil	

Iminster Neighbourhood Plan (INP)

What are the INP's policies and themes?

There are 15 planning policies under four themes:

Environment and Leisure Theme

The surrounding beautiful countryside and hills are visible from many parts of the town and historic centre and **Policy ILM1** seeks to 'conserve and enhance Iminster's historic landscape setting' and identifies 20 important views. **Policy ILM2** requires at least one new tree to be planted for each new bedroom built and for biodiversity to be conserved and enhanced. **Policy ILM3** proposes a 'Green Chain' of designated local green open spaces and well-signposted routes between them for enhanced walking and cycling. **Policy ILM4** requires planning applicants to contribute towards the delivery of new recreation facilities adjacent to Canal Way.

Economy, Tourism and Heritage Theme

Policy ILM5 allocates an area of land to the west of Iminster for an Environmental Enterprise Zone, to strengthen our local economy: Small business units, sports and leisure facilities, hotels and camp sites are encouraged alongside improvements to cycling facilities. **Policy ILM6** seeks to enhance Iminster's economy, tourism and heritage by promoting improvements to our historic buildings and spaces and to attract more visitors. High quality design is promoted in **Policy ILM7** in keeping with Iminster's historic buildings which are unique and highly valued by the community.

Access and Movement Theme

To encourage shoppers and visitors, **Policy ILM8** seeks to improve the pavements, cycle paths, bus stops and parking in the town centre. In **Policy ILM9**, safe and interesting walking and cycling routes are supported in all development proposals. To welcome people to Iminster, **Policy ILM10** allocates six road junctions on the edge of the town, as 'gateways' for improvement and to be made safer. **Policy ILM11** promotes the preservation and enhancement of the historic town centre with high quality road and pavement improvements, including a new shared surface for vehicles and pedestrians with better parking.




Figure 1: Plan Proposal Map

Legend

- INP Boundary --
- ILM3: The Iminster Green Chain ↔
- ILM3: Designated Local Green Space ●
- ILM4: Potential sport/recreation facility □
- ILM5: Potential location for cycle hub ●
- ILM7: Iminster Environmental Enterprise Zone ■
- ILM8: Public realm enhancements at gateways and key road junctions ●
- ILM9: Existing and proposed cycle routes →
- ILM9: Existing and proposed walking routes →
- ILM12: Site allocation for education □
- ILM12: Site allocation for new homes □
- ILM14: Development area boundary ○
- Site with outline planning permission for homes and education □

Site Allocations
See Policy ILM12 for site addresses

Homes and Places for Living Theme

To meet South Somerset District Council (SSDC) requirement for 839 new homes in Iminster between 2016 and 2036, **Policy ILM12** allocates 14 sites for new homes. Some of these sites already have planning permission, such as South West of Canal Way. The location of these sites is shown on the map above. In accordance with the Iminster Housing Needs Assessment, **Policy ILM13** specifies a mix of housing types and sizes in developments with over 20 homes: 25% bungalows and 5% self-build homes. **Policy ILM14** requires high standards of design in accordance with the Iminster Design Guide. **Policy ILM15** is a specific design policy for the large, strategic development sites, such as South West of Canal Way.

The Iminster Design Guide

This Guide complements the INP with guidance on high quality design, considering buildings and the spaces around them. All developments will be required to comply with the design parameters of the Iminster Design Guide, for example installation of certain styles of roofs and windows, use of specific building materials, such as stone and new homes to have sustainable design features, such as solar panels.

Please read the INP, its Appendices and supporting documentation, and tell us what you think by completing the questionnaire on the Iminster Town Council web site www.iminster.gov.uk.

Appendix B

Statutory consultee responses

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy/Page Reference	Action
Chris Lewis CPRE Somerset	9/8/21 Via email	<p>Opposed to site 15A is North-East of Shudrick Lane</p> <p>Opposed to site 26 extends into, or impacts, the Shudrick Valley.</p> <p>Objection based on the analysis of the landscape of Shudrick Valley by the Appeal Inspector ref APP/R3325/W/ 16/3152932 and impact on Ilminster Conservation Area.</p> <p>The significance of the Conservation Area derives from its cohesive visual identity brought into relief against the openness of the Shudrick Valley.</p> <p>The inspector identified the important position of the intact valley in the local topography, and the importance of its open and undeveloped character.</p> <p>The town is poised above the and the erection of 20 dwellings on Site 15A descending the slope down to the valley floor will dilute this relationship and harm the landscape character. It will create an anomalous rectangular block of development intruding into the valley which will be highly visible from permissive paths at top and bottom. The effect will be to harm landscape character, and the town edge will be seen to descend to the valley floor in part of the valley, rather than sit poised above it.</p> <p>Shudrick Valley, is important to the setting for Pretwood Hill.</p> <p>The harm would especially be felt by users of the permissive path by the stream on the valley floor, and would appear in stark contrast to the existing tranquil rural outlook of the valley.</p> <p>Contrary to INP Policy ILM1- Table 7 ILM3 ILM2 INP Chapter 6, Vision-Aim Five.</p>	ILM12	Could remove sites from proposal. Either replace with alternatives or have no allocation. Alternatively carry on with allocations and risk not being voted in at reg 16.
Rob Kidson, South Somerset Drainage board	9/08/21 via email	<p>Comments raise concerns over the Runoff rates and volumes, impermeable surfacing, water quality, development within 9 metres of a water course, outlet levels and maintenance of drainage features</p> <p>If development is proposed in flood risk areas the sequential test should be demonstrated.</p>		<p>Flooding is not addressed in this NP. This is however covered in the local plan.</p>
Richard Bull, Environment Agency	10/9/21 Via email	<p>Biodiversity net gains should be achieved enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. How does the Neighbourhood Plan deliver environmental net gain?</p> <p>Water and waste water infrastructure is required – water efficiency measures should be incorporated into developments</p> <p>Climate emergency response</p> <p>Soil depletion should be considered.</p> <p>The inclusion of aspirations for greening river corridors for biodiversity improvements are encouraged, set back of development would create recreation and access for maintenance benefits. Any lighting should be set back and suitably designed with wildlife in mind. New development should be encouraged to create green / blue infrastructure and maintain habitats, for example creating wildlife corridors or green space, tree planting etc.) and advocating the use of green roofs. Blue/Green Infrastructure has a real opportunity to link with and deliver against Carbon Net Zero targets. The opportunity for carbon sequestration through wetlands, improved floodplain connection, wet woodlands, etc. should be considered within the approach for carbon net zero development.</p> <p>Sustainable development and resource efficiency, waste minimisation and recycling is supported. New development should be carbon neutral in the future and level 4 of code for sustainable homes encouraged.</p> <p>Concept of water sensitive urban design is encouraged.</p>	ILM12	<p>Sequential test needed in areas allocated for development in flood areas. This is to ensure areas at the lowest risk are built on.</p> <p>Ilm15 covers net gain.</p> <p>Water efficiency an aim in aim 5 however no policies</p> <p>Carbon net zero recommended</p> <p>Carbon neutral and code for sustainable homes level 4.</p>

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy/Page Reference	Action
Lead Local Flood Authority Somerset	4/8/21 Via email	<p>Flood sensitive areas should be avoided.</p> <p>Section 19 Flood investigation report Ilminster should be reviewed when considering allocating sites in Ilminster</p> <p>Several of the allocated sites and the Environmental Enterprise Zone appear to be located within areas of Surface water, fluvial and reservoir flood risk. Sites 15A and 26 in particular.</p> <p>Flood zones 2 and 3 need a sequential test</p>	ILM12	Site 15a and 26 need reviewing in terms of flooding.
Amanda Grundy, Natural England	9/08/21 Via email	<p>Throughout the policies, especially Policy ILM3, sustainable drainage (SuDS) features should be incorporated within new development, green areas and infrastructure to enhance amenity, biodiversity, water quality and manage water quantity. These areas are ideal opportunities to showcase multifunctional SUDs features for a variety of benefits and educate the community on the importance of managing surface water runoff.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Natural England regarding the Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We note the HRA has highlighted potential effects of the Neighbourhood Plan on the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar site and that it recommends additional text to require new development to achieve nutrient neutrality for phosphorous (paragraph 7.4 below):</p> <p>7.4 Regarding the water quality in the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar (the SPA designation is not sensitive to changes in water quality), particularly the phosphate concentrations, the AA took the issue of phosphate neutrality into account. Importantly, the phosphate budgets for all allocations (calculated using the most relevant NE guidance) were in surplus, meaning that all residential sites are likely to result in a net increase in phosphate concentrations in the Ramsar. To this end it is recommended that the following text is inserted into the next iteration of the Ilminster NP: 'Given the sensitivity of the Somerset Levels and Moor Ramsar site to an increase in phosphate concentrations, it is a requirement that all developments contributing to the total wastewater burden in the Parish must achieve phosphate neutrality. Developments resulting in a phosphorus surplus, will be required to provide appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. wetlands, reed beds) in agreement with the local planning authority. The requirement for mitigation will be commensurate with the scale of development and might be achieved strategically, particularly in the case of smaller developments.' Provided that this text (or an appropriate equivalent) is inserted into the next iteration of the Ilminster NP, it is concluded that the NP will not result in adverse effects on the site integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA / Ramsar regarding water quality, alone or 'in-combination'.</p> <p>We note however that no land is allocated within the plan for delivering phosphorous neutrality measures.</p> <p>While the recommended wording appears to make the Plan Habitats Regulations compliant, we advise that this in itself is not a guarantee that suitable solutions will come forward to enable the housing being proposed to be delivered during the Plan period. In the 12 months since Natural England first advised Somerset local authorities of the impacts of phosphorous levels on the Ramsar site interests and of implications for new development in the Ramsar catchment area, we are not aware that any strategic or significant site specific solutions have yet come forward in Somerset. In our experience here and elsewhere in the country, delivering effective mitigation for reducing phosphorous levels is likely to prove difficult. Further, as the treatment efficiency at sewage treatment works varies, housing allocations in some localities within the hydrological catchment of the Ramsar it will be easier to achieve phosphorous neutrality than others. Ilminster is served by a sewage treatment works with a relatively high consent limit of 5 mg/l with no plans for future improvements. This will make mitigation measures up to 10 times more difficult than some other localities with more efficient facilities. Further consideration should therefore be given to whether the quantum of housing proposed at Ilminster will be able to achieve phosphorous neutrality with the land available. For example, whether it be possible to meet reduce phosphorous loads through the construction of a treatment wetland associated with the sewage treatment works. If no such mitigation options are available then there will be considerable uncertainty as to whether mitigation for the planned housing will be achievable.</p> <p>We also note that the HRA refers to the Nutrient Neutrality Methodology for Stodmarsh in relation to phosphorous - as you may be aware, advice and Phosphate Budget Calculator for the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar site is now available: Phosphates on the Somerset levels and moors (somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk) We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the Neighbourhood Plan Development Group if that would be helpful.</p> <p>Following from the review of the Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan, Regulation 14 2020 - 2036, we are in approval of the plan. As Education Authority we carefully examine the capacity of all the schools in Somerset to ensure they meet the demand of pupils moving into their respective area.</p>	ILM2	Phosphates needs addressing – do we need to review if we do not allocate sites?

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy/Page Reference	Action
George Maltby Somerset County Council Education Authority	18/08/21 Via email	Swanmead Primary school is to close and Greenfylde is to enlarge. Split location of single school over 2 existing sites. Positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.		Noted.
Sports England	28/06/21	It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97.		Noted.
South Somerset District Council	07/21 Via email	Clarification required. The front cover states the Neighbourhood Plan period to be 2020 to 2036, whilst paragraph 3.2 states it to be 2016 to 2036. The Current Local Plan is for the period 2006 to 2028 and the Local Plan Review will be for the period 2020 to 2040. We suggest that there would be benefits of aligning the Neighbourhood Plan with the Local Plan Review (LPR) period. The figure of 839 dwellings will be amended at the next stage of the LPR process, based on the most up to date housing monitoring data and the Government's standard methodology for calculating housing need. Reg 19 consultation is anticipated in mid-2022. SSDC is happy for you to proceed on the basis of the 839 dwellings as we do not wish to cause confusion or delay. We may need to pick up any additional housing sites in Ilminster through the LPR if we consider more are needed as a result of further work on sites against our overall housing target. Any reference to 'Emerging Local Plan' should be replaced with 'Local Plan Review'. There is already an Adopted Local Plan. Consultation on a Neighbourhood Area is not required where the area aligns with a parish boundary. It may be helpful if this map included an area wider than the parish to give more context. The base is also quite faint and difficult to read. Any reference to 'INP Boundary' should be replaced with 'INP Area'. The Adopted Local Plan is for the period 2006 to 2028. The Local Plan Review will now cover the period 2020 to 2040. NPPG actually stands for National Planning Practice Guidance. You could consider referring to the proposed A358 Taunton to Southfields Dualling. Insert 'means' in the last sentence prior to 'public transport is very limited'. The education system in Ilminster is set to be reorganised. You may wish to consider the implications for vacant school sites? The most recent 5Y HLS report was published in November 2020. Next version due for publication in Autumn 2021. It is suggested that you also refer to South Somerset Environment Strategy, 2019 https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/2690/environment-strategy-document-3-final.pdf This should now refer to the New Use Class E It is suggested that the Proposals Map may be trying to represent too much information on a single plan, making it a little confusing to understand – perhaps include more than one map?. The Canal Way site does not yet have outline permission – it is approved subject to S106 planning obligation. A minor typo here with the full stop missing at the end of the paragraph.	Neighbourhood Plan Period Page 4; Third Paragraph 1.3 Table 1 Figure 1 3.3.1 3.6.2a 3.6.2c 4.1.4 4.2.2 Table 5 6.3 Aim Four Figure 2 8.5.1	Align timeframe with local plan review to 2040. Noted. 1.3 emerging local plan replaced with local plan review. Fig 1 map needs updating and to have more context Reference to INP boundary should be INP area. needs amending Spelling NPPG A358 needs referring to. needs amending No sites will be vacant but reused as a school under a new name. HLS document needs updating in the report and reading. Now class E Map needs revising Typo.

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy/Page Reference	Action
		It is not clear from this map whether any of the proposed protected views are affected by proposed site allocations in Neighbourhood Plan. It is not clear where the evidence is to support these Local Green Space (LGS) designations and what is it that makes them important; nor what analysis has taken place in accordance with the criteria for designation of LGS set out within the NPPE. The SSDC Ilminster development area is quite faint.	Figure 4	Are any views affected by allocations. Local Green space analysis needed Development areas faint on map.
		It may be more appropriate to refer to 'water quality' rather than 'water' in the introductory paragraph. It may be more appropriate to use the term 'Green Corridor', rather than green chain. It would be helpful to reference either in the Plan or the supporting text the District's Phosphates Calculator and published Position Statement: https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/services/planning/somerset-levels-and-phosphates/	ILM2	Water quality not water Phosphates calculator needs addressing
		This may not be justified or achievable on site and it is not clear what evidence supports the planting of trees in accordance with this Policy. SSDC have commissioned evidence on Tree Canopy cover in the District and are proposing to include a policy in the LPR.	ILM2a	Evidence for tree cover – green Ilminster?
		It may be clearer to say - provide or improve 'green corridor links' within and adjacent to the site. It is not clear whether this will apply to all development or just certain types e.g. sites for major development?	ILM2c	?
		It may be helpful to clarify what and where 'existing and new habitats' are – or be clear in the supporting text that this means any development adjacent to the natural environment.	ILM2d	map this?
		The correct reference would be to the LPR Preferred Options (Regulation 18) consultation document.	8.7.6	amend
		The identified Local Green Spaces need to be justified in the context of the NPPF tests. Not clear what mechanisms will be used to deliver the Green Chain network, although reference in the supporting text states that CIL may be available – this could be where the 25% CIL receipts for areas with a Neighbourhood Plan could be focussed. Any S106 contributions would need to meet the tests for planning obligations: They must be: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	ILM3	work needed
		It is not clear where the evidence is for this and whether it would be compliant with the S106 tests? Neither is it clear what exactly is being proposed. Should the word 'applicants' be 'applications'?	ILM4	evidence typo
		This section should reference SSDC's Built Leisure Facility Needs Assessment and Strategy - https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/your-council/your-council-plan-and-strategies/planning-for-open-space-sport-and-recreation/	Table 8	amendment
		Enterprise Zones are quite specifically defined – clarification is needed on terminology. This policy covers a lot of different elements.	ILM5	amendments and definition
		It is not clear how much of this section has had regard to the LPR evidence base on economic prosperity; https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/your-council/your-council-plan-and-strategies/planning-policy/local-plan-review-2020-2040/	9.4.7	evidence?
		The list of evidence should include the Ilminster Design Guide (Appendix C)	9.6.5	amend
		The South Somerset Employment Land Review will be undertaken by SSDC. Later this year SSDC will be publishing an Economic Development Needs Assessment as part of the LPR and updating the Employment Land Review. The Town Centres and Retail evidence is also being updated - this will take account of the recent changes to the Use Classes (Class E) and changes to permitted development rights.	Table 9	amend

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy/Page Reference	Action
		Dropped kerbs are a matter for the Highway Authority and should not be referred to a consideration in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is not clear whether this policy will apply to all development requiring planning permission within the defined Town Centre. There is a need to clarify where or to what the policy applies. You may consider adding the term 'where appropriate'. We suggest that this is included in a 'Projects' Appendix.	ILM8	amend
		You may wish to consider referencing the planned improvements to the A358 Taunton to Southfields.	10.4.1	amend?
		Criterion c. is a statement of how Ilminster TC will prioritise CIL spending and is not a land use planning requirement. Suggest it is deleted and moved to the supporting text. You may wish to refer to the issue of dropped kerbs here too.	ILM9	amend?
		These proposals are unlikely to be used in the determination of planning applications and should be listed separately in an appendix as 'Projects' to be overseen by the Town Council.	ILM10	amend.?
		Part of the Green Chain is outside the neighbourhood plan area – not sure whether this is intentional as it does not appear to follow an existing public right of way.	Figure 6	review?
		Aim Four – New Use Class E now replaces Class B1.	11.2.1	amend
		It would be helpful to have the site plans easily accessible and visible at this point in the Plan. Should these requirements apply to all the allocations, rather than the two specifically referred to? Not clear from the plan where Site 16 is – should reference be made in the supporting text instead? Generally, people will not know to look at the supporting documents/evidence. Site 22A – East of Winterhay Lane. This site is ref W/ILMI/0026 in the HELAA Review. It is not actually suitable for development as it suffers from poor accessibility confirmed by SSDC's highways consultant. Site 24 – Gooch and Housego. This site is ref W/ILMI/0027 in the HELAA Review. It is now to be a boutique with studios and workshops and is no longer available. Refer to as former Gooch and Housego. Site 25- Station Road – flooding issues remain to be resolved and capacity may be further reduced. Site 15A – South of Shudrick Lane - SSDC have commissioned additional evidence on the potential impacts on the historic environment and landscape of LPR Preferred Options Site IM2 and this will inform any subsequent proposal in the next iteration of the LPR. You might like to consider carrying out viability assessments for any allocated sites in the Neighbourhood Plan. More information can be found here: https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/Locality-Viability-Toolkit-final-1.pdf	ILM12	new plan of just allocations needed
		The figure of 839 dwellings will be subject to reappraisal in the Local Plan Review for the period of 2020 to 2040.	11.4.1a	refer to this in report
		SSDC's records indicate that, as of the end on March 2021, the total completions and commitments from 2016 is now 150.	11.4.1b	amend
		It would be more accurate to say that the HELAA methodology applies a dwelling density of 30 dph.	11.4.5b	amend
		The requirement for 20% of homes to be built to accessible and adaptable standards does not appear to be supported by evidence in the Housing Needs Assessment. The term 'Lifetime Homes' is now longer in use. Neither does there appear to be specific reference to the requirement for the proportion of self-build and custom building sought.	ILM13	amend based on HNA amend add in
		The latest Planning Practice Guidance should also be referenced.	ILM13f	revise
		Please can you confirm if the Development Area shown reflects that in the adopted Local Plan.	11.6.1	??
		The latest Five –Year Housing Land Supply report was published in November 2020. This section should be updated and should also refer	11.8.3	amend

Appendix C

Written representations

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
Alistair Davies	9/08/21	I would wish to fully support the following sites identified as sites 12 and 19 within section 11.0Homes and Places for living and as detailed in Figure 2 INP to be included within The Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan. It is my understanding having viewed preliminary plans that both these sites (12 & 19) would offer significant community benefits, in terms of additional parking provision for existing residents, along with community land provision (site 12). Both these would contribute to the required housing stock for Ilminster in bringing forward smaller deliverable sites with a variety of housing types to suit community needs. Site Reference 21a, 21b	ILM12	None required.
Darren Duffield	08/08/21	This site should have been split into two separate sites from the start. The two sites are completely different and are owned by completely different owners. Page 49 to 51 (Site Allocation Assessment Report) gives the site assessment scores for both sites combined which is very lazy of the ECA consultants. The scores from 21a and 21b are totally different and it seems that the ECA have just taken the easy option and given scores for the best parts on each site completely missing some major negative points. No mention of both sites being in the curtilage of the Grade II listed Manor Farm. One of the most historic and important heritage sites in Ilminster dating back to medieval times and many mentions in the Somerset HER - English Heritage ID 263965, - Winterhay Green ILM/415, - Manor Farm ILM/705, SMR 53463 – Enclosures on Winterhay Green “Enclosures on Winterhay Green probably date mainly from the post-medieval period, and consist of both houses and farms. Manor Farm, however, is medieval in origin (Winterhay was one of the medieval manors around Ilminster) and is thought to contain the site of an early chapel (SMR 53463). These enclosures were added to in the 19th Century, but have not been swallowed up by urban development.” There is no mention of the minimum of 12 mature trees on site 21a and many other well established shrubs and bushes, providing a diverse habitat for many species of wildlife. Also no mention of site 21a being refused planning permission in recent years for many reasons including the consistent flooding. Corrections to pages 49-51 of the Site Allocation Assessment Report for site 21a: Page 50 Question 8 Natural Environment Constraints The choice of site does not protect the biodiversity or the environment. There is a large number of mature trees, very mature hedgerows, shrubs and bushes. Score 1 (Not 2) Question 9 Impact on historic/ heritage This site is within curtilage of Manor Farm; one of the most important heritage sites in Ilminster: English Heritage ID 263965. The site is directly on the Winterhay Green Heritage Enclosure site: Somerset HER ILM/415. Score 1 (Not 3) Question 10 Site access/existing road network This site has no access to any local roads. Completely new roads would need to be constructed on land not owned by the current land owner. Score 1 (Not 2) Question 12 Cycle paths This site has no access to any cycle paths in any direction.	ILM12 Site assessment	Noted. q.9 of each assessment addressed listed buildings. Furthermore should any application come forward this would be detailed at that stage. No further action required. Noted. This is for individual assessment should the landowner apply for planning permission. This is for individual assessment should the landowner apply for planning permission. Winterhay lane is an adopted road. Any other issues would be subject to assessment by the landowner as part of any planning application submission.

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>Score 2 (Not 3) Question 13 Footpaths This site has no direct access to any public footpaths in any direction.</p> <p>Score 1 (Not 2) Question 14 Shops and Services The site is more than 10 minutes' walk from the edge of town where most of the shops and services are found.</p> <p>Score 1 (Not 2)</p>		A convenience store is located along Western Road within 10 minutes. Other amenities are 13minutes.
Jason Miles	07/07/21	<p>Too many documents that are too long. Site allocation document is too long, too much jargon, poor plans. The 15 criteria for assessment is good. The tree planting scheme for the whole town with detailed targets and stie allocations is missing. Large-scale tree planting is vital for carbon capture flood control and for well being of the community and will soften the impact of any developments. It will enhance community spaces and goes hand in hadn with the green chain. Plan of the views is too small scale. Good to do but no analysis of views from far and near into the town. The principles in the design guide are good but are not reflected in the site assessment report. It should not be appendix c but a primary document. Sceptical that the design guide will be enforced. A recent development on Station Road is an example of poor design. The number of houses allocated to Ilminster should not necessarily follow suit in relation to the amount allocated to towns nearby without reference to character. The town has already had a number of houses allocated to it. Infrastructure is already creaking under the strain. The allocation of houses is simplistic and flawed. No analysis of whether people will want to move to Ilminster. All the development is outside of the development area of the town. The westward direction of growth upsets the balance in relation to the town. Ref 12 – decribed as land rear of new wood house'. It is opposite New Wood House and should be called 'the conspicuous steep field below Beacon Road and North of Uplands. The field is an important inlet of countryside into the town and is extremely visible from many points. It should be green space or for trees. The public footpath would be enhanced by tree planting here. Steep slope, access and engineering should preclude it from development. As should any loss of hedges. There should be no housing on the west side of Beacon Road, our house along with Wyldwood is an aberration. Ref 18, 21a and 21b- These fields are very prominent in the landscape in particular from Beacon Road and the footpath. This would have a negative impact. Flooding is also an issue here. Ref 22 – It should be confined to 22a. impact here would be less than area 12 on the landscape – 59 dwellings is excessive. Town centre – site 24 is under new ownership. dwellings should be provided in the upper floors of town centre shops.</p>	ILM1 ILM2	<p>Noted. Seeks to conserve trees and hedgerows. This policy suggests a tree per new dwelling, replace every tree removed with 2 and to retain all significant trees.</p> <p>New plan of the views created</p> <p>This figure is set by South Somerset Council.</p> <p>This is for consideration at planning application stage. 59 dwellings is based on a recommended dwellings per hectate which nationally is quite low.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Peter Lansdown	08/08/21	<p>Climate change - This is one report on the situation in Greece:</p> <p>The movement northwards of global temperatures was predicted by NASA in 2004. It has now happened. The whole of Southern Europe is affected: Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey and Southern France, the Alps and the Balkans as well as Palestine and the North African coast. Changes are also affecting us, dryer in the South and wetter in the North.</p> <p>Given the tendency to extreme weather we can expect short violent downpours and increasingly hot spells. The town needs to be ready for both of these and the neighbourhood plan would be an obvious place to start.</p> <p>With the tendency towards dryer weather we again would do well to look at how we can bolster the town's water supply which is why I push the idea of the development of a flood prevention/water retention scheme. It is evident that an enormous amount of effort has been put into this enterprise</p>		<p>Flood prevention scheme either needs to be on a site by site basis or as part of a strategy agreed with the environment agency. This has not been discussed or put forward by the Environment Agency and as such it is to be dealt with under the sequential test method.</p>
Green Ilminster	08/21	<p>Summary of Proposals. Over View.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our first proposal therefore is that the issues of climate change and biodiversity are highlighted robustly at the beginning of the report so that this permeates all that follows. <p>Environment and Leisure.</p>		

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose an audit of the condition of the wildlife or biodiversity assets that we have and that this is repeated regularly so that we know if this is improving or declining? • We believe that an ambitious tree planting programme should be put in place as a matter of urgency and partnerships with landowners sought to facilitate this. • We think that the role of community groups and individual initiatives in relation to tree planting is strongly acknowledged and explicitly supported and encouraged. • We propose that a clear aspiration is expressed in the Plan to seek opportunities for the development of a community wood or orchard and additional allotment space. • Residents, building and landowners should be supported to play their part through gardening for wildlife, leaving wild areas wild, the erection of bird boxes and many other measures which can make a significant contribution to biodiversity. We can all play a part. • We propose that all sites identified for development should be independently assessed for the potential environmental impact. <p>Renewable Energy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose that the Plan states clearly that initiatives for individual and community scale renewable energy projects will be supported subject to the considerations outlined in national policy and guidance. <p>Homes and Places for Living.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The task nationally and locally of decarbonising our housing stock is considerable and we think that this reality should be clearly highlighted and acknowledged in the Plan. • We propose that a working group is established to identify to what extent fuel poverty is an issue in Ilminster and identifying what part have we can play in tackling it? • We propose that the Neighbourhood Plan strongly and explicitly encourages zero carbon homes with high levels of energy efficiency in all new development, and that it potentially, creates binding energy efficiency targets/standards for new development. • Where possible we think that priority should be given to re-using, improving and repurposing existing buildings while maximising the use of brownfield sites. • We propose that all applications for development state in their submission what the anticipated Carbon Footprint is and evidence that efforts are being made to minimise this. • Our next proposal is that it would be valuable to designate one or some of the identified development sites to exemplars of carbon neutral development and to seek partnerships with developers or organisations such as Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development and the Energy Saving Trust for example that would support this with expertise and guidance. • We propose that if developers want to build in the Plan area that they are required to enter into meaningful programme of community consultation that is consistent with the scale of the development. • We propose that the Plan states that innovation in building design and materials in a way that supports local distinctiveness and the other objectives for good design and sustainable development will be supported. • We further propose that the Plan includes an explicit statement that developers build homes that are designed to last and that developments will be supported that adopt energy conservation strategies at all stages including in the construction phase (including the use of local materials to avoid transport impacts if at all possible). That they avoid using those materials most harmful to the environment. That building design maximises opportunities for natural lighting and ventilation to reduce energy use. That where hard surfacing is required permeable materials are used. • We propose that development work on the Environmental Enterprise Zone is treated as a priority to reduce the necessity of commuting. <p>Extreme Weather Events, Flooding and Water Conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose that adaptation and mitigation be made a stronger theme of the Plan. New development must meet the highest standards of SUDS design and maintenance. Additionally, a programme of SUDS enhancements to existing properties and hard paved areas should be put in place to reduce storm run-off for example Tesco's car park. SUDS can be positive features of the local environment. • We propose that the Town Council begins an urgent conversation with local landowners so that tree planting can be undertaken in key areas that absorb water and stabilise the soil. • We also urge that all developments be designed taking into account best practice in water efficiency, such as water efficient fittings and appliances, water harvesting and storage features, and green roofs. Perhaps all major developments should be required to provide evidence of anticipated internal water use per person per day and evidence of how the development takes this into account and mitigates against it. 		

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>Access and Movement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose that more ambitious and explicit targets be set for recharging points in the town centre for both cars and cycles in addition to the wider town area where on street parking is common. Development should not be piecemeal but part of a coherent pattern. • We propose that a conversation on connectivity be initiated with surrounding parishes and authorities so that the network of cycle and walk ways is not developed in isolation. • We propose that cycling and walking be made more pleasant, realistic and accessible by upgrading the supporting infrastructure in and around town. This includes addressing the obstacles that the A303 and A358 present. <p>Culture Heritage and Tourism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose an enhanced market. This might be seasonal to attract tourists over the summer. Closing Silver Street would make this a more pleasant experience. This would require some investment in stalls, promotion and advertising. • We make a number of other suggestions to enhance Ilminster’s cultural offer. <p>Overview</p> <p>In 2019 The Town Council declared a Climate Emergency and we note that this is referenced. We also welcome the inclusion and acknowledgement of the One Planet Living principles in the Plan itself although we thought that how these principles have or will influence decision making and action should be made explicit.</p> <p>We think that it would be helpful to make a stronger statement early in the Plan that it is being developed in the context of a climate/ecological/biodiversity emergency, and that this context should explicitly permeate the whole document.</p> <p>In our view this is a unique opportunity to respond to the challenges that the Climate Change Emergency creates as it is intended that this Plan runs to 2036. There is a broadly held consensus among environmentalist scientists that there is a significant lag between the carbon we are releasing now and future impacts. This could be as much as 40 years so what we do now in a very real sense impacts future generations. “If we have not taken dramatic action within the next decade we could face irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies.”</p> <p>David Attenborough (Climate Change: The Facts, BBC1, 18 April 2019)</p> <p>Glasgow City council, home for this years UN Climate Change Conference (COP26) acknowledges the gravity of the situation by stating in their development plan;</p> <p>Glasgow City Region stands at a climate crossroads..... even if the Paris Agreement is achieved globally, this will mean Glasgow City Region faces a very different climate over coming decades.</p> <p>This is true for all of us.</p> <p>Record temperatures and record flooding across Europe underline the seriousness of the situation and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned that</p> <p>“The challenge of avoiding catastrophic climate breakdown requires rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society”.</p> <p>The year 2020 was the third warmest, fifth wettest and eighth sunniest on record, scientists said in the UK State of the Climate Report. No other year is in the top 10 on all three criteria. In the space of 30 years, the UK has become 0.9C warmer and 6% wetter. The report’s lead author Mike Kendon, stated that</p> <p>“A lot of people think climate change is in the future – but this proves the climate is already changing here in the UK. As it continues to warm we are going to see more and more extreme weather such as heatwaves and floods.”</p> <p>We think that given a long view that it can’t be overstated that sustainability issues will become more urgently central to all aspects of the planning process and therefore think that highlighting this issue is best done in the introductory chapter perhaps even entitling this introductory chapter The Challenge of Climate Change: Future Resilience and Sustainability; for example. We believe that this gives the issue the significance that is necessary.</p> <p>At appendix A we, somewhat presumptuously, attach a potential introductory chapter or insert on this issue which is intended as an example of how this could be presented.</p> <p>Our first proposal therefore is that the issues of climate change and biodiversity are highlighted robustly at the beginning of the report so that this permeates all that follows.</p> <p>If this is an emergency, then we should behave like it’s an emergency.</p> <p>Environment and Leisure.</p> <p>We of course welcome and acknowledge the thoughtful work that has gone into the plan on these issues.</p>		

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>Biodiversity and wildlife across the world and in the UK is under unprecedented pressure. According to a 2018 report by WWF, in nearly 45 years, humanity has wiped out 60% of global wildlife populations and more than 4,000 species were in decline between 1970 and 2014. The Government has committed itself to halt and reverse the overall decline in biodiversity, most notably in the recently published 25 year environment plan, “A Green Future” which proposes embedding an ‘environmental net gain’ and low-carbon development in neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework places a renewed emphasis on the need for developments to not just protect existing wildlife and biodiversity, but contribute to a net gain in nature conservation:</p> <p>“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” (Paragraph 170)</p> <p>“To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should ... identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.” (Paragraph 174)</p> <p>We note the requirements for new developments to plant trees. A typical tree can absorb around 21 kilograms of carbon dioxide (CO2) per year, however this figure is only achieved when the tree is fully grown so saplings will absorb significantly less than this. It may be many years before trees planted now have a significant impact on the uptake of carbon.</p> <p>We propose an audit of the condition of the wildlife or biodiversity assets that we have and that this is repeated regularly so that we know if this is improving or declining?</p> <p>We believe that an ambitious tree planting programme is put in place as a matter of urgency and partnerships with landowners is sought to facilitate this.</p> <p>A great deal of the tree planting in and around Ilminster in the last two years has been undertaken individual landowners and by volunteers and volunteer initiatives such as Ilminster Tree Project and Green Ilminster and we think that this would be an opportunity to acknowledge and celebrate this community initiative and to explicitly promote it.</p> <p>We propose that the role of community groups and initiatives is acknowledged and explicitly supported and encouraged.</p> <p>We propose that a clear aspiration is expressed in the Plan to seek opportunities for the development of a community wood or orchard and additional allotment space.</p> <p>Residents, building and landowners should be supported to play their part through gardening for wildlife, leaving wild areas wild, the erection of bird boxes and many other measures which can make a significant contribution to biodiversity. We can all play a part.</p> <p>We propose that all sites identified for development should be independently assessed for the potential environmental impact.</p> <p>Renewable energy</p> <p>We believe that the Plan could creatively go further on the issue of renewable energy.</p> <p>In addition to generating all our electricity from renewable sources, decarbonising our society will also require our transport and heating systems, currently largely reliant on fossil fuels, to be electrified. The Committee on Climate Change estimates this could result in a doubling of electricity demand. Overall the CCC predicts we need to quadruple the supply of low-carbon electricity by 2050. National planning policy stresses the need for plans to provide a positive strategy for renewable energy, so as to help increase its use and supply, and encourages plans to identify suitable areas for renewable energy where this would help secure their development.</p> <p>It’s clear that responding to climate change will require a total transformation of how we supply and use energy, and a major increase in the number of renewable energy developments hosted in local communities.</p> <p>We ask does the plan address the issue of renewable energy in an ambitious, creative or overt enough way?</p> <p>For example could Ilminster as a whole produce a higher proportion of its’ own energy from renewable energy sources locally? What forms and scale of renewable energy would carry support in our community and where could renewable energy developments happen? This would include exploring whether or not there is any potential in generating electricity through the use of turbines in the river Isle.</p> <p>We think that the Neighbourhood Plan could aim or express the intention to explore all the renewable energy resources that could viably be developed locally and bottom out which could carry community support. If one field of County owned land were given to the community for solar energy we could for example begin a community fund that owned and developed that facility for the good of the community.</p> <p>There are now a significant number of community owned or led renewable energy projects around the country including in the south west. This issue clearly heavily overlaps that of housing and given what we know about the potential in contemporary materials for house building for energy efficiency the targets in the Plan seem modest.</p> <p>We note that there is a requirement in the Plan that the development along Canal Way is capable of generating 10% of its energy require-</p>	<p>ILM2 ILM3</p>	<p>A biodiversity and habitats assessment are carried out as part of a major planning application and other application where necessary however an area wide assessment would be beyond the scope of the funding available.</p> <p>Tree planting schemes such as this would not need planning consent. The provision of trees is encouraged in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Space can be allocated for community groups for specific uses if desired, a clear idea of the demand for a community orchard or additional allotments is required before it can be allocated and assessed. Further detail is required.</p> <p>A biodiversity assessment can be required on all applications and enhancements sought through policy.</p>

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>ments. In context this seems modest.</p> <p>We suggest that the report could go further and offer a more generalised support for renewable energy generation. Some individuals or groups of individuals may wish to make a personal contribution to addressing climate change through lifestyle choices by using less, using it more efficiently and by sourcing sustainably.</p> <p>We propose is that the Plan states clearly that initiatives for individual and community scale renewable energy projects will be supported subject to the considerations outlined in national policy and guidance.</p> <p>This in spirit and principle gives encouragement to broader and more creative thinking on the issue of energy generation.</p>	ILM15	<p>The policy seeks to achieve a standard of renewable energy over and above that of the neighbourhood plan. Issues of viability need to be assessed as part of the proposal.</p>
		<p>Homes and Places for Living.</p> <p>We fully acknowledge and welcome the intentions expressed in the Plan and the detail that is in the Design Guide; particularly the latter stages of this which we think could be highlighted further in the Plan.</p> <p>The number of new homes suggested in the plan is about a 28% increase in the number of households in Ilminster over 15 years. This is very substantial.</p> <p>The Committee on Climate Change report ‘UK housing: Fit for the future?’ (Feb 2019) states “We will not meet our targets for emissions reduction without near complete decarbonisation of the housing stock.”</p> <p>Energy use in homes accounts for about 14% of UK greenhouse gas emissions. Getting design right from the outset is likely to be vastly cheaper and more feasible than having to retrofit later. The CCC report also states that efforts to adapt the UK’s housing stock to the impacts of the changing climate: for higher average temperatures, flooding and water scarcity, are lagging far behind what is needed to keep us safe and comfortable, even as these climate change risks grow.</p> <p>The task nationally therefore is considerable and our next proposal is that this reality should be clearly highlighted and acknowledged in the Plan.</p> <p>The Environmental Audit report “Heatwaves: adapting to climate change” records that in the August 2003 heatwave, where temperatures reached 38.5°C in England there were 2,193 heat related deaths across the UK in just 10 days. The report predicts that on our current trajectory that the average number of heat-related deaths in the UK could more than triple to 7,000 a year by the 2050s.</p> <p>The Plan makes one reference to Fuel Poverty and we hope that this could be strengthened and enhanced. If a fairer more integrated and healthier community is one of the Plans intentions or objectives then it is necessary to understand the local context.</p>	ILM15	<p>This policy goes some way to start addressing this issue through providing renewable energies.</p>
		<p>We propose that a working group is established to identify to what extent fuel poverty is an issue in Ilminster and identifying what part we can play in tackling it?</p> <p>A significant feature of the carbon emissions dilemma now and in the future will be improving the energy efficiency of existing and future buildings, including historic and listed buildings. The CCC report indicates that the poor quality of UK housing stock also contributes to existing health and social problems. Around 11% of UK households are fuel poor and so can’t afford to heat their homes adequately. The health cost to the NHS of conditions exacerbated by poor housing is currently estimated to be at least £1.4bn per year in England alone.</p> <p>The CCC report concludes that; “New homes should be built to be low-carbon, energy and water efficient, and climate resilient.”</p> <p>We propose that the Neighbourhood Plan strongly and explicitly encourages zero carbon homes with high levels of energy efficiency in new development, and that it potentially, creates binding energy efficiency targets/standards for new development.</p> <p>We propose that all applications for development state in their submission what the anticipated Carbon Footprint is and evidence that efforts are being made to minimise this.</p> <p>Where possible we think that giving priority should be given to re-using, improving and repurposing existing buildings while maximising the use of brownfield sites.</p>	ILM14	<p>Any and all suitable brown-field land has been considered as part of the brownfield land register. Retrofitting existing properties is encouraged in ILM14.</p>
		<p>Self build or community led initiatives for building on land held in common may provide opportunities for examples of innovative carbon neutral development and we argue should be supported. We think that this is likely to bring energy and creativity to Ilminster. Like all other developments these would have to comply with Planning and Building Regulation.</p> <p>On our doorstep at Langport we have award winning examples of Green or Eco house building to encourage us to think of what is possible. The Bows Wharf development is an award winning development of contemporary houses that enhance the local environment. They are designed to make the most of a natural site. The whole site uses traditional materials in a creative contemporary way.</p> <p>We also have the much older Camelot Development at South Petherton.</p> <p>At one end of the continuum we also have the off grid Tinkers Bubble almost on our doorstep too.</p>		<p>Carbon neutral housing could be an aim of the policy.</p>

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>A search of the internet indicates that developers such as Ssassy Property in Oxfordshire by partnering with Greencore Construction are building carbon positive homes with renewable charging points for cars. Each home is built to Passive house standards, achieving net zero energy and going beyond net zero carbon to become climate positive. This means that more than the total embodied carbon used to manufacture and build each house has been effectively offset.</p> <p>Our next proposal is that it would be valuable to designate one or some of the identified development sites to exemplars of carbon neutral development and to seek partnerships with developers or organisations such as Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development and the Energy Saving Trust for example that would support this with expertise and guidance.</p> <p>This would be an excellent opportunity to support vibrancy, creativity, vitality and innovation in the locality.</p> <p>We propose is that if developers want to build in the Plan area that they are required to enter into meaningful programme of community consultation that is consistent with the scale of the development.</p> <p>We acknowledge the detail in the Design Guide for developers particularly the latter stages of this which contains many positive ideas that could benefit Ilminster and the environment. Many of the houses that are built look as though house design stopped in 1935. All use concrete based products which require huge amounts of fossil fuels to make them and therefore have massive imbedded carbon footprint. Timber is used round the world for house building and is renewable and sustainable and, of course, actually locks in carbon. Oddly in many TV property programmes people knock out the back of a Victorian house to create a vast glass box kitchen diner. Why do none of these ideas make it into our new house building from the outset?</p> <p>Also arguably architecture is a social influence. That is the physical and built environment we experience and live in affects the way we see the world and how we feel about ourselves and where we live.</p> <p>If we want an aspirational community we should encourage aspiration in our built environment.</p> <p>We propose that the Plan states that innovation in building design and materials in a way that supports local distinctiveness and the other objectives for good design and sustainable development will be supported.</p> <p>We further propose that the Plan includes an explicit statement that developers build homes that are designed to last and that developments will be supported that adopt energy conservation strategies at all stages including in the construction phase (including the use of local materials to avoid transport impacts if at all possible). That they avoid using those materials most harmful to the environment. That building design maximises opportunities for natural lighting and ventilation to reduce energy use. That where hard surfacing is required permeable materials are used.</p> <p>Where publicly owned land, through Somerset County Council for example, is to be developed in the neighbourhood Plan area then the process of choosing a developer should be transparent and should contain a significant Green representation.</p> <p>We think that it is really important to have an estimate of how many new jobs are likely to be needed to support the growth in population and therefore</p> <p>We propose that development work on the Environmental Enterprise Zone is treated as a priority to reduce the necessity of commuting.</p>	ILM5	<p>Community consultation could be a requirement on major developments as is the case for London authorities now.</p> <p>The policy could include wording on the impacts of materials and sustainable construction techniques?</p>
		<p>Extreme Weather Events, Flooding and Water Conservation.</p> <p>We know that this is not distinct heading in the Plan but wanted to make it one in our reply. The latest predictions are that climate change will result in more extreme weather events in the UK, with heavier rainfall events and an increased risk of flooding, more and longer-lasting heat waves and higher sea levels. We are already seeing increasing numbers of heavy rainfall events, and expect this increase to continue, with greater risk of river and flash flooding. Already in England and Wales an estimated 2.4m properties are at risk of flooding.</p> <p>We know that extreme weather events are going to become more frequent and more severe and therefore</p> <p>We propose that adaptation and mitigation be made a stronger theme of the Plan. New development must meet the highest standards of SUDS design and maintenance. Additionally a programme of SUDS enhancements to existing properties and hard paved areas should be put in place to reduce storm run-off for example Tesco's car park. SUDS can be positive features of the local environment.</p> <p>Ilminster sits in a Valley and is surrounded by farmland. Much of this is arable land and storm runoff can cause problems within the town. Dialogue with landowners of this farmland has significant potential both to reduce water and soil run-off and at the same time improve biodiversity. This consideration affects all developments around the town that have a potential impact on flooding either in the Shudrick Valley or at the old Horlicks site.</p> <p>We propose is that the Town Council begins an urgent conversation with local land owners so that tree planting can be undertaken in key areas that absorb water and stabilise the soil.</p> <p>We also urge that all developments be designed taking into account best practice in water efficiency, such as water efficient fittings and ap-</p>	ILM5	<p>Noted.</p> <p>SUDS forms part of an existing policy</p> <p>Water efficiency could be included in the policy.</p>

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>pliances, water harvesting and storage features, and green roofs. Perhaps all major developments should be required to provide evidence of anticipated internal water use per person per day and evidence of how the development takes this into account and mitigates against it.</p>		
		<p>ACCESS and MOVEMENT.</p> <p>Re-shaping transport systems has enormous potential to enhance quality of life for everyone. Proposals for better facilities for walking, cycling and public transport, alongside reductions in car traffic, can create a cascade of benefits, including improved public health, improved air quality, more hospitable public spaces, greater footfall to support town centre uses and reduced economic losses from commuting and congestion.</p> <p>At the same time these measures will help meet environmental commitments: the transport sector is responsible for approximately 36% of all UK energy use and 23% of CO2 emissions so reducing car usage can bring significant savings.</p> <p>We welcome the recommendations and observations on transport in the report and strongly support the recommendation that all new development has the capacity to store cycles and has electric car recharging points.</p> <p>The Institute for Public Policy Research document: All Aboard (2021) states that planners need the power and backing of national governments to refuse planning applications that generate extra traffic and do not contribute to reducing car dependence. The developments that are approved and encouraged by national and local plans should be compatible with a new vision for transport that provides people with good alternatives to private car ownership and use.</p> <p>We propose that more ambitious and explicit targets be set for recharging points in the town centre for both cars and cycles in addition to the wider town area where on street parking is common. Development should not be piecemeal but part of a coherent pattern.</p> <p>We propose that a conversation on connectivity be initiated with surrounding parishes and authorities so that the network of cycle and walk ways is not developed in isolation.</p> <p>For example the Plan references Ilminster's connectivity via road links with significant transport hubs via the A303, the A 358 and access to the M5. More aspirational thought could be given to cycle routes to Crewkerne rail station (7 miles) and Taunton (13 miles) The availability of electric cycles for hire might for example make this seem less daunting for some. The A303 is a major obstacle for cyclists from the surrounding areas and in using cycling to get to Taunton for example. This needs to be more actively addressed.</p> <p>We strongly support that where new employment is to be developed these sites wherever possible are connected to the town by cycle and walk ways and have safe cycle storage and charging points for cars.</p> <p>Good transport links to Taunton and other local villages are essential to supporting local development and reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>We propose that cycling and walking be made more pleasant, realistic and accessible by upgrading the supporting infrastructure in and around town.</p> <p>We also think that Ilminster could be put on the cycling map much sooner than waiting for the development "hub" on the edge of town. A conversation could begin with the Football Club, Cricket Club about sharing facilities or utilising unused buildings such as at the Summervale Drs Surgery site. There are unused buildings at Rose Mill too. We also thought that this is more likely to be successful if any "hub" development had the whole community in mind and not just committed road cyclists. This would cater for families and those new to cycling as well as those who have been cycling for years. It would have to be a welcoming, inclusive facility and not just aimed at the enthusiast which some might find intimidating. However, in the short term even taking some modest initiatives by for example having a "café" facility around the Rec would attract cyclists. This could be used to raise the profile of cycling in Ilminster.</p>		<p>Car charging is not a policy but is in the aims.</p>
		<p>CULTURE, HERITAGE and TOURISM.</p> <p>The Plan highlights Ilminster's Heritage as a market town. Indeed this is highlighted as one of its USPs. We could therefore enhance our Market.</p> <p>We propose an enhanced market. This might be seasonal to attract tourists over the summer. Closing Silver Street would make this a more pleasant experience. This would require some investment in stalls, promotion and advertising.</p> <p>There are good examples of thriving markets in Bridport, Wells, Frome and numerous farmers markets around south Somerset. Markets attract tourists and encourages and promotes localism.</p> <p>Other activities that could support and enhance Ilminster's cultural offer could be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artist in residence for 4 weeks....theme of waste or plastic pollution or what its like for children to grow up knowing what they are going to have to face and find answers to. To work with the whole community or school children. • Writer or Poet in residence to accompany the Literary Festival. • Musician in Residence/Street Performance catalyst person focussed on celebrating Somerset and Ilminster. • Story teller in residence to work with school children. 		<p>Policy IM7 and ILM9 reflect this desire. A policy could encourage this</p> <p>use. ILM11.</p>

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host a cycling event for South Somerset based on Ilminster. • Encourage a cycling Hub now around the Rec. • Think widely about possibilities. We have the most active Jazz Club in Somerset. • We soon will have Shin Dig can we partner with them re music/creativity? • Think about venues that can support events attractive to the wider community as this tends to be polarised at the moment. <p>Finally we hope that the Plan can be used to express Vitality, Intention and Aspiration about Ilminster's future.</p>		
		<p>APPENDIX A.</p> <p>This is intended as an exemplar. Other neighbourhood plans have been used as models. We think this could be integrated with the existing Introductory chapter.</p> <p>The Challenge of Developing a Neighbourhood Plan in the Context of a Climate Change and Biodiversity Crisis.</p> <p>“If we have not taken dramatic action within the next decade we could face irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies.”</p> <p>David Attenborough (Climate Change: The Facts, BBC1, 18 April 2019)</p> <p>Climate change and the broader concerns of ecological sustainability are rapidly becoming a necessary and integral part of all aspects of central and local government planning. Indeed, we think that given a long view that it can't be overstated that sustainability issues will become ever more urgently central to all aspects of the planning process. It is inevitable that this will cut across every section of the Ilminster Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The impacts of climate change are already being felt across the world, including the UK, and the scientific consensus is that without urgent action they will increase in frequency and severity over the coming years. In the 2015 Paris Agreement, governments have agreed to act to limit global warming, further reinforcing the commitments made in the UK's own 2008 Climate Change Act. This implies changes to the way the economy and society are run, and influences actions by the government at all levels, by industry, and by ordinary citizens. That is by all of us.</p> <p>The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned that a global temperature rise of 2°C will “significantly increase” the risk of “drought, floods, extreme heat and poverty for hundreds of millions of people”. Importantly it states; “The challenge of avoiding catastrophic climate breakdown requires rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society”. We think this could not be clearer and it's a fact that physics has no interest in politics whatsoever so wherever we stand on the political spectrum we all have our part to play. We need to make it easier to take low carbon and climate-smart choices in the way we heat our homes, what and how we consume and how we travel.</p> <p>Research shows that people's concern about climate change is on the rise, and understandably peaks particularly in the aftermath of storms, floods and heatwaves. As these become more frequent, it is predictable therefore that increasingly people will see the necessity of embracing greener lifestyles that might contribute to slowing down climate change. However, it is a reality that responses and solutions cannot be generated overnight and the choices being made by us now at each stage of the evolution of Ilminster's development should therefore be transparent and open to public scrutiny so that their impacts can be understood. Its healthy to be accountable.</p> <p>On 14th July 2021 Frans Timmermans, the European Commission's vice president in charge of the EU's green deal, said: “This is the make-or-break decade in the fight against the climate and biodiversity crises. Yes, it is difficult, yes it is hard. But it's also an obligation, because if we were to renounce our obligation to help humanity live within planetary boundaries we would fail not just ourselves but we would fail our children and our grandchildren.”</p> <p>What we do in this generation will affect each generation that follows us. The causal chain and responsibility is unavoidable.</p> <p>So, for example, the publicising of carbon footprint predictions by developers would encourage transparency and accountability not just for the developer but for us too in the choices we are making. (Policy ILM2)</p> <p>On the issue of carbon emissions South Somerset's Environment Strategy (Oct. 2019) states</p> <p>“Given the scale and rate of change required, it will be impossible for us to reach our targets of carbon neutrality within the county by 2030 without significant and immediate policy changes in central government coupled with individuals and businesses making major behavioural changes.”</p> <p>If houses and domestic activity and transport account for a substantial amount of South Somerset's carbon emissions, it is essential that we set ambitious targets for any new development; residential and employment. (Policy ILM7)</p> <p>Successive national and local government policies have committed to reducing carbon emissions and expect neighbourhood plans to have a positive impact on reducing carbon within their areas. Thus, the current legal and policy framework allows Neighbourhood and Local Plans</p>		Noted.

Name and reference	Date and method	Summary	Policy Reference	Action
		<p>to set policies that require enhanced energy efficiency.</p> <p>The Local Plan recognises that some recent developments have failed to reflect the unique character of Ilminster in their design and build quality. The Community consultation and engagement events we conducted confirmed that good quality design is important to the community and should be provided, even on sites which are away from sensitive locations, such as the conservation area or on the edge of the countryside. We aim to make the environment we live in as high a quality as possible.</p> <p>As stated in Policy ILM14 outline planning applications often fail to include a sufficient level of detail for well-considered decision making, particularly with regard to strategic developments. Therefore, the INP strongly encourages the submission of full planning applications, with detailed design and layouts, to understand and consider all aspects and implications of the proposed development in relation to Ilminster's unique heritage, landscape setting, the environment, adjoining sites and properties. The INP is underpinned by the detail and intention in the Design Guide. Applications should include a projection of the carbon footprint of any proposed development.</p> <p>Policy ILM15 should also be read in conjunction with the Design Guide which encourages developers to think creatively about their contribution to Ilminster's built environment both aesthetically and from an ecological and environmental perspective. The Town Council will support creative approaches in design particularly where combined with carbon emission reduction and water usage management.</p> <p>To reduce the carbon impact new development, both commercial and residential is encouraged, where possible, to secure at least 10% of its total energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources. However, beyond this the INP will also support community and individual led initiatives for energy generation in line with South Somerset Council's plan for 2020 to 2024 states that they will;</p> <p>Support community led initiatives that contribute towards combatting climate change.</p> <p>Managing flood risk and inundation is likely to be a rapidly evolving challenge as is our understanding of the changing pattern of rainfall and the probable impacts of climate change. It therefore is a possibility that the flood risk guidance available to developers will be overtaken by the pace of change. We need look no further than northern Europe this year to understand this. The community would like to be reassured that the flood risk both at development site and downstream will be acceptable for the lifetime of any new development. All developments, especially those required to submit a flood risk assessment should make every effort to be informed and take account of the most up-to-date predictions of flood risk and the probable impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Expanding our tree cover will assist with both flood management risk and carbon reduction. However, the proportion of tree cover in South Somerset is lower than Somerset as a whole. This means that we know that our current tree stock is able to capture only a very small proportion of kilotons of carbon emitted. The Woodland Trust Report, State of UK's Woodlands and Trees 2021 states that the trends for the UK's woods and trees are concerning. The UK's woodland cover has more than doubled in the last 100 years, but much of this is non-native trees. Existing native woodlands are isolated, in poor ecological condition and there has been a decline in woodland wildlife.</p> <p>It is clear we need to do more and this Plan will support community and individual initiatives such as Ilminster Tree Project and Green Ilminster in efforts to enhance tree cover.</p>		
Lilian Kirby-Comber	11/07/21 Via email	<p>GREEN ILMINSTER August 2021.</p> <p>I have attended all the meetings and at every meeting someone objected to the various areas suggested by the Town Council. So Obviously you cannot please all the people all of the time. However, when I discovered that the sites you have selected to build on were those that the localland owners were willing to sell, I realised why! They are obviously keeping hold of the more sensible sites for their own gain!</p> <p>I think that for the people of Ilminster one site stands out as the most suitable more than anything that has been proposed. This would solve all the needs of the Government to have more new homes available in Ilminster, but would not impact on the residents or the beautiful land around the centre of the town that would cause so much upheaval in the town.</p> <p>The land that many of us are now coming to realise would be the best option for the town. This being the land on the hilltop coming into the town from Seavington - Above Bay Hill. There would be no problem with access onto the road into Ilminster and connecting with the 303 . Please could you contact Dillington Estate and ask if they would consider this land for redevelopment.</p> <p>Most of the land identified as possible sites for redevelopment have flooding problems - but this land is on a hill top so this should not be a problem. Plus everyone one in Ilminster would find this a suitable addition to the town.</p> <p>I really hope you can put this forward to Dillington Estate as at the moment we feel we are being BULLIED into what the Land Owners class as problem land!</p> <p>Thank you for listening to me as I am passionate about this beautiful little town and want any additions to be in keeping with what we already have.</p>		<p>Site assessment work was carried out on sites near to the Dillington estate. Please refer to the site assessment work carried out.</p>

Appendix D

Summary of questionnaire responses

Any other comments on the Vision or Mission?

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

For others to visit there needs to be a better public transport service

The plan is very good and appreciating that there is a boundary for the town it does seem that everything is being done in isolation. The fact that 45.5% of residents commute by car is not really addressed in this plan. To become a great example of a sustainable town, we do need the green chain (great idea) but also need to think about the wider connectivity of town. We have an excellent traffic free cycle link to chard which many people use to commute by bike. In order to reduce car usage Ilminster should be actively seeking further 'safe' cycling and walking routes to the surroundings villages and other towns such as Crewkerne and the major towns of Taunton/Yeovil. Simply saying we are on sustran route 33 is not good enough. Appreciate it is not the remit of this plan to think about the wide area but the plan should at least address this and provide links that could be added or joined to by other organisations such as Sustrans. Bus links are poor and not commercially viable so maybe providing electric transport for those who need it -or at least a routes which can be used by mobility scooters to link to our surrounding community. Ilminster is part of a much wider community. The conversion of footpaths should be considered.

The access to Ilminster from the East is very pleasant and scenic. However the opposite is true of the access from the west. Unkempt, overgrown etc.etc. What exactly is the "vision" for improving this ugly landscape? Why is this brownfield site not considered for building the houses at present included in the Plan, for Shudrick Valley? 220 new houses here would be a disaster - for all the reasons the development was refused time and again.

Any new housing must be affordable and sustainable. Recognising climate change as a driver for design. Green schemes must inform planning. As must the needs of low income families.

To encourage development that regenerates existing tired, unsightly and poor urban spaces and redundant land fully utilising existing highway infrastructure rather than to allow urban expansion at the expense of the beautiful unique countryside that surrounds the town.

no

Education is vital to this vision a thriving middle or upper school being both environmentally and socially necessary

Concreting over Shudrick Valley would trash our unique heritage and rural location.

Ilminster will lose its beauty and historic feel.

Ilminster IS already a desirable town and doesn't need planning bureaucrats expanding it whilst the town's infrastructure...mainly the shopping street and in town parking cannot be altered

Does the Rural Location include Shudrick Valley , where 220 Homes are planned
How could one reasonably disagree?

No

This is spin, the narrative of implying that residents do not want to live in a vibrant and healthy community is disgracefully misleading. The community of Ilminster is healthy, safe and vibrant. The development of housing of up to 220 homes in a site of beauty and heritage will ruin the vibrancy of the town and destroy the rural aspect. We do not want a commercial high street, and a view of cloned rooftops across an area that has outstanding natural importance. The flood plain is not considered, nor is infrastructure -parking is already impossibly difficult.

Reduced parking charges all year round. More flowers in the town centre. WiFi for the public in town. A play centre.

Too much basic housing, poor quality and visual and architectural poverty of new buildings
The mission should be to maintain Ilminster's "stimulatingattractivehealthy safe and sustainable environment" and not overload the roads and services to the detriment of people already living here...

This vision is how I feel

Ilminster is spreading so fast, yes we need updated larger facilities but not at the expense of our beautiful green areas

Why was the plan unreadable?

I agree completely. It is important that balanced development occurs to maintain a mixed demographic. 100% we need to consider the environment, and not build on areas of natural beauty, where people enjoy dog walking etc.

Your mission, map and questionnaire are full of mistakes so commenting is pointless

Yes, the maintenance and retention of green spaces that contribute to the overall 'feel' of Ilminster is essential. This is with particular reference to Shudrick Valley - development would destroy a key Ilminster attribute.

This question is strangely put. Do you agree we want things better? Yes. But this statement fails to highlight the importance of protecting the fabulous environment etc that we do have and which supports our amazing wildlife, particularly in the Shudrick Valley area. I believe Ilminster is hugely desirable, attractive, healthy and does respect the rural location. I really would emphasise and strongly agree with the requirement to be safe and healthy. The speed and the weight of traffic we have at the moment is not safe and not healthy. Do we want/can we really cope with more? At the east end of Ilminster I can categorically state that we can't.

You need to add " properly co-ordinated to meet the needs of the people living there."

The vision of a more desirable town is very good. Some of the language used is rather inaccessible, for me at least. For instance the phrase: " Public realm enhancements at gateways and key road junctions" is pretty meaningless and when I asked for more clarity yesterday evening nothing became much clearer. For example, the idea that something could be done to reduce the traffic flow by the Dillington Drive great in principle but I don't see how it could work.

Ilminster need not be any more desirable than it currently is. This statement is as garrulous as it is vapid.

Any development needs to be in keeping with the Local Area, in particular the local biodiversity and with

a support infrastructure

But do you follow the vision or mission

We firstly need to supply existing residents with basic needs like easy access to a doctor or dentist without having to wait weeks. A supermarket other than Tesco's which costs a fortune meaning a lot of families travel to Taunton or Yeovil to shop at Aldi. Access to support for new parents and existing parents who are struggling. We don't need more houses for people moving into the town we need decent houses for people growing up in Ilminster. These new houses with tiny gardens and a disgrace and will compound the problem of obesity and developmental problems in our young people.

I am concerned that the town does not grow to big.

Well considered vision and mission

Vision/Mission should be considered in the context of short, medium and long term. Perhaps 0-3 years, 4-10 years and 10+ years

Not very fair as it prompts you to put just one answer to too many questions - probably would be better to ask individual questions rather than lump everything together as one item may not be what you want. As I do not agree with several of these issues. And there is no where I can say actually I do not agree!
Why ask these questions when we have answered the same one before?

No

Ilminster is already a desirable market town to live and work in. I don't want to see it spoilt by over eight hundred new houses being built on green sites. I want people to be able to appreciate the beautiful countryside on their doorsteps.

Ilminster is a rare market town which needs to be protected from developers.

It would be good to factor in spiritual nourishment. We have an important church in the centre of the town with a rich history. The church is an important part of the community and engages actively in the life of the town and surrounding areas.

I believe Ilminster is a desirable town to live in but its future lies with the community to feed back from this plan the importance of building on brown field sites and leaving our green sites for all to enjoy. Making a compulsory order for the Horlicks site and building both homes and leisure facilities which would benefit the whole town and certainly improve the appearance when driving from the A358.

Ilminster is set in such beautiful countryside for all to enjoy and should be preserved not spoilt for ever with large housing developments.

This seems to be a highly biased question. More relevant is whether Ilminster already meets that vision

We support all the values listed above. The only others we would like to see mentioned are: fostering togetherness across diversity, and being welcoming for people from diverse backgrounds.

This sounds marvellous, but in reality it is an excuse to develop the town beyond its current capability and infrastructure.

To improve public transport links to larger towns (Taunton, Yeovil, Crewkerne) so that people can take jobs that allow them to afford to purchase and maintain homes in the area, without buying cars that pollute the environment.

To protect the nature that surrounds Ilminster

sustainable environment through well-considered and balanced development that respects Ilminster's unique

heritage, rural location and wild life

Too wide a vision. Danger of this 'desirable' market town losing its unique identity.

Balanced development should include additional medical facilities for a growing population.

Also support motherhood and apple pie.

Seems a rhetorical question - who wouldn't agree.....?!

Only on the basis that clear criteria are agreed by which "well-considered and balanced development" can be determined. First and foremost this must serve long-term benefits and prospects of our community as a whole, and not the immediate commercial interests of an exclusive few. Also, what is actually meant by "creativity, technology and innovation"? Why single these out over other attributes such as amenable, safe, sustainable, enjoyable or beautiful?

Building more houses in the Shudrick Valley would be to its detriment we would lose the local wildlife in this area of outstanding natural beauty which creates a haven for Deer, insects, moths & butterflies providing a feeding & breeding ground for birds such as Swifts, now endangered, that nest each year in the listed buildings on the edge of the valley.

Why change a town that works already. It's already desirable with enough housing. Why build more when the infrastructure can't support what there is?

Ilminster is currently able to provide more facilities to its residents than many other towns. This must be developed further both to support a self-contained environment for those who live here and to accommodate visitors who we want to attract

building mass cheap housing with no thought for green areas -instead a mass of concrete e.g. greenfyld close is not conducive to your vision stated above

The issue is balance, developers should not be allowed to destroy areas of natural beauty in particular Shudrick Valley. It is essential that before building commences the problems with road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster are addressed with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles e.g. coaches and lorries which use these roads as rat runs, specifically along Moolham Lane which is very dangerous and through Kingstone

I have been involved in many of these plans, and not one has achieved anything that could be recognised as the "mission statement" described. Ilminster is a unique town and needs nurturing, not destroying.

We personally don't believe that this rapid expansion would 'respect Ilminster's unique heritage and rural location'. Homes, like ours and many others, will lose its 'rural' nature due to the development.

Too many houses being built and spoiling character of town

we already have all this. but there again i'm not a developer

I already live in a desirable market town which is already stimulating, attractive, healthy, safe and sustainable to live in

We are already beautifully balanced without further development

I consider this a biased question, as it suggests this plan is required to make it so, when I believe we already have a "stimulating, attractive, healthy, safe and sustainable environment". It is my contention that some of the proposals contained within this plan will be counterproductive to maintaining specific elements of this.

It is already one of the most desirable market towns to live in, it doesn't need expansion

Not at the cost of our countryside

I hope that previous examples of permitted planning permissions such as the newly built unimaginative and bland development off Winterhay Lane, Howdens grotesque building and many other instances of unsympathetic housing and commercial development on the western approach to our historic town will not be allowed. Your mission statement says “ respects Ilminster’s unique heritage and rural location”. I’m not sure how these examples of development that you have allowed in the past fit with your statement? I hope that the people of Ilminster hold you to account in all future planning applications. Over the years, your planning department has allowed the main approach to our town to become scruffy, unsightly, unwelcoming and in no way a reflection of the heritage and other values that you “mission” claims to protect.

To maintain the town's unique rural and green environment and to allow development that sits within the built and brownfield areas of the town.

No

Please see Green Ilminster's written response. Creativity and innovation are key.

It won't be rural with all the new house plans, the school will definitely need to be on site not 2, it also looks a mess when borders don't get cut. Well and as for play the new boat that got put in is a joke glass has been found in it plus dog poo.....

It needs to consider working lives as we are increasingly expected to commute. It is difficult to use the shops in regular business hours. The recreation facilities need to be improved to encourage us to stay in town to reduce mileage and encourage walking

To stay in keeping with our historic town

This vision is admirable, however it must not undermine the community spirit and social lifestyle that already exists in Ilminster.

The emphasis is on balanced development. It would be foolish to build hundreds more houses, when there are few additional jobs in Ilminster, meaning that the residents of the new houses would have to drive somewhere else to work. Bearing in mind the Government's commitment to net carbon, and the shortage of public transport in and around Ilminster, it does not make sense to create a situation where even more cars are on the road as people commute to work. No more houses before more jobs!

It's important for Ilminster to remain a thriving town that supports current residents and attracts new residents, providing for diverse needs.

Clearly open to interpretation as manipulation can occur to suit a person's own agenda.

I moved to Ilminster because it was such a lovely place to live. It needs to stay that way for the next generations so that all can benefit from its community

Don't let's get too large.

The word 'sustainable' is much overused and never explained. Much of Ilminster was built hundreds of years ago... That's sustainable.

The town is already all of those things, allowing over development around Herne Hill will irrevocably damage the town's only natural amenity.

Ilminster is already one of the most desirable market towns in which to live, learn, work, play and visit. It is already stimulating, attractive. But all these advantages will be lost and ruined by building another 839 houses.

I would like a stronger focus within both statements on sustainability for example vision: To be one of the most sustainable and desirable market towns in which to live, learn, work, play and visit.

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

Too much technical change will ruin the appeal of the town.

Sustainability must be top of the list

please don't use leading questions such as 'how strongly do you agree'. I also think the vision could be stronger and more distinct for Ilminster - this is very run-of-the-mill and not at all distinctive. The overall ambitions and sentiments seem right, however there is limited reference to creating a vibrant local economy, with good quality jobs for local people, attracting inward investment respecting its rural location is critical, is already a thriving town

Personally I think the style of buildings are very important regarding this mission.

We already have such a town as described above, but it will be spoilt not enhanced by proposed large-scale housing developments.

1. I would like to know some specifics and be more involved; are you using community planning tools (<https://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/community-planning>) and Countryside Agency Healthchecks to structure planning and help local people assess their town's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the environment, transport, accessibility, and wider social and community concerns?

2. I have noted that the INP working group does not have representation of all demographics of Ilminster town e.g. 18 to 40 year old professionals. The INP-WG may be embracing heritage but struggle with the future looking aspects of a modern market town that includes the creativity, technology and innovation sought in the Mission statement. While I agree with the statement, I am concerned about the current organisational aspects of the INP-WG.

3. I have seen the new development on Winterhay Lane and do not think it delivers on the Market Town Mission; it is neither attractive or sustainable. The housing estate is already filled with litter and looks more like a slum making Ilminster undesirable. A better development would have kept some 'market town' character that marries rural with urban e.g. flowers and gardens to attract wildlife around the homes, and one that includes innovative schemes for sustainable future e.g. solar panels and electric car charging points. Taking into full account of the limitation and capacity of housing expansion and recognising the importance of sustaining the natural environment, in particular the surrounding hills and valleys. You're correct in stating Ilminster is a desirable market town, however building an additional 800 plus houses, including 'affordable homes' will completely take away all the desirable attributes of our town.

Massively over complicated, how is anyone supposed to be able to digest this jargon?

Please plant more trees. Please enforce 30 MPH speed limits, for example on The Beacon. Ilminster is already a strong and desirable place to live.

The vision & mission are noble but I wonder how this is to be achieved considering the lack of large scale employers in town (Clarks, Horlicks, the shirt factory etc all lost in the last 30-40 years), the lack of services (in particular those for adolescents) and the lack of basic infrastructure etc. Even our town drainage system is Victorian and antiquated and Ilminster has suffered as a result from incidences of flash flooding. I realise as a town we don't have much chance to challenge Ilminster's housing quota, but I fear the number of houses we as a town are required to have built will put further pressures on a town that has already had to absorb a lot of new housing and is already suffering from it (flooding, parking and traffic issues, residents unable to get appointments with doctors for 2 months or not able to sign up with a dentist etc etc). Those with power have not been able to sort these issues thus far, so how do they believe they will when another 836 houses are added to the mix?

There is no opportunity at the end of this questionnaire to give an overall comment, so I would suggest that it

is totally inadequate as a sensible consultation document and should be ruled as unfit for purpose. The plans and diagrams are so small, misprinted and unclear it is almost impossible to be clear about the meanings and proposals

The document is also full of unclear planning speak to the extent that some questions might at best unclear and at worst misleading. What does 'public realm enhancement' mean in normal English. 'Shared surface approach' does not say clearly what it implies which is a very significant move to pedestrianisation, this is misleading at best and deceitful at worst.

The planning consultants for this survey have not produced a clear user friendly consultation document and it should be withdrawn and resubmitted in a clearer simpler form.

Ecological & climate crisis is not at centre. A bit like valuing a house's architecture without noticing it is collapsing in fire

Maintaining the heritage and rural ethos of the town should be the first priority.

I hope that the housing developments are green focused and environmentally considered. Please see Green Ilminster's formal response

Not only to respect Ilminster's heritage but to sustain it. To build further dwellings may be a necessity, but at what cost to its history. I fear that we could be losing Ilminster's charm by potentially developing in its scenic views/locations. I feel the title of 'The vision and mission' implies change, which in turn compromises heritage. I would not like to see the perimeter of our lovely town being developed, would we then see our market town being filled with more high-street names to cater for this expanding town.

I think it already is a desirable place to live, with nothing much needed to enhance it.

It's an all embracing statement this would be difficult to object to.

Emphasis on "well-considered and balanced development that respects Ilminster's unique heritage and rural location", especially rural location.

Sustainability should be first in the list of attributes.

Maintaining the heritage and rural ethos of the town should be the first priority.

Ilminster already is one of the most desirable market towns and I am very concerned that the proposed development and changes will take lose the unique characteristics and appeal of the town as it is.

Absolutely agree that sustainability and ecology should be at the absolute heart of design and planning for Ilminster.

I like Ilminster as it is and don't want it to be spoilt

The Neighbourhood Plan seems to contradict the Vision and the Mission. Ilminster's lovely rural location should not be diminished by new housing developments. Existing buildings should be repurposed and development on brownfield sites should be the priority.

No more houses should be built until there is enough doctors to look after the existing population, having to wait for two weeks for a doctors appointment is not practical, sort out the services first then build the houses.

This is a silly question. Did anyone not agree? Our town is superb already.

Please see our letter for full comments (emailed to 'town.council@ilminster.gov.uk' and 'admin.support@ilminster.gov.uk' at 10:35 on 9/8/21)

Vision, Mission and Aims

We support the overall vision for the plan to make Ilminster one of the most desirable market towns. We also broadly agree with the 12 Aims set out. However we do have some concerns about the wording of some of Aim Three. This seeks to ensure good design but also states all new development 'will' generate a portion of on-site energy. Whilst we support the sentiment and agree that development should be sustainable we do not

support this wording as it fails to understand that the context and proposed form of specific development sites do not always lend themselves to being able to accommodate on site generation of renewable energies, in some instances it could be less sustainable to install equipment to generate energy that fails to generate proportionate outputs (for example solar panels on units with poor orientation for solar hours). There are a number of approaches that can be taken to achieving low energy sustainable homes, and not just through the use of on-site renewable technologies, such as the use of fabric first principles. The aim should be amended to caveat on site generation 'where possible'.

The Proposals Map

Parts of our client's site is shown on the proposals map as an allocated site (15A and 26) for new homes. We strongly support this, and welcome the recognition that this site is suitable for development. However, we have some serious concerns regarding some of detail shown on the map. Firstly, it is not clear that the map is indicative and this should be stated on the map – the nature of the plan is that it is graphically stylised and does not reflect precise boundaries for the features shown (such as the extent of allocated sites, the exact alignment of proposed routes and the boundaries for the 'public realm enhancement gateways'). We request that a caveat is added to the map to indicate the information shown is indicative/illustrative.

We also strongly disagree with the extent of the available Shudrick Lane site that has been shown as allocated or development and disagree with the 'existing and proposed routes' and 'Green Chain' shown across the site. Further detail on these specific points is set out in more detail in our commentary on the relative policies and background documents below.

Poorly worded question

I think that Conservation is worth a mention alongside Development

This is not dependant on additional housing on greenfield sites

Not necessarily linked to this plan

Ilminster has a unique character where smaller deliverable sites would enhance this unique form, rather than large homogeneous housing estates.

I would like to see protection and preservation or wildlife included in the vision.

It seems you are trying to draw new people in with this statement, rather than to make a more feasible life for those here and their young. Transforming the site of the promised new school for Ilminster in to a leisure zone has disenchanted the general population, who want this school. There is scant mention of new infrastructure which the vast increase in housing will require. Ilminster's natural environment needs to be better respected in this Plan.

And what about Climate Change? Your inaccurate, confusing and expensive leaflet proposing this Plan used inappropriate language and alienated most inhabitants of this charmed town. This badly presented electronic form is too long for most working people to consider. more could be proposed to support existing small businesses.

Ilminster is already one of the most desirable market towns in which to live, learn, work, play and visit. The world is in crisis with the issues of climate change being the most important to be addressed (very little mentioned in the plan) and all future development needs to be adapted accordingly.

The Plan leaflet that was sent out in June was very confusing and not at all user friendly-what happened to plain English?. The map was too small and didn't make sense at all. It didn't encourage the people of Ilminster to interact with this very important piece of work which is going to affect their future. It'll be interesting to see how many people respond to this survey which also was poorly constructed, confusing and very difficult to answer. A general comments at the end would have been useful for the issues not addressed in the survey.

This is a loaded question. The vision for Ilminster is positive, I do not disagree with it but the mission is overly aggressive without consideration for the fact that Ilminster already is "one of the most desirable market towns in which to live, learn, work, play and visit." It feels like we are being told it is broken and you are

going to fix it, which is not necessary.
Some expansion is essentially to help support the town which is mostly made up of over 65's. Providing an attractive place to live which is attainable to younger people would be very beneficial.
have you not heard of Climate Change?

It is already a desirable, stimulating and attractive market market town

PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

Most of the principles here are good and the team should be congratulated, so far
It's already desirable! May not actually improve what we have. Now we have more houses, Ilminster is already saturated with cars and has drainage deficiencies which are old.
At this stage everyone has a different view like the way it is here.
Not one mention for old people (such as care homes etc)

The vision describes something we already have in the town by developing the town in the way you suggest, it will not be healthy, safe, attractive or a sustainable environment

We already have a desirable market town in which to live and work. Your proposed development pushes your vision further away. Increased traffic in town, more pollution for residents, 2k more people - NHS service + police already stretched! The plan is short sighted.
Already live in a desirable market town
Ilminster is already a desirable town,, care must be taken not to ruin its unique character with overdevelopment.

But the vision cannot include overbuilding in the wrong place
Building more houses will not make Ilminster more desirable the opposite actually,

Ilminster is a lovely market town already, so the question is superfluous.

The sustainable element needs to include prices rent or part rent houses/flats, sustainable construction methods and promotion of green economy and living.
it is fine as it is m Despite deveioplemt excessive
Already is desirable? BALANCED DEVELOPMENT? 'Respects unique heritage + rural location' is key suffocate this with too much new housing?!!

The vision is admirable, but is development profit driving the mission?
Obviously!

The documentation is deplorable for such important consideration
Disagree with wording 'well considered developpment

It is important to retain one countryside
Yes pavements need to be replaced in many areas realize wee need character but not too look scruffy.

retain rural location no building on farmland
Provide free fruit trees for all new housing and plant trees [...] on all new roads

A neighbourhood plan printed with just so many errors and omissions e.g. Shudrick Valley

See attached
ilminster already desirable lucky to livehere

Ilminster is already a most desirable market town your policies will not enhance the desirability but destroy the enviable landscape character and setting of the town by your policies and proposals
Ilminster is already a desirable, attractive, safe town with a thriving community

It is too wordy! Keep it brief
Not sure whether technology & innovation includes industry

Balanced & sustainable are the key words here!

Should use existing site for development and not green belt
No building in Shudrick Valley. No need for houses in this special area. Who put this forward and why?

We are now a dormitory town not enough employment so people can live & work in the town. How many jobs have been lost in the last 30 years?
No building of houses in Shudrick Valley. This area should not be developed.
Mission is great but I am not clear how the policies will achieve it

Ilminster is unique and farmland should be saved and not developed

Strongly believe building should only be on infill sites not green belt.
Your vision is not the same as your actions. Building homes on farm land in the past.

This is already a desirable town - it doesn't need to be larger!

Naturally we would all like bread and circuses. What is not wanted is a planning system captured by vested interests of landowners and developers.
I disagree with the use of green belt land to be used for development.

It would be hard to disagree with the above or with much of below. It doesn't mean the draft plan is agreed - it isn't.

Some policies contradict the vision statement

There should be no development in Shudrick Valley. No housing required.

Heritage & rural location important.

ILM1: ARE THERE ANY OTHER VIEWS YOU SUGGEST?

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

I think all the views should be preserved and it is good to see the skyline of Ilminster being protected.

Shudrick Lane towards Townsend Farm

From the South of town including the playing fields, being able to see the Minster

All views are precious and irreplaceable.

The view over Shudrick valley and up to Pretwood along with Herne hill are the two most important and beautiful natural landscapes of Ilminster. These two natural areas must be preserved for future generations and development totally forbidden. They are viewed by almost every area within Ilminster. Ilminster is renowned for the beauty of these areas.

No

Bell allotments. Highfield.

All views south across the Shudrick Valley towards the hills beyond.

Totally missing the object, you can't just take a few pictures to use!
Shudrick Lane or the valley should NEVER be developed.

It is absolutely impossible to read this online

Views to and from Herne Hill which is regularly accessed by many in the community and is a well used community asset.

Development on high ground or alongside existing developments will not incumber the views for the valley and town below and will also protect against floods.

The most important views are those of the townspeople..

Herne Hill and Pretwood. Bakers copse
Herne Hill Pretwood

Herne hill, nothing to block the view to that, or Shudrick valley, which is a beautiful landscape.

Your view numbers do not match with the description

I could tick all the views. This is an incredible town surrounded by fabulous views that makes us such an attractive and healthy (to an extent) place to live. There are many fabulous views including the north edge of the Shudrick stream. The views from all sides including from the estate near Tesco's looking east and from many houses (including some listed). The views on the top and north side of Pretwood Hill looking across the valley are beautiful/breath-taking and full of amazing wildlife. What take that away from the community.

I'm afraid the map is not clear enough to comment on this. On the leaflet it is too small; on my computer blown up it becomes too blurred. There are no road names on the map so sorting out where the 20 places

above actually are in relation to the new development would be extremely time consuming, even though I am very familiar with Ilminster. Trying to decipher where the proposed developments in New Road last night on the good map were difficult; on my computer it would be almost impossible. Therefore I cannot answer this question.

However I would say generally that I don't understand about developments preserving views because only the houses on the outside of a development would have a view which would entail ribbon development so it seems to me that preserving a view is impractical if groups / estates of houses are being built.

Every aspect of Herne Hill should be preserved.

All views will be important and personal to those living in the areas

The view from Herne Hill and the fields over to Donyatt provide a special 360 degree view of the surrounding countryside

I suggest the council consider views from outside in, all the protected views are from the town outwards. I would be devastated to lose my view if Herne Hill from the south.

Leave Ilminster free from more building of houses it's not sustainable

#9 The view from Bay Hill is definitely South and not North as suggested

Actually I can't see the Map key as it is too small! I think the extra houses should be built on the edges of the town. To put it inside the town would make the roads too congested.!

The area above Bay Hill owned by Dillington Estate- a larger area so no impact on the town. Cannot be seen and close to the main road! Makes more sense than all these silly small plots. Won't impact on the beauty of Ilminster and keep it's Heritage intact and rural outlook,. It's a no brainer!

No

The view from the top of the hill at Pretwood looking to the town and to longponds on a clear day can see for miles.

Pretwood hill across the town and long- ponds

New Road and the view of Pretwood and green spaces below

Walking from Long close across the fields show amazing views of the town and the Minster

The view from Bay Hill over Pretwood Hill from the entrance to Dillington

It is difficult to answer without knowing the object of the view also there should be a view from Bay Hill (point 9) towards Pretwood Hill.

Carbon neutral is a currently popular phrase which doesn't take into account the wider implications relating to home heating, car use and the necessity of commuting out of the town. An objective causing a substantial on-cost to every household and individual with minimal effect

We moved here because of the open countryside...we wouldn't have if it was built up

Viewpoint 9 should be pointing over the Shudrick Valley, and not up the Dillington driveway.

No. 9 SHOULD POINT OVER SHUDRICK VALLEY

All the views shown are good, in so far as we can read the plan which is virtually impossible. However, there are also important views INTO the town, none of which are shown here -- for instance, the many views from the A303 as it comes down from the Blackdown Hills, and on the approach to the town from the roundabout.

I think these views are all equally important to the town

View #9 should be facing the other way (South) as I think the view over Shudrick Valley must be preserved. I doubt the view up Dillington drive is ever going to be under threat!

Looking down Silver Street from either end

Dowlish Brook and surrounds

see my last comment. Developers do not adhere to any of these when they begin to build. Look at Bishops Hull and Norton Fitzwarren

If all development proposals are going to preserve all views, why must we chose which ones are of greatest value? *Please improve the visibility of maps to allow us to answer fairly.

all of them are important, thats why they are protected views

Winterhay Lane towards Ilton and the river Isle

None

Station Road requires further work to develop the brownfield site, before the 303 roundabout

Yes Winterhay Lane

All views are important

Yes! The view from The Beacon at 335600,115000 in a NNW direction looking over Ilton and Curry Mallet.

This wonderful view contains most of the defining factors listed in Table 7 on page 43. It is a glorious view on a clear day. It is an amazing view during rain storms. It is a large part of the reason why I bought my house.

The proposed development at site 12 will completely ruin this view for many of us living on The Beacon. I would not buy this property again and consider that the proposed development will blight my property.

Why am I asked which views are important if ILM1 requires all views to be preserved??

The view west down East Street, please.

Views from Pretwood Hill and the current permissive path towards Long Close

All views that we have in Ilminster at the moment are important!

All views are important. There also needs to be thought given to how the town looks. For example the drive int Ilminster along the Greenway hides the brown until you are over the crest of the hill. The new proposal shows hoses being built on both sides of the road. This demonstrates how Ilminster is becoming a large town.

All views are important. Ilminster is a small town in a rural location. The surrounding countryside, and the views that it provides to its resident, is an intrinsic part of Ilminster and its residents

I hope I have read and understood this correctly. Personally, I find the whole process bewildering and could do with unbiased support. In addition, it would appear that this plan is very exclusive and it is unreasonable to expect all concerned to have access to all information and the use of jargon and lack of paper questionnaires again serves to exclude individuals who may have the odds stacked against them anyway.

On an another point, I do not believe we have the luxury of time in the fight against climate change. It has begun and is rapidly gaining momentum, whether we chose to accept this or not.

Views from Herne Hill, or the Beacon looking towards the Minster. Strawberry Bank to Herne Hill. New Road to the hills beyond the A303.

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

Winterhay tracks unadopted roads are a haven for wildlife . The building of houses in this area will spoil the nature walks which children and teenagers who live locally enjoy . Winterhay lane junction with station road is already proving to be a problem with traffic at peak times with the new housing estate built and with Daido employees travelling to and fro work .

Winterhay Lane , Green Lane, Home Farm Way/Park

from the top of berrymans lane/court barton, looking down over the church and beyond

The fringes of our town have truly stunning views. Again Herne Hill is incredible and the views from the Beacon looking over Winterhay Lane are beautiful, especially so when the sun is setting in the West. It would be sad if extensive housing infill spoils this forever.

Beacon looking over to Herne Hill

Pretwood hill

Pretwood Hill views need to be maintained

Horlicks factory area should be an area to be looked at. Shudrick Valley area which has already been refused planning in 2017 should never have been included in Ilminster Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan.

Only Shudrick Valley to be kept as it is.

Area around Winter Hay Lane

No mention in the whole 118 page document of the historic grade 2 listed manor farm in Winterhay. At least two site allocations (21a and 21b) fall within the cartilage of this very important part of ilminsters historic past. English heritage ID 263965. Somerset HER ID ILM/705.

The map is so bad and unclear it is impossible to comment

'Views' are pleasing but of secondary importance

Winterhay Green and Manor Farm on Winterhay Lane are historically important sites that should be protected.

All of them

Surely viewpoint 9 should additionally point in the other direction across the Shudrick Valley.

Winterhay Green and Manor Farm on Winterhay Lane are historically important sites that should be protected.

The view from point 9 looking in the other direction towards Prett Hill as you walk down from the Dillington estate with the gates behind you

View from the entrance to Dillington on Bay Hill looking back towards Pretwood Hill is a beautiful view. The view from the public bench on the path between Frog Lane and Walnut Place to the fields the other side of Shudrick Lane. This will be spoilt by the proposed development area south of Shudrick Lane, especially in winter when the trees have lost their leaves.

Looking south from New Road and The Heights.

impossible to read map, invalid consultation

Please see our letter for full comments (emailed to 'town.council@ilminster.gov.uk' and 'admin.support@ilminster.gov.uk' at 10:35 on 9/8/21)

Policy ILM1 Conserve and Enhance Ilminster's Historic Landscape Setting

This policy seeks to protect important views, these are shown at Section 8.6 and on Figure 4. These views cross the town in nearly all directions, some are short range and some are long distance. There is no apparent logic to how and why these viewpoints have been selected, or any clear explanation as to what is important about the views shown, for example, there are several pictures which include private properties or road junctions. In particular views 11 and 17 (screenshots at Appendix 2) show 'glimpses' of Pretwood Hill that you would have to be in a very specific spot within the town to be able to see these fleeting incidental views.

Although reference is made to the Peripheral Landscape Study Ilminster (Conservation and Design Unit, SSDC, November 2007), and Table 7 sets out the Factors and Features of Ilminster's Landscape Setting there is no clear link established as to why protecting the views identified is crucial to protect the Landscape Setting. It is also not clear what 'protecting' the views means, would any change in the images shown at 8.6 cause harm to the landscape setting? For example if the property shown in viewpoint 10 were to install gates in the archway shown this would completely obscure this view.

We consider this to be a significant failing of the plan as presented given the updated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) assesses the suitability of the Shudrick Lane site for development against the impact of these views. The SEA states that in terms of visual impacts, there are direct views into the eastern half of the Shudrick Lane site from two locally identified viewpoints within the town (from Townsend), specifically viewpoints 10 and 11. The Site Assessment Findings (Table 4.2 of the SEA) provides a score/rating for the site against the landscape criteria and concludes that new development within the fields in the eastern half of the site is likely to detract from the rural character of both viewpoints. Without a sound explanation for why the viewpoints have been chosen and what about each viewpoint is in need of protecting it is inappropriate to assess the sites against the impact on these views. Furthermore, and fundamental to the issue of how much of the Shudrick Lane site should be allocated – it does not appear that the areas of the site assessed in the SEA (SEA red line at Appendix 3) are visible at all from viewpoints 10 or 11 as these views are obscured in the foreground by the existing built form and only capture the upper slopes of Pretwood Hill some way south of the small site area assessed for the plan.

In order to address these concerns we suggest that the policy wording needs revisiting. At present section 'a' of the policy states all development proposals must demonstrate how they 'preserve all views ...shown on Figure 5 Protected Views, Landscape Character and Designations'. Firstly, there is an error in the Figure reference as the diagram titled 'Protected Views, Landscape Character and Designations' is shown as 'Figure 4' in this version of the plan. Secondly the wording is overly restrictive by use of its assertion that all views must be 'preserved'. This is not in consistency with section 15 of the NPPF which explains that valued landscapes should be protected, and done so in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan (paragraph 174). The views shown are of the countryside surrounding Ilminster, and it should be recognised that the countryside has intrinsic beauty but this landscape is not subject to any protective landscape designations, and not a formal 'valued landscape'.

Firstly clear justification needs to be given as to why the specific views shown are of particular relevance to Ilminster's Historic Landscape Setting, and secondly the wording needs to be caveated so as not to indicate that any amount change would necessarily be harmful. There needs to be growth and change at the town in order for other policy aspirations to be met, such as enhancing the local economy and ensuring that there is a vibrant, self-sufficient community. It would be more appropriate, once further justification has been given for the views identified, that the policy state that development needs to consider the impact on these views and, where possible, seek to protect and enhance, or consider mitigation if this is not possible.

Green Lane Bumpy Lane

All

Views to and from Shudrick Valley

Section ILM1 of The Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan covers the main applicable views.

View from Ilminster to Chard cycle path across to Herne Hill

It's important to have a view

The beauty of living in Ilminster is the countryside is more or less visible from wherever you might be within the town.

Yes, on the footpath at the bottom of Pret Wood (opposite 10 & 11) looking all directions over Shudrick Valley.

Build on existing brown sites such as G and H and the land for sale in Donyatt. There are already leisure activities in Chard, Crewkerne. Improving bus services using smaller (bustler) type vehicles will help residents to get to those existing facilities. The intention to build 800 homes will only congest the roads around and through Ilminster.

POST QUESTIONNAIRE

All important - plan (ie. this map) unintelligible

From New Road to Shudrick Valley

All views should be preserved.

Do I need to visit/test each view?

This question is too difficult to answer.

Herne Hill - to be spoiled by further housing ...

Where is Shudrick Valley on this list?

9. View should be south not north to show Shudrick Valley

17. The view should be taken from further down Shudrick Lane to the valley

They are all important

the Crescent towards Chard

Non of these views will be affected by this plan

Higher Beacon

From Kingstone and Pretwood Hill

Numbers too small to decipher!!

Any and all views of Pretwood and Herne Hills

Views from up Shudrick Valley across and down valley towards the town.

All around the Shudrick Valley

ILM3 (a) proposes a 'Green Chain' as a continuous walking and cycling route around Ilminster connecting up some of our open spaces and countryside with the town (shown in orange!).

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

You have not made it clear what the intention is - are you building new routes, or just putting a new name on existing ones?

Excellent idea. It would be good if this loop took in all of Ilminster with walking/cycling links back into the town. The proposed loop does not include the south of the town. As per statement in the mission part - this should also have external links to the surrounding villages.

Cycling on some paths may be difficult especially in the autumn and winter
Maintaining green chains and creating new ones is tremendously important.
The most used existing foot/cyclepath in green space is the old stop line way, but in places it is dangerously narrow with tight corners given it is shared between cyclists and pedestrians and well used by families and dog walkers

Good. But the 7.5 tonne restrictions would also need to be enforced.

I agree with increasing access to green spaces But not by development into the existing green spaces.
Yes to green chain

Important to the well-being of the townspeople

It's an excellent idea.
It's good.

plenty already however, you will lose the beauty sites so won't need the routes
Very good idea

The map you provided of Ilminster is appalling with the town greyed out so it is hard to see landmarks and specific roads unless you have a handy boy scout with you, Really bad presentation

Good idea, but needs good signage and on going management
Our cycle routes are urban, on pavements
Nothing specific
This is too small to read

I suspect that the reason that there is no 3-dimensional plan, is because the undulation of the land would clearly show the reasons why these developments would ruin the beauty and interest in using walks and cycle paths - with bland, housing to look at instead of valleys and green fields. Where is the consideration of wildlife? 'Green Chain' is a diversion. All of the valley is important.

Very important and will become more important as time goes on. The beauty of Ilminster is the open space around it, which should be maintained.

Good idea.. as recent incomers from North Devon (which is pretty beautiful) we have found the walks around the town to be excellent ..Obviously walks are very important for fitness

Terrible. Our wilder areas need to be kept as such for wildlife. We have encroached enough. Keep developments out of green belt areas and on the edges of existing estates.
Needs better maintenance more publicity encouraging all age groups to appreciate what we have and to learn how to manage this in the future.
No

Shudrick Valley should not be developed - it is a key area close to the town centre.
Laudable but must not impact on the wildlife we love and enjoy and overly impact on the farming (noting the dangers of mixing) that takes place (which appears to respect the environment to a large extent) in the Shudrick Valley

good signposting a must

This would be nice.
This more or less already exists.
Need to ensure safe access to these areas, and the impact on road traffic should be an important consideration.

Excellent idea - will create a valuable wildlife corridor as well as allowing the free and safe movement of people around the town.
Brilliant idea as currently it is very difficult to ride a bike, push a buggy or use a wheelchair round Ilminster. This needs to be an inclusive path which is accessible for all and includes a good surface for young bike riders, pushchair and wheelchairs.

No harm in it as long as does not interfere with traffic flow.
There is no mention of bridleways through the whole of this process only cycle routes. There are many horse owners in Ilminster and any cycle route should also be incorporated as a bridle way suitable for horses as well as bikes

Confused to how cycle paths will work through farm fields with cattle grazing, and where such paths are footpaths not byways
Paths should be enhanced to improve access for less able walkers.
Cyclist off road can be a danger to walkers.
Cycle routes should be controlled. They do not mix well with walking routes.

Seems a reasonable idea.

I'm all in favour of protected cycle routes, but they don't have to be green all the way. As long as they are protected from road traffic and offer a better route for the cyclist rather than having them on the highway. The cycle route to Chard is a prime example of a good route, where as some of the suggested rural cycle routes along the local network of country lanes is positively dangerous.
I cannot comment as I cannot enlarge the map. Most people who live in the town walk these routes already - so why spend time on this?
Again - we would not need to have all this disturbance if the houses are built above Bay Hill on the Dillington Estate.

No

There are many lovely walks around Ilminster with amazing views.

I would like to see good cycling routes purely for the cyclists as walkers and dog walkers get in their way.

Only that I would agree

Ok as long as are kept tidy & neat into the future, and safe.

The pandemic has shown us just how important easy access to green spaces is for everyone

Nice idea.

Good idea

Good idea.

Impossible to read anything off this map

Cycles and scooters don't mix with pedestrians

Brilliant idea

Good!

This would be of enormous value for encouraging health and exercise

I agree

Almost impossible to see the extent of this online. Agree in principle.

There are plenty of existing walks all round Ilminster, without the need for 'making' a Green Chain.

Ensure this complements ecology and wildlife corridors, rather than assuming it has to be either/or

Brilliant

great idea

An excellent plan. It would be helpful to be able to read the plan and text.

Yes I have deep concerns that Ilminster is in danger of losing its green spaces.

good idea

I suspect this is more an excuse to connect areas through localised developments rather than for any 'green' reasons.

Very important

Making it possible for families to walk or cycle directly from home, around our green spaces is important and must include consideration to safe road crossings. Making more of our connections to the National Cycle Network will help residents and tourists

incredibly important for our health and well being, the problem is that a lot of the paths you maintain are just woodchips on mud which is a disgrace!

Walkers and cyclists do not mix well together!

Have flood plain foot paths been considered as, with increase building works, the likelihood is that the paths north of the map will be even more susceptible to flood than now. Paths suggested are also suffering already from neglect - will these be improved, repaired and maintained?

as this is a very unclear map, all i can say is, the more open spaces for walking and cycling the better

This is a good idea

I feel this is very important to maintain the ability to be able to get into the countryside and utilize its benefits

Yes walking & cycling are great way to keep from driving on roads

Excellent proposal. Please provide more than adequate dog poo bins in order to encourage people to use them.

Put maintained pavement next to the roads, dangerous towards Kingstone and whitelackington by the main roads

Many of the routes are there. They would benefit from promoting and improved signage and maintenance. They would benefit from promotion to encourage visitors.

Yes, as long as roads are not inpeded. In addition, a path is needed between Summerlands and Greendale, like there was in the past.

Great idea to utilise our lovely open spaces and make them accessible and enjoyable for all

It is good to be accessible for all abilities to enjoy walking and cycling around the local area

Good idea, but how long will it be protected?

It is all very well to have a green chain for leisure cycling but what about people needing to get to work, where are the safe cycle routes that will create economic improvements. What about better transport links? Encouraging 'local partners' to improve public transport is not strong enough this must be insisted on at local and central government level.

This needs to go further out to enable sustainable travel to and from the town from our neighbouring villages PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

More overgrown footpaths need regular clearance, provide a cycling route up the beacon.

This is a great idea.

Great idea should be just the start!

Good idea

Yes it would be great to walk traffic free around Ilminster

active travel is the inevitable and most effective way to reduce carbon emissions, as well as supporting well-being. I would strongly support a more extensive green chain, and ensure that there is sufficient infrastructure on the route to protect walkers and cyclists at key junctions, as well as other amenities such as rubbish bins, lighting and benches.

Cycle Paths and footpaths are always a great asset for promoting greener activities / travel.

Good idea

Any schemes to facilitate access to open spaces are vital.

Please maintain and continue to clear footpaths.

Where is the bike parking?

This would be an excellent addition to the town's outdoor exercise facilities

I think this is a good idea, the old canal path between chard and ilminster is a good example of this principle in place

Need green views, not just corridors. Country views spoiled by development close by.

This is just a gimmick to make these developments look green somehow.

Green chains, paths, cycle ways etc. MUST include an effective maintenance routine for litter, dog mess and, in particular, ensuring control of bushes, trees & undergrowth.

I feel a 'Green Chain' is a token gesture and a bit of a gimmick. We are so lucky to have an abundance of footpaths through lovely countryside around Ilminster - these walks do not need to connect to make a chain. Public footpaths are a lovely non invasive way of enjoying the countryside - cycle paths are urbanising and spreading our urban sprawl into the countryside. I see developers are already suggesting levies on their developments could help fund this 'Green Chain', but there should be other priorities for such money. Facilities for our teenage residents have been shamefully lacking for years (I know as a town we have a wonderful selection of clubs - but unfortunately there are many parents who can not afford to send their children to these) and over the years the town has reduced facilities for teenagers further. Where are they to meet and see friends without causing a nuisance? The Youth Club has not been running for a couple of years, the Grand Stand was taken down. Youth are criticised for congregating around Tesco, the playground and in the Market Square - but where are they supposed to go? Houses and gardens are being built smaller and smaller, so parents can't accommodate groups of friends at home. These youngsters are our future and we are not providing them with the environment to thrive in or feel valued in. This should be addressed. As for the 'Green Chain' - it might be called 'Green' but I don't consider it a very 'green' initiative to put cycle paths through areas of countryside that we are trying to protect. We need true green initiatives and better uses for any levies resulting from developments.

This diagram is almost impossible to read in any meaningful way the scale is so small and the background almost invisible.

Cyclists and pedestrians need to be separated

Upgrade Green Chain to cycle path particularly around Rose Mill

Good idea but we must retain the green areas in the first place to be able to connect them up.

Also provide more cycle parking in town.

I think this is really important for both environmental issues and public health.

It is not clear from this map which parts are new and which are existing footpaths

I'd prefer the existing paths to stay the same as they are now rather than be "urbanised" and border new housing estates that will ruin the setting.

Can't read the map, even with a magnifying glass!

map impossible to read - dont know

No

This is an excellent idea

Essential

Open spaces and associated connectivity is important. Ilminster has good provision for this and these need to be kept.

Open species should remain not enough

This is important to encourage use of walking and cycling routes

Yes, but what of habitat creation and preservation?

The more we can "green" all areas not just the green corridors has to be an improvement for the environment and biodiversity.

Will it mean damaging development along the footpaths already in existence? Will Ilminster lose its rural feel by developments along the green chain? I walk my dog regularly along parts of this green chain, will I now have to worry about cyclists on what are currently quiet and beautiful footpaths. Will the footpaths be paved? I think this is a nice idea but needs to be balanced with the need for more housing in the town. I would see this as a "nice to have" opposed to a "need to have" idea.

I live in Ilton and would love a cycle route avoiding the main road.

PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

ILM3 (a) proposes a 'Green Chain' as a continuous walking and cycling route around Ilminster connecting up some of our open spaces and countryside with the town (shown in orange!). DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THIS?

Excellent plan (ie. map)

Sounds super regarding walking but don't need a continuous cycle route. Good for cyclists it stands as it stands and visiting cyclists need to go through town via East St to make a more vibrant town centre, using eating facilities and shops. Then down Ditton St with easy access to cycle path west of Ilminster. Cyclists and walkers and children do not mix well, so keep SOME walkways and green chain bicycle free if not already established as dual purpose.

Ilminster too dangerous for cyclists. All routes should be bike or pedestrian only.

We currently have footpaths and cycle paths around the town. These are poorly maintained by the council now.

Existing walkways are poorly maintained + overgrown any cycling routes must not cause narrowing off existing roads - spend money improving existing walkways

good idea

Sounds like a good idea as long as rural views are preserved.

Sounds great

Good idea

Balance of 'facilities' so not all green chain is monetarized. Clearer signing to deal with works + all extra traffic - electric vehicles spots needed.

Is this just a rouse to offset the effect of all the proposed new housing?

None

As a cyclist I am all in favour of this. There also needs to be a safe crossing of the A303 at the end of Station Rd. - a very busy roundabout, which is a barrier to accessing to accessing countryside around Horton and Broadway by bike.

Any help to provide safe access to walk or cycle is a great health benefit

Only a mastermind champion could make sense of this rubbish

It already exists informally. This is what people do, walk, run, cycle along these routes, with children & dogs beautiful walks and waling and cycling good in ilminster

The footpaths also need to be kept in good order + passable. Most footpaths are becoming overgrown with foliage in summer

Your vision to connect up open spaces and countryside is destroyed by your inclusion of Shudrick Valley for development which runs along the Shudrick river.

Making walking and cycling routes safer is very important

Good idea but what about disabled?

Not necessary

We have the cycle path and walking paths well signposted

Will be an asset

Walking & cycling yes - cars no!

No cycling in the Shudrick Valley

Very good circular route with lots to see and good views over town.

No cycling routes in Shudrick Valley. Walking only.

Support uninterrupted green chain through Ilminster & in particular through Shudrick Valley

Currently openly spaces in Ilminster are lovely. Shudrick Valley is a valuable open space.

Most welcome !

Good idea as roads are getting ever more dangerous.

No orange line to follow

Excellent idea

Vision to connect open spaces does not tie in with desire to build in Shudrick Valley.

No cycling in Shudrick Valley

ILM 4 - Any other comments on the policies under this theme?

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Recreation facilities' is vague - what does the town specifically need? That should be detailed and written into the provision. Easy for developers just to stick in a playground or a green space.

These facilities must be fully accessible and of good quality.

Absolutely essential. Having a year round indoor leisure centre with a swimming pool would be a huge benefit to the town.

Recreational facilities are important, but must be accessible to all. And the 'cost' in terms of environmental impact must be viewed forensically.

The facilities at Canal Way are quite adequate and not a priority. Improving facilities must not be a excuse or pre-text to allow unsuitable development within the town area.

No

there may be other places that require play equipment or other

Only if it is appropriate and the building is in the correct place

Existing and old members have already missed many opportunities for this.! but a lot of personal gain has been identified.

Where is there any mention of Shudrick Valley?

Resources would be better directed towards more policing to combat vandalism of the existing facilities

The new children's play area on Canal Way is fantastic, as are the opportunities for older children for sports.

Herne Hill remains a wild habitat, it would be disapointing to see this 'improved' and become an overly sanitised environment.

Additional recreational facilities for the town should be provided through the delivery of large scale development sites rather than intensifying the use of existing recreational facilities because the Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan has identified a number of small sites. The land between Tesco and Knott Oak should be identified as a complete site with an access road through for the benefit of the whole town with a cycle link and additional recreational facilities for the town.

A community orchard; community involvement in providing and planting trees

NO DEVELOPMENT OF SHRUDWICK VALLEY!!!

Consult residents on play equipment

There are already a lot of facilities and these should be protected.

For 400 homes the 106 should be considerable...A swimming pool /leisure centre and 1000 space treelined car park would be a start

I own a property in sea, ilminster with an adjacent 5 acre field to my house. I am in the process of submitting a planning application which will diversify the land from grazing to a new wetland with lake and biodiversity including wildflowers bamboo, and trees and hedge planting.

We have already lost a school!

This should go to public consultation, spending over £350,000 on the newly developed site is ridiculous.

Other towns and villages have far better recs than we have. We should be encouraging all age groups to exercise. Not all can afford gym memberships and putting exercise equipment outside would have encour-

aged 9-90 year olds to meet and use.
Areas such as The Crescent and Winterhay also need support

Provision of adult exercise equipment, possibly as part of an exercise trail is essential.
I think the recreation facilities are very good in town and improving. I would hesitate to stipulate great use of green spaces, enhance 'green chain', or deliver new recreation facilities if they in any way threaten the wild areas full of wildlife that we already enjoy and benefit from in so many ways including our mental health. If a 'green chain' development (?) threatens our bats, badgers, slow worms, foxes, buzzards, amphibians in the stream, deer, etc etc that enjoy so much the Shudrick Valley - including most having been regularly seen in the area immediately north of the stream - then it would be a shameful further step backwards in our respect and support to the local environment.

recreation facilities have greatly developed and meet the increasing population

Planting and preserving trees is good but care must be taken as to where they are planted or preserved. Living in a house overshadowed by large trees is not necessarily a great idea - lack of light and danger of falling branches for instance. So although I agree with the idea of planting trees I would not think it is a good idea to fill a person's garden with lots of trees, unless it is a big garden, or they like the idea of living in a wood. There is no lack of facilities.
the infrastructure needs to be appropriate & deliverable

Do not tamper with the Shudrick Valley
"Significant development has already been done and there have been few additional facilities. We need to know what the contributions will be and what they are being earmarked for"
Why only Canal Way? Other areas would benefit from this and should be considered/included.
We could do so much more with our green spaces to enable access for all. A bike/ buggy/ wheelchair accessible path round the recreation ground would be fantastic and make the space useable for all in all weather's. There doesn't need to more for anyone to do as kids love having big open spaces and these also work well for dog walkers etc but without any path network it is very weather dependant and not accessible for pushchair and wheelchairs.

"The development of any new facility on the recreation ground needs very careful and considerate thought. I live by the rec and the noise now created there is becoming unbearable. When I moved here 15 years ago there was occasional events at weekends. Now it is every weekend there is noise until midnight and occasionally after keeping local residents awake. (lockdown was a small blessing)

In the day time cricket and football tournaments are acceptable but not the noise at night every weekend. I moved to ilminster as it was a lovely rural town . The noise and light pollution created by the development of the rec are now a problem.
Extra sports facilities should be developed away from the recreational ground and in another part of the town"
wasted £240000 on wooden boat that should have been much cheaper

Extensive consultation should be carried out to ensure facilities are appropriate and desired by local people of appropriate age.
Leave it as it is
Care needs to be taken to ensure all age groups are catered for with these leisure facilities. Old as well as young. And consideration of physical abilities of users is very important.
As the last few questions do not give you the chance to put forward your concerns - i feel this questionnaire should be null and void as it does not reflect the true feelings of residents .

we have all these things already - so why do you want to spoil our beautiful little town! Please listen to the residents and build on the outside of the town on Bay hill which would not detract from our beautiful location and heritage.

No

Not entirely clear what this means but we do have good facilities already and I would not support any more building on the current recreation area.
A dog walking area could be beneficial, sadly too many dogs leave faeces uncollected by owners. It's an unhygienic & unsightly problem on the recreation field.

"There are lot of great walks around Ilminster which need to be clearly marked and new maps available for visitors to explore and take in our wonderful countryside.

I would like to see the cycle paths separated from walkers as many get in each others way.

"

Should be for sites with more than 5 properties.

The increase recreational facilities should be contiguous.
Ilminster has sufficient leisure facilities e.g. play areas, football pitches , cricket grounds, tennis courts, bowling greens as well as grassed recreational space.

Commercial planning applicants should contribute a greater amount than residential

Should not concentrate solely on Canal Way facilities

Canal Way seems to already have significant recreational facilities.

Ensure such facilities are undertaken using a co-discovery and co-design methodology, to ensure community input and increase community take-up. Also strive to make as safe, welcoming and financially affordable/free as possible to reduce social barriers

Planning applicants should not be allowed to renege on their commitments that were made when planning permission was given. The sellers of the sites should also be expected to contribute.

This is fine, but there has to be supporting work to keep families in Ilminster - both for the longer term, and critically important is the availability of both local employment and also public transport. I note that the Plan specifically states that it does not plan new bus services, but all the proposed new dwellings NEED new bus services - or we'll be swamped with the thousands of additional daily car journeys. This is a major problem with the plan - a problem that cannot be ignored. I also note that while there is provision for additional recreational facilities - there is nothing about additional public services like doctors, dentists, etc. Even before the pandemic it took 2-3 weeks for a doctor's appointment. Adding several hundred new households is going to make that much, much worse. This problem also must be addressed without simply saying that "it's not in our remit".

you have not been very successful with previous developers have you!

It is not the planting and planning that matters, it is the continuous looking after when trees etc are planted. The future maintenance is more important.

"*IN REFERENCE TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTION* ILM3 (b) requires developments to do the following. WHICH OF THESE REQUIREMENTS ARE IMPORTANT?

Hard to fairly answer this question when the irony is that our current green spaces will be eaten into! "

i would agree if it didnt encourage decisions to build on unsuitable sites

None

Please preserve our town

No

Much more could be made of the Rec. Including moving the youth club to that area.

They need to reflect community need

Developers need to provide a lot more for the town in general.

The largest impact on the area will be traffic. It is all well and good having trees planted and hedges saved, but if there is a high traffic flow all the good work will be undermined by noise and air pollution.

The existing play areas should also benefit.

We need to provide for our young people and develop their future / potential. It will encourage families into the area bringing new ideas and greater community.

Is this an immediate concern I wonder in terms of prioritising plans?

Great environment sometimes in need of more facilities and services for residents to make best use of the area

Why limit these facilities to Canal Way?

The most important thing is to preserve the open spaces we already have and not build on them further.

There should be no more building on open green field sites, especially in the flood plain. There is a historical reason why the area is known as the 'meadows' it is a flood plain and needs to be preserved as such with no more building filling it with concrete and tarmac access roads. If you are really interested in preserving the biodiversity do not build more houses, plant trees to help carbon absorption and help water management.

I would rather see sustainable developers chosen to provide more environmentally friendly housing not simply to King the planning boxes so this can be a real selling point of the town

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

Limit any more new buildings.

These should be for use of as many people as possible - an outside Gym maybe

Ilminster already has playground, recreation ground and football facilities. No further buildings recommended.

To bring forward the proposed new leisure centre using this money every effort should be made, and should be embedded in policy, to retain as much flora and trees as possible when new developments come forward. young, immature trees absorb far less co2 than older more mature trees, and every effort must be taken to ensure that these are protected during development.

Herne Hill has so much biodiversity, this must be protected.

Sounds good - not sure on ethics

"Development should support the inclusion of new residents into the town by growing recreational opportunities for the larger population.

Development should be characteristic of a market town that marries the urban and the rural to keep green corridors for wildlife to navigate e.g. hedgehogs, deer.

The development must keep hedgerows and trees or plant more to reduce the risk of flooding and land slides.

"Parking is a consideration also toilets and food & drink

More focus should be put on preserving areas that are already great natural habitat than trying to recreate once destroyed

Need to have better traffic controls in that area, as motorists do not do 30 MPH

Why in the whole 118 page document is there no mention of future schooling in ilminster.

An accessible pathway running completely around the Recreation Ground would be a great improvement.

Yes Ilminster needs more recreation facilities, but I am extremely concerned by the fact that the site you propose for these facilities is the site SCC have set aside for a potential new school. SCC state this is still the case, so I find it disturbing that a Governor of Wadham School and member of Ilminster Town Council has put this site forward for a possible new use. There is supposed to be no preconception of an outcome before consultations. The Neighbourhood Plan was drafted before the SCC made their decision about the school restructure, so I find it disturbing and improper this has happened. The site you are referring to under this Policy is still supposed to be a site for a potential new school.

The plans and diagrams are confusing unclear and essentially meaningless

An outdoor gym area for both adults and children to use. A play area for children for imaginative play should be created similar to Wildplay at Underway in Combe St Nicholas please see Green Ilminster's formal response

Plenty of recreational facilities already in the Canal Way area

All developments including Hort Bridge should be required to make contributions

This would be easier to answer with some more detail in "recreation facilities".

An outdoor gym area for both adults and children to use. A play area for children for imaginative play should be created similar to Wildplay at Underway in Combe St Nicholas

Need to know what you are planning and what the benefits and costs will be

I think the existing facilities such as the public tennis courts need looking after better before plans for further recreation facilities are implemented

Nature and the countryside benefits everybody. New recreation facilities will not compensate for the loss of countryside/ Ilminster's rural setting.

"Please see our letter for full comments (emailed to 'town.council@ilminster.gov.uk' and 'admin.support@ilminster.gov.uk' at 10:35 on 9/8/21)

Policy ILM2 and ILM3 Local Green Spaces

Policy ILM2 Conserve and Enhance Ilminster's Ecology, Species and Habitats, and Policy ILM3 Enhance and Connect Local Green Open Spaces with a 'Green Chain' both set out details of the proposed 'Green Chain' shown on the Proposals Map. This is described in ILM3 as well signposted 'Green Chain' of designated local green spaces. The local green spaces listed under the policy include areas that cross the Shudrick Lane site along the Shudrick Valley Stream. We strongly object to both the terminology used in the policy wording and also to the route shown crossing our client's site.

A Local Green Space is a specific type of nationally recognised landscape designation intended for communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. The designation should only be used where the space meets the following criteria (para 102 of the NPPF):

a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;

b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

However, the NP shows 17 proposed new Local Green Spaces including the woodland on Pretwood Hill.

Albeit on Figure 5 'Existing Access and Movement' the Pretwood Hill local Green Space designation, and the one for Herne Hill to the south west of the town, are not shown.

We do not consider that there has been sufficient evidence set out to demonstrate that 'Local Green Space' is the most appropriate designation for the NP to use in order to afford policy protection to these green areas. We suggest that an alternative term is used, such as 'informal green space'. The plan can still continue to seek protection for these areas but they would not be afforded the disproportionately onerous level of protection established through Local Green Space Designation.

Furthermore, we request that the 'Proposed walking route' shown that crosses the Shudrick Lane site, both east to west along Shudrick Stream, and crossing the site southwards up the hill to Pretwood Copse is removed. There are statutory processes in place for seeking rights of access to land through the establishment of a Public Right of Way. It is not appropriate for a neighbourhood plan to seek to establish a walking route over private land where there is no right to access. The route being shown along the Shudrick Stream is currently open to the public on an informal basis as a Permissive Path, and whilst there is no intention at present to remove this access and close off the route to the public, we object to a formalisation of this access through designation as a walking route in the Neighbourhood Plan.

With regard to the other path that crosses the site to the south, there is no right of any kind in place at present to allow the public to access this area. This is private land and it is wholly inappropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to propose this link. That being said, if the true extent of the Shudrick Lane site were to be allocated for residential development in the NP there would be scope for our clients to work with the NP group to establish links through the development site to the countryside beyond, and this could be secured as part of an allocation of the site for development.

The proposed route of the Ilminster Green Chain (shown in orange on the proposals map) also crosses the Shudrick Lane site. Our comments with regards to objection of any formalised right to access being sought through the neighbourhood plan set out above in relation to the walking route is equally applicable to this designation. We also object to this route being shown across the site in this way.

Finally, with regard to the policy wording of ILM2, we consider the terminology needs to be revisited. The Policy at present requires at least one new tree to be planted per each new bedroom built, and every tree lost should be replaced with two. This is overly prescriptive and should be reworded. We do not disagree with the aspiration that existing trees should be protected where possible and replaced where lost, nor to the sentiment that new development should be accompanied with additional planting. However, the specifics of this policy wording risk causing issues for the application of this policy as it is overly specific. The same aim could be achieved by encouraging developments to secure a net increase in trees. Similarly point 'd' of the policy states development will be required to 'Provide as a minimum, a 10-metre buffer zone adjacent to existing and new habitats'. This wording is imprecise and, arguably, impossible to comply with; if a 10m buffer is required from all existing habitats then no new development could be accommodated anywhere on any green-field site as agricultural grassland is a 'habitat'.

“

Canal Way is a key area for recreational facilities.

No trees older than fifteen years should be felled. Two trees per bedroom is minimum. Gigantic fines should be employed to deter environmental malpractice.

Utilise unused buildings on or around this site to encourage other sports groups. A cafe would be useful and welcoming to all.

Regarding the recreation ground. It's a real asset to the town and would hate to see too many 'facilities'. Green space!

PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

Any other comments on the policies under this theme?

Make facilities for all age groups in the recreation area. Static exercise equipment, moving chess board. Developers hardly ever give promised facilities.

These things need to already be in place. The town has significantly grown in the last 20 years or so. New recreational facilities are long overdue.

Money would be better spent preserving existing facilities

We already have a green space

We already have football, cricket, tennis and bowls and a playground

Heat protection will be more important what facilities are these? Are they for all ages and also for those with disabilities + outside seating.

Further development/housing at the foot of Herne Hill will ruin it ...

We can't make everything perfect Ilminster is quirky and all the better for it.

Yes - Leave Shudrick Valley alone

undrrstand more houses needed not on green spaces

The town has sufficient recreational facilities already

A path around the Recreation Ground would be a great asset

Problem with parking - disabled parking

Any planning for that area of town should be scaled down significantly. No infrastructure and adverse effect on flora and fauna.

Brownfield areas should be developed fast.

Why are more needed? Existing ones very good.

There is enough planned housing in Ilminster. Brown areas should be developed first.

Important

Flora must be native. Trees protected by covenant or TPO

Depends on facilities and whether they will be used. Clamour for a swimming pool must not forget the running costs as not one pool in UK makes a profit.

Develop brownfield areas first before green spaces

ILM6 (continued) Any other comments on how you would describe Ilminster's function

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

If we are not careful, and over develop, then Ilminster will become just another large market town that loses its' identity. Its uniqueness is being a SMALL attractive town within a rural environment.

A unique town, with a very friendly, open character, needs to be protected, at all costs. The Town Council will, hopefully, represent the town and its' people, rather than succumb to the power plays of developers.

All of the above

No

To maintain the unique sense of community

Has been really good to bring up a family and be brought up in for over 50 yrs. This is a dreadful outlook/ Plan and will be probably moving on if goes ahead. Tightly controlled development that does not destroy the character or Countryside aspect. Of the town.

A Dormer town without employment

Good place to live

The attraction is the small town feel, community and local shops

Perfect - just the way it is!

Ilminster is a place which has a strong community and this must be considered to not dilute it with more development.

Different business to be encouraged. Home wares shop? Children's clothing and toys shop

A good family orientated town with schools, easy access to shops. Unfortunately Tesco has distorted the old traffic system. A new traffic flow system should be worked out.

I moved here 9 months ago and think ilminster is a beautiful market town. There is very little in the way of encouraging tourism here though and I am keen to help this by developing a unique bespoke glamping visitor centre in sea.

Building a car park to connect people to nature?

"Shrudrick valley is visible when entering the town. Our changing lives dictate we need these areas to breath.

Over the past 15 months of lockdowns so many of us have relied on these spaces for our mental health and well being. Wildlife always visible. Our market town would be swamped and even loose it's charm.

During the recent rain storms the natural springs really over flowed damaging the fields in the shrudrick valley and crops to fail. Housing will only increase the flooding."

I think a combination of the top two

Ilminster prides itself on respect for people and the environment within which it is blessed to sit. Fairtrade, environment groups, support to food banks and those others in need are all parts of the function of Ilminster. It is what makes it so attractive to people not wanting to have a negative impact on the natural and human environment.

the growing population has increased inspiring people that benefit the town in many ways.

I would have liked to tick several of the above including 'unique market town' and 'beautiful place in which to live, work and play'.

It is not a machine with a function to be marketed, it is a community.

Unique and friendly, this is as a result of it relatively small population, which makes it easier for people to get to know each other.

Do not build houses on green belts

I wish I could say all of the above - but we have a long way to go

Sanctuary away from busier/more developed towns such as Taunton and Yeovil.

First and foremost it is people's home and needs to function well for those that live in it. Visitors are all well and good but they will always come if there is a good cafe, park and parking. We should maintain the look of a small historic town but concentrate on providing outstanding care and support to its residents.

To enable residents to live in harmony with each other with the opportunity to provide facilities for all age groups and a wide variety of interests but still being considerate to each other and provide a caring environment to all people and the surrounding wildlife, fauna and flora

As a relatively new perso to the area I have been blown away by the community spirit during what has been a challenging time for everyone

A geme in Somerset

Why have you limited this to one choice? Why not give a score for each of these descriptors?

As per before This Questionnaire is biased - so how can I write what I want to say?

We want the town to thrive, but to do that you need to plan sensibly and LISTEN to what the residents say.

Build on the outer limits - Bay Hill above the town. It is already a lovely place to live . You have the old sites on the edge of the town to put Businesses on - so use it!

A town with unique combination of everything you need, and nature and countryside on the doorstep.

No

Large and very active church community.

To be a safe, all age friendly place in which to live.

Over development will kill the 'unique' 'beautiful' market town

A hub for mainly independent traders offering a wide choice of goods, keep the large chains away.

Although Ilminster is known as an historic market town, it is clearly much more to the residents. It is also a peaceful, yet thriving town to live and work and relax.

Ilminster is an historic market town (but not unique except in the sense that every town is unique), it is a great place to live, work and play, it needs to become a more dynamic place for business, enterprise, creativity and innovation, it is an attractive centre for shopping, leisure and recreation, it could become a visitor destination with more tourist orientated provision, and it could become a place that connects people to the historic and natural environment. The potential exists for all this with the appropriate support.

"The existing cycle paths need attention and repairs, these paths need more signage as cyclist find walk-

er's and their dogs take over cycle lanes. I have stopped using them and now cycle on the roads and lanes around Ilminster!!!!

“

ILM 5: these questions are very ambiguous, and it is unclear which area is encompassed by 'the west of Ilminster'.

The online selection does not allow more than ONE selection but the paper survey states tick up to 6 boxes????!!

In your description of Ilminster Today in the Plan (Pg 24) you totally omit any reference to the Religious/Spiritual facilities for inhabitants. Ilminster has five churches/faith groups all meeting at least once weekly - often more - and making a very important/vital contribution to the life of the town (Anglican, Catholic, Quakers, Gospel Hall, Community Church)

Ilminster has a fantastic opportunity to capitalise on business and personal moves towards a mix of office and "local to home" working. Recognising this hybrid work movement by providing flexible business "hub" facilities in addition to public transport services that are actually useful to people in work, would contribute greatly to the aims of carbon-neutrality, environment friendliness and keeping working-age families in the local area.

Hopefully as a safe friendly small town with local shopping and open access to the countryside

you only allow one answer??? why?

It might be described that Ilminster has minimal facilities in terms of shopping, leisure and recreation but current residents have chosen to live here with the current facilities available. With a short drive to large towns like Yeovil and Taunton, a small market town like Ilminster doesn't have a necessity for such large-scale facilities. As 'rural' residents, we made the decision to live here fully aware we would have to travel for bigger facilities!

None

Theatres Trust has some interest in the proposed plan because Ilminster contains a theatre, the Warehouse. Alongside this there are other cultural facilities in the town such as the Meeting House Art Centre as well as a number of pubs and other social and community facilities. These have an important role in supporting the well-being of local people and the strength and function of the town centre. We consider the plan and its effectiveness would be enhanced through Policy ILM6, or a separate bespoke policy, supporting these facilities and protecting them from unnecessary loss.

The centre of Ilminster is beautiful. However past planning permissions have allowed some truly horrendous commercial and domestic developments which blight the town. YOU MUST DO BETTER in order to preserve the heritage for future generations.

A small balanced rural economy

No

Attractive centre for shopping and leisure

Please see Green Ilminster's written response.

I find Ilminster increasingly backwater and scruffy. After 20 years we are looking to move away. The overgrown pavements and litter make the place unkempt and neglected. The pubs are lacklustre and restaurants limited.

Friendly small town.

Ilminster is a charming, welcoming town. It is important to keep this community feel as we move forward and make the town even better

Essentially quaint, characterful, respecting our historic presence. Good strong community of mutual help and support.

It should be possible to tick more than one box, these are complimentary not exclusive. Ilminster is a unique historic market town and a beautiful place to live, work, play and learn. It is an attractive place to come and shop and relax, and an interesting historical town to visit and learn about our history.

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

Limiting speeding traffic and heavy traffic through the town.

It would be great if Ilminster were a bit more dynamic to try and keep some young people in the town

Community hub for surrounding villages

Ilminster acts as a town centre for many other nearby hamlets and villages, drawing significant footfall at peak times for both retail and services. If Ilminster is to survive the 'decline of the high street' however, more space must be provided for start-up and scale-up businesses in different sectors, including shared office spaces, meeting rooms, and workshops for creative and light industrial sectors.

I feel that Ilminster's character might be missed due to speed and volume of traffic using the B3168. I.e how many people drive through Ilminster, not to it. I'm not sure what percentage of traffic actually frequents the shops etc? It would be interesting to know.

If you push too hard to create something big you will lose all the charm that the small town currently has

Town surrounded by countryside. No more houses needed using up the green fields around the town. Views of countryside from all areas add to the attractiveness of the whole town.

Ilminster is a Beautiful Place to live and work.

Ilminster must develop to ensure that those who grow up here can afford to stay here if they wish.

There are some elements in each of the descriptions that describe Ilminster - but not fully. Ilminster has always been a town that has attracted visitors, but Ilminster often seems to fail to take advantage of this. As an example, many criticise the area in front of Tesco and through Swan Precinct and suggest a much better introduction for visitors to the town could have been created (many feel ground floor flats in Swan Precinct should have been shops). Also despite being suggested for years, there is still no parking for coaches which could bring day-trippers to the town. The INP proposes visitor accommodation and eco-tourism facilities, but surely these things should grow organically as the need for them is realised, therefore I don't feel it should be a proposal, but the INP/the town should play its part in supporting those willing to invest in such enterprises.

Need to encourage more visitor accommodation. Promote visitor attractions

Visitors appreciate Ilminster as it is. They like being able to park easily

Ilminster is a small town which is attractive to visitors due to its shops, historic buildings and rural setting. It has great potential for tourism, provided these things are preserved and areas that are less attractive are improved.

I find this question confusing - is it about current or future function?

Has everything you need.

Ilminster provides generous scenic walking provisions for its residences, which enhances the town's environment especially during lockdown. This is particularly attractive for the current trend of remote working.

an exemplary centre for Climate Change and environmental practice

Ilminster needs to be a self contained environment that offers education, work and leisure facilities all in a low impact ecological way. It's important to develop new businesses as well as supporting existing ones to offer employment to local people and to reduce the amount of people commuting. Less carbon emissions etc... At the moment Ilminster can still qualify for UNSPOILT unique historic market town that is a beautiful place to live, work and relax. Please let's keep it that way. I used to live in St Ives Cornwall and I have seen first hand what has been done to that town in the name of progress and "enhancement"...

A small market town with a strong sense of community and support for each other, smaller and quieter than other similar towns in Somerset.

PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

These are already Ilminster's attributes, but some visions and missions could seriously jeopardise what we already have.

Lovely as it is.

Not too many just holiday homes

An increasingly busy town, with already far too much traffic. Speed limits are ignored. There is not enough parking for the population now.

Small pleasant town in which to live. It is not yet overcrowded which is why I moved here! Improvements to prevent speeding traffic long overdue.

As a tourist destination. A historic, thriving typical English market town in a beautiful rural setting. As such, it is vital that the farmland to the South East of town is preserved.

To retain its exiting character and charm - and not to be spoilt by unsuitable development.

Diverse retail centre, historic town with some 'village' advantages great centre for arts - helping people not to drive to Taunton.

Its a little town with mot mucj going on thts nice about it.

A characterful, intimate small market town which is currently not swamped by new development but is in great danger of becoming so

No further large scale house buikding

lमित shopping for shoes and clothing

Help for our little theatre and arts centre as important for all

It has few trees, those by the Co-op are unsuitable because of huge roots. More flowers would be good

Uniquely placed and offering a (now) rare combination of modern living + an area of outstanding natural

beauty.

The size of the existing town and its rural location and landscape setting sets it apart from other towns. The small historic centre adds to its charm. This will be destroyed by inappropriate development destroying the valued landscape features.

Community

A most caring communal town

Beautiful town to live but work at what?

Totally unique now. Don't spoil it!

Ilminster is a unique town - any growth should keep the town concept.

Doctors and dentists surgeries should be increased. Swanmead school should not be closed - poor decision.

It needs to wake up and deliver on promises of employment, sports facilities, schools, retirement properties Ilminster needs another dentist surgery. Not enough thought has been given to this.

Ilminster needs to promote shops in the town before expansion.

To not be over developed or lose its unique qualities.

With the policies in this NP and the Local Plan for over 800 houses there is a danger of Ilminster becoming a dormitory town. Employment needed.

ILM 7 - Any other comments on the policies under this theme?

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Any new development should have parking allocation for 2 cars per dwelling - not sure what it is currently?

Using local materials and not building housing that could be anywhere in the UK. e.g. Winterhay Lane development

Green, sustainable building methods and materials must be used. Buildings must be future proofed.

There should be a requirement that industrial/business premises aesthetics fit in with the town character. The main 'entrance' to the town from the A303 roundabout is blighted by ugly industrial buildings. it isn't just houses that need to look good!

Sustainability. Green design. Affordability. Accessibility.

The main priority needs to be where to allow development to use existing infrastructure and maintain the beautiful surroundings of the town and not to use these surroundings and try to landscape the development to try to negate the loss!

No

"Do we really have to have more estates of nasty little boxes, blighting the lives of local people for perhaps centuries to come? Why not build low density housing?"

Don't be bullied by protest as suitable options seem to have been dropped due to weak representation of our council.

What on earth does 'adhesive relationship' mean. Basic English please!!

Learn how to spell "Density". This is all posh political bureaucratic waffle and not for ordinary folk. I can't see that you care about anything other than box ticking and trying to sound clever.

Let's ruin the lot by building on Shudrick Valley. No mention whatsoever of affordable homes

Silly questions. It's asking for confirmation of general virtue - leading but empty. Whoever designed this questionnaire needs further proper professional development. Probably the whole committee. Now, don't sulk. Think.

"Conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings" - this is a highly manipulative and contradictory question. The preservation of old buildings and the refusal of new building in areas of natural importance is what is required.

Conversion of old buildings fine. New buildings should be sited where they do not bring traffic in to town.. As mentioned above I have submitted plans to South Somerset Council to develop a bespoke glamping site on my property in sea with wetland and a strong focus on encouraging biodiversity. I was excited to see in the INP that there is a strong vision for encouraging tourism in the area and I hope to garner the support of the council in my plans as I believe it will be of great benefit to the town and will be in line with the vision of this plan. I would be happy to discuss these plans in more detail when the time is right.

Bizarre. If the Council was keen to promote our Natural environment why would they want to dig up and concrete beauty spots? Leave nature alone and build on existing plots.

"As a town our budgets are limited and we need to keep our independent shops and history.

When on herne hill you can see Tesco's roof which is totally not in keeping with our beautiful little town.

Why do we need to spoil it further. We are expanding at the canal road end and the Old Horlicks site has

land to use with commutable roads on its doorstep. Our town is not built with the capacity of more vehicles." Again most of these are no brainers but they fail to address the need to protect the wonderful habitats that we have and enjoy.

I'm afraid I don't understand some of the questions ' what is an 'adhesive relationship'? With regard to 'selective materials', does this mean good quality materials? Again the question is not clear to me. And I don't understand what is meant by a 'strong relationship between built environment and its landscape settings.' These aspirations are rather woolly. It is important that houses are build in a sustainable and long lasting manner so that they are fit for the future for many years to come. They should comply with eco standards so that they are well insulated, have solar panels and maybe heat pumps, and can be well ventilated if temperatures rise in the future and that they let in as much natural light as possible, with large windows.

Poorly designed and loaded questions.

Use to be made of brown fill sites when considering any future developments

Do not allow developers and councillors to use our green fields for building houses

"The convention of old buildings needs to be split from the creation of new.

All possible old buildings should be put into use before any allowance of building new dwellings just as the Horlicks and winterhay sites should be changed to provide a mix of houses and work units before any agreement to build on green field land is even considered"

Be careful of mixing cycling and walking

Horses for courses here, no point in building either shops or residences that the local population can't afford. Please can you re do this questionnaire to reflect the true feelings of Local people NOT just what you want to hear - surely it's for locals to decide rather than a group coming in to just get boxes ticked.

What rubbish is this? of course we want good workmanship and space for any new comers to the town. But we also want to preserve the environment close to the town as this makes Ilminster so special - No more building in the centre of town Please - leave Shrudrick Valley alone - it's the last hill not built on and is an immense asset to the town in it's beauty.

No

There needs to be consideration of the relationship between the town and the church

I would love to see on the Horlicks site housing & business development plus leisure facilities that includes a swimming pool so young and old can enjoy keeping fit and healthy.

Many of these questions are planners jargon. What do they mean? What does conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings mean? Do you mean more or less? Do you mean convert and retain old in preference to building new? What is 'denisty' of streets? Do you mean density?

Buildings should be built for the modern age with ecologically selected heating and water systems and fibre broadband.

I don't actually understand what the first one means

I don't know what the word 'adhesive' means in this context,

What is meant by 'density of streets..' ? It would not be desirable to have street upon street without green spaces or hedges or trees for example. Unsure of what is meant by 'adhesive relationship between streets and public spaces'? The comment about 'selective materials available to builders" if this refers to only having

the cheapest selections available then that would not be acceptable. Selective in that builders can select high quality in keeping with the style of buildings around proposed development would be preferable.

Again I don't understand these questions. What is an "adhesive relationship"? Do you mean high/medium/low density? What is an "active street frontage"? Selective materials available to builders? Who is doing the selecting? Do you mean limited selection of building materials available? "Conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings" - what other sorts of buildings do you envisage?

Separate cycle lanes from walkers

A harmonious aesthetic is needed that contributes to the past and future heritage of the town. Seventies housing and eighties apartment blocks have mired the phenomenological character and social fabric of the town. 'Bad design' is ultimately more economically and socially expensive than 'good design'. This doesn't mean resorting to historic pastiche or cheap façades. It means contributing to and complementing the town's character, and the community's story, with bravery and conviction. Let's define our era in a way that future generations can look back on with discernment, appreciation, gratitude and respect.

Do not swamp existing built up areas & Listed buildings with new properties around them. Walking and cycling connections already seem pretty good, but there must be some room for improvement.

It's important that the developments are 'individual' design rather than all looking the same.

from recent developments i cannot see where high quality design or even high quality building skill is present

Why is road safety not mentioned? It is essential that before building commences the problems with road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster are addressed with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles e.g. coaches and lorries which use these roads as rat runs, specifically along Moolham Lane which is very dangerous and through Kingstone why lump conversion of old buildings and creation of new together, they are 2 totally different concepts.

Not to create many new buildings

psyco babble. whoever devised these questions was paid too much

None

Make new builds affordable, we don't need 4/5 bed detached houses

As a nation, the public are being encouraged to recycle. YOU must encourage property owners and developers to recycle existing buildings and derelict land before developing our valuable and irreplaceable surrounding countryside. Scattered amongst some of the eyesores that you have allowed to be built in the past, there are some beautiful old but dilapidated buildings that have great character and deserve to be preserved by sensitive and careful reuse.

All new homes should have solar panels and electric car charging points; before major developments proceed, appropriate educational, medical and transport infrastructure should have been considered and implemented. Some higher density areas should be created so that dwellings are more affordable. Every opportunity should be taken to encourage business and therefore employment.

Please see Green Ilminster's written response. It would be possible to encourage innovation and creativity in the way the town is developed.

Don't build any more homes

The building is of extremely poor quality, does not promote the appearance of Ilminster and makes it look depressed and appears as a dormitory town

The town centre of Ilminster is very important. It would be worth considering the possibility of making the town centre a pedestrian only zone.

To help the town grow we need to develop business and residential facilities to attract new families and keep Ilminster a fantastic place to live

The developer who has the rights to build adjacent to Herne Hill has demonstrated that they are incapable of producing high quality, attractive and architecturally pleasing housing, they have demonstrated themselves as shoddy, profit focussed organisation that holds the local authority in utter contempt. Suggest that their plans are given deeper scrutiny.

It is also essential and should be legal binding that all new builds and conversions have solar panels, heat exchange pumps, insulation and grey water capture. Even listed buildings should have these. They have been listed to protect them, but there will be no future planet to enjoy them if we have not reversed climate change by cutting down on CO2 emissions. The cost of retrofitting new buildings is exorbitant compared with incorporating solar panels etc when they are built. The houses on Canal Way are leaching hydraulic salts and have been doing so since they were built. The roof timbers are not fit for purpose, the developers scimp on building materials and craftsmanship.

Choose greener smaller developers that care about their developments rather than the bottom line PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

Use of sustainable materials in construction including steel glass as as hay bale and wood

Any new builds should be strictly limited before the towns character is ruined.

New building should be of a quality which lasts and is sustainable

substantial jargon in the last question - please avoid and remember the lay audience

"The style of homes within the latest development completed on Winterhay Lane are not in keeping with a market town, compared to the houses at Carnival Close are so much nicer to look at due to their stone construction. I've noticed a large increase of debris such as plastic bottles.

Also; there does not seem to be provisions for green corridors, EV charging points or solar technology. I find this staggering considering the government's plans to cease the sales of new petrol and diesel cars to end in the UK by 2030."

You use the term high quality craftsmanship whilst talking about modern mass produced housing - this is completely ironic. I work as a high quality craftsman in the building industry- the type of housing you are proposing is not in the slightest bit related to the statements you are making

Must have green spaces and more trees. Must avoid high density housing.

The heritage of ilminster should be the most important thing to keep this town such a Beautiful place. Developers must be (meaningfully) answerable if they fail in quality, standards & long term upkeep of areas for which they are responsible.

"There are already super connections between the urban and rural landscape for walking i.e. public footpaths. I am a cyclist as well, but it concerns me this enthusiasm to open up the countryside to cyclists too. Cycle paths spread our urbanisation into the countryside and spoil the very countryside which the cycle

paths were built to enjoy. We already have a section of the National Cycle Network, but I think we should be cautious about too much specific development for bicycles in the countryside, but definitely we need to work on making cycling along urban roadways as safe as possible for cyclists to encourage cycling as a green mode of transport rather than using cars.

Whilst obviously I would like to see high quality finishes on all new developments, I don't see how this can be possible when building affordable housing, if it is to be affordable. Having said that, I believe developers could be more creative and more attractive housing could be built with little increase in cost.

Whilst Ilminster has a wonderful amount of private clubs, public recreation facilities are lacking. It has been suggested over the years to install work out equipment at the Recreation Ground so parents can use it while their children play (great way to improve people's health!) - many surrounding villages/towns already have this equipment, but we don't. I would also love to see the Recreation Ground used more by all ages and would love to see tables installed with built in chess boards on top so people can take along chess pieces and sit and play etc.

"

each application on its overall merits

Please see Green Ilminster's formal response

Not clear what an 'adhesive' relationship is, presumably a low density is implied, 'selective' materials but not restrictive, no other sort of buildings other than old and new.

"Conversion of old buildings and creation of new buildings" are two separate things; tricky to make one answer that fits both.

Think you mean density in question 2?

"There are already excellent countryside walks accessible from all parts of the town. It is sad that parts of these are to be lost to development.

Conversion of old buildings is very important but the creation of new buildings should be on brownfield sites only. Innovation and creativity is greatly needed to satisfy the quantity of new homes required and all new buildings should aim for environmental excellence rather than just a few token features."

Houses are still being built with no solar panels or water butts, only lots of concrete.

"Please see our letter for full comments (emailed to 'town.council@ilminster.gov.uk' and 'admin.support@ilminster.gov.uk' at 10:35 on 9/8/21)

Policy ILM7 Promote High Quality Design

We support the broad intention of this policy in terms of the aspiration to ensure new development is of a high quality and in accordance with the local area. However, the wording as currently presented is overly specific and restrictive in terms of detailed design considerations. In particular, the statement that 'Development must be in keeping with the identified characteristics of Ilminster, as set out below and in Appendix C - The Ilminster Design Guide' (emphasis added) needs to be revised to allow some flexibility in the interpretation of what is good, high quality design. The reference to the Design Guide needs to be changed so it requires developers to have regard to the principles and design features included in the Guide rather than requiring accordance with it. Having reviewed the Guide is it very prescriptive in terms of setting out details of what development should look like. For example Principle 2 states that 'Fronts of development, should be bound by railings, low walls or hedges and buildings should be set back behind planted front gar-dens.' Clearly accordance with this level of detail is not feasible to achieve across all potential development sites in the Town.

It is not clear from the plan what the status of the Design Guide is. Whilst we do not disagree in principle

that a Design Guide is a potentially useful accompaniment to the NP, we do request that clarification is included either in the NP itself or within the Design Guide that the document is guidance only, and that the principles should be considered and adhered to where possible but that caveat is included to acknowledge that not all principles could be appropriate to adhere to for all proposals. Sufficient flexibility needs to be allowed to ensure that the most appropriate use of each site based on the site specific features can be achieved, avoiding the Design Guidance becoming a constraint to site specific design considerations.

"

Conversion of old buildings should be the priority

All of the above points are valid, but a balance needs to be struck with regards to contemporary and more classical styles. Ilminster needs to grow, but with a considered architectural vision.

poor use of language, impossible to understand what some statements mean; some contradict themselves.

All new development should be built to be low-carbon, energy and water efficient and climate resilient from sustainable materials.

Do you mean high density or low density? If you mean that streets, blocks, plots and active street frontages have space around them and are not crowded and look appealing and fit in with the town then yes, otherwise no. And what do you mean by selective materials available to builders? If you mean high quality and in keeping with the landscape and existing attractive buildings then yes, otherwise no.

The quality of any buildings need to be carefully considered so that they are suitably in keeping with existing styles.

I would be sad to young working families priced out of Ilminster. Avoid big chain shops moving in

PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

What does question 1 mean, or question 2

Need top quality houses in rougher areas.

High quality design should be concentrated on improving the existing buildings in disrepair. hopefully needs to be better than Winterhay development

Look - just don't overbuild and what you do build, put houses in the right place. NOT SHUDRICK VALLEY

Some strange questions

How many of these issues can still be open for negotiation/discussion. Green is good.

Less of the Jargon of doublespeak please

The current housing development off Canal Way is unattractive + unimaginative. What about green housing looking to the future - sadly lacking.

Suitable shop fronts in keeping with a historic town

There is no mention of affordable housing either to purchase or rent

Affordability. Sustainability. Respect for the natural environment.

The empty and inhabitable dwellings within the town need to be addressed before any new dwellings are constructed

Attractive dwelling, ample parking, adequate spacing of buildings.

Not too many housing areas which will encroach on the countryside.

Develop brownfield areas before green areas.

What does adhesive mean?

Use a section of business not just one

Develop brown field areas first.

All the above are leading to new developments, which means any answer is N/A

Keep environment clean and well

Develop brownfield areas first. Re-use old buildings and areas. More local business areas required.

ILM10 (continued) WHAT OTHER GATEWAYS DO YOU SUGGEST?

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The map has a cycle route marked between Riec-sur-Belon way and Shudrick lane. There is no such provision currently and this is a dangerous junction where the Tesco garage is situated. Although just outside the ILM boundary - there is currently no safe way to cross the A303 towards Horton. This is an incredibly dangerous junction and needs a bridge or underpass to link Ilminster to the villages of Horton and Broadway

a through road from shudrick lane and townsend to kingstone and beyond

Connecting Shudrick Lane to East Street, creating a ring road around the town to make it accessible. When Tescos was built, it was allowed to block direct access to the town centre, (except via a lengthy detour around Canal Way and Station Road). (It was also allowed to build over the only car park within easy walking distance of the town centre shops). This was disastrous for the town. The effect could be somewhat mitigated by linking Shudrick Lane to East Street.

Depends on location of developments.!

What statistics are available of accidents occurring at these gateways

The land between Tesco and Knott Oak should be allocated for a large site so that a new gateway/route in and out of the town can be provided to prevent the build up of traffic around the library junction.

This is also manipulative- once roads are built then housing development follows. There is already a road that leads to nowhere- this is clearly a collusion between the council and developers who have ignored the fact that this plan was defeated in appeal in 2017.

None needed.

None we need to protect and keep our current roads in a good maintained state. New roads aren't going to help as we can't look after what we have now.

When ever the by-pass is shut, Townsend to Canal Way is very dangerous. Should be no parking along this whole road

All Gateways are important to improve for safety but must be balanced/cognisant of the impact on health and safety of people from any negative impact on the local environment/wildlife.

"Why drop kerbs? What is safer about a drop kerb unless a person is in a wheel chair. Otherwise there is no safety advantage to people.

What is a 'green chainxz'?

With regard to the 'gateways' what is planned to make these safer. I am not aware that there is a safety issue with any of these junctions. East Street at Butts is easy enough to cross although Bay Hill can be difficult and the junction at Townsend/Bay Hill can be awkward, although not that much. There are pedestrian lights at the Triangle so it is easy enough to cross Station Road for New Road. Station Road and Riec sur Belon way function fine with the roundabout and there is a pedestrian crossing here. Ditton Street and East Street to Shudrick Lane has a crossing although the pavement is much too narrow in Ditton Street."

There are pedestrian/cycle gateways ie the old railway.

All roadways should be appropriate for their location and safe to use,

I think the bigger issue is parked cars and the volume or traffic on the roads. Plus the huge issues of emer-

gency vehicles and access in places like blackdown. The roads in Ilminster simply cannot cope with the amount of traffic or parked cars.

"Again I don't understand why multi-use paths for pedestrians cyclists and horse riders are not being talked about.

The map is very confused at showing these junctions "

Hort Bridge

I'm not sure it is clear what the intention is for these areas. For sure the quality of a gateway is important but this should not be construed as acceptance of any specific development that may be required to produce such a gateway.

All around Tesco fuel station

Why are you doing this if not to find out what we want. This too is telling us which areas you want us to vote for not what we have told you in the many meetings I have attended! WE LIVE HERE PLEASE LISTEN TO US!

Leave everything as it is as it works! Just build the houses away from the Town Centre on Bay Hill!

None

"A lot of these problem areas are made worse by cars parked on these roads, when the A303 is closed it's mayhem.

Clear speed signs and other speed restrictions should be in place on canal and Kingstone Hill into Townsend."

"New Road is very difficult especially with so many cars parked on the road.

From Whitlackington turning to Townsend and Kingstone very sharp left hand turn.

I find it hard to comment on your list of road junctions as not always clear on your plans!"

What does gateway importance mean? important to whom? What sort of improvements? In the absence of more explanatory information they are all important

Southfields Roundabout

Access from Southfields to Rose Mills

Prioritise junction Bay Hill & Townsend. Traffic ignores junction markings & speed across in front of on-coming traffic down Bay Hill (Yeovil Road)

Making any of these junctions safer is certainly desirable, but depends on good detailing and avoiding more clutter of signage.

More concerned about reducing speed of traffic than enhanced gateways.

I don't know what you mean by a "Gateway" and find it difficult to comment without details of what might be proposed as "improvement".

The short stretch of National Cycle Network R33 along Bay Hill suffers due to the busy road. Any improvement to this would help to make this safer.

It is essential that before building commences the problems with road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster are addressed with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles e.g. coaches and lorries which use these

roads as rat runs, specifically along Moolham Lane which is very dangerous and through Kingstone These junctions are all part of the history of Ilminster, as are the narrow streets. they have worked for many years, leave them be.

None

None

None, there's no issues unless Ilminster bypass is closed for accidents, make it dual carriageway

"With all gateways! Parking is a big issue so a lot more parking needs to be provided for safety.No public car parks Ditton street,Listers Hill etc.

"

There are four main arteries into Ilminster. It would be beneficial if these all had traffic calming. Also the town centre could be a pedestrian and cyclist only zone.

Essential work to be done in a manner that is not disruptive, noisy, with careful thought applied to the consequences for residents of the town.

Not sure of other but it would be good to develop alternative access route joining up round the back of Tesco's so that you didn't have to go so far round the whole town to get back out. It would also ease congestion and traffic around some of the above key junctions

The southern route from Chard

It is essential for the local shops that Silver Street does not become a pedestrian precinct. Vehicle access must be maintained to allow these businesses to thrive and survive. The Berry's Coach Service is one of the few public transport links and it is often very difficult for the coach to turn from the High Street/Butts down North Street, so it would be a good idea to stop cars parking at certain critical pinch points on North Street.

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

The approach from southfields is very poor greater use of the river perhaps a leisure centre using the river as well.

Need a better explanation of a Gateway.

Winterhay lane junction has too much traffic already,Daidos employees and the new housing estate have made it a difficult junction . It is an accident waiting to happen as is Ditton Street. In

The Beacon. Is meant to be a 30 mph zone, but cars do 60 mph and it makes it very unpleasant and unsafe along there.

Winterhay Lane to station RD will require massive improvement with any development proposed. It's already a very busy junction with the recent developments just finished adding big traffic at peak times.

"Not sure how to answer this question. I agree the western entrance into Ilminster is a poor introduction to the town and it would be wonderful for the town if this could be improved and heritage signage installed.

As for the other gateways mentioned, I'm not quite sure why they are so difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate? I think most gateways are quite attractive except for the amount of resident's cars having to be parked on roads, but then Ilminster has had opportunities before to create additional parking facilities in town (such as the Wharf Lane garages site) but has failed to do so. Not sure there is really much central and convenient spare land to use for parking left, so not quite sure what can be done! T

The proposal/Policy is too vague to really comment on as it is not clear what plans are proposed.

Just had a thought about the roundabout on Station Road (by the Stonemasons) perhaps Minsterstone could be approached to use some of their products to enhance this roundabout - it would be advertising for a local business/employer and could be a feature roundabout for Ilminster as a town! We also need more signage at this roundabout to make visitors aware of what an historic and attractive market town centre we have (perhaps even photos) because when they are directed to carparks via Canal Way, they are unlikely to stop in the town because they have seen none of it and may not be aware!!"

The sharp turn from Bay Hill into Townsend is the only junction with any real problem
The town entrance should be as soon as you turn off from Southfields Roundabout along Station Road. An opportunity exists to develop a major tourist attraction here as part of the Horlicks re-development. This could include open spaces for townfolk with educational and environmental facilities and would provide a major visitor stop over for travellers along the A303.

The first impression of Ilminster from the A303 roundabout/station road area is awful. There is huge room for improvement.

Don't understand this question. What is going to be done?

movement of traffic in Ilminster is difficult so any improvements are welcome

I don't think this is a major issue

Ditton Street- Shudrick Lane is a disaster, as is the nearby Canal Way junction

New Road has become a challenge to travel on, especially for cyclists. Residents need somewhere to park though.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Beacon at Cemetery - to slow the traffic
Attractive gateways from Southfield roundabout

Traffic calming measures on East St - an accident waiting to happen.
Ditton Street is getting busy Access to Garage need changing dangerous
I don't agree with Gateways. Ilminster's narrow streets and sharp bends such as the one from Bay Hill to Townsend are all part to the character of our ancient market town.

East St/Butts tends to be a through road

What does improve/make safer mean? Implicit in this is enlarge, [modernise] + reduce character ...

As above - the roundabout where Station Road meets the A303, at present very intimidating or cyclists.

East Street, Ditton Street + North Street. Somerset CC were not interested when Tesco was planned.

entrance and egress to winterhay lane and stn road

Winterhay Lane because of the new housing development at Powrmatic old site

Look at parking on congested roads

The gateway at Horlick Station Road needs to improve by development. Brownfield site.

Herne Rise

"All above are safe already
Just need limiting speed to 20MPH for East Street from Bay Hill"

Winterhay Lane to Station Road

Improved speed limit signage is the key to safety on all "gateways". "Improvements" may encourage speeding.

Hort Bridge

ILM11 - Any other comments on the policies under this theme?

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

I would see no issue with making the whole town centre from East Street to Silver Street pedestrianised. This would have many benefits for residents and tourists. However for that to work, there would need to be an easily accessible car park. The current one way system on ditton street effectively cuts the town in half for drivers so a link road would be needed from Townsend to Shudrick Lane. Simply restricting traffic in what is already a busy area is not a good idea.

Do not understand the 'flowery' language used in the question !!!

Support and consideration for disabled people. More seating.

"The loss of the car park close to the town centre was disastrous for the community. The council should acquire land for a new car park, close to the shops. Please do not pedestrianise the shopping area - it would end up like a ghost town.

"Parking.

The one way has already split the town but benefited Tesco's, well done

FREE PARKING IS NEEDED TO KEEP THE TOWN ALIVE

"A key aspect of the Access and Movement vision is to reduce car traffic. The relevant section of the plan concentrates on the reduction of traffic to, from, and in the town. It does not however address the issue of traffic which simply goes straight through.

Section 10.6.2 of the Plan identifies that the predominant gateway into Ilminster is from the West of the town. This creates high volumes of through traffic, notably along Station Road, West Street, High Street, and Butts.

Unless addressed, the speed and volume of private vehicle traffic along this route will continue to endanger and discourage pedestrians and cyclists. The volume of large, commercial and agricultural traffic is damaging to the roads and creates bottlenecks as two way traffic flow is frequently impossible. In addition, both these categories of through traffic are environmentally damaging and generally unhelpful to the aim of promoting visitors and stimulating the local economy. This traffic brings no obvious benefits to Ilminster. Arguably, it actually discourages the visitors and modes of transport that the Plan promotes.

In addition to the suggestions in the Plan which are designed to encourage and facilitate appropriate and welcome traffic into the town, it should also make specific proposals for discouraging unnecessary traffic going through it.

Traffic calming and speed enforcement measures, particularly on the East/West gateway roads mentioned above, could help achieve this. These measures would improve the safety of this key gateway route for walkers and cyclists, and also help free it up for the public and community transport the Plan seeks to promote.

"

None

We barely have enough parking for the current retails and business traffic. The infrastructure and parking

needs to be improved to support current traffic and population. Since there is no great profit to developers and the council in improving services for local people - this is likely to be ignored, they are busy calculating how they can get back-handers, and privilege from destroying the rural beauty of the town, and building legoland!

Access around the town should be considered, if not possible provide parking
It all works pretty well already..except for the weight of traffic on station rd at times

Improve existing town.

Again, whilst respecting and protecting the wonderful environment that we already have. All of the plan needs to be aware of unintended consequences/ the impact on so many areas that are so previous and attract people to the town and make it a great place to live.

Not really sure what is meant by these suggestions. A question was asked last night about the shared surface approach where pedestrians have priority over vehicular traffic but not coherent answer was given. James Street in Taunton has this approach and it does seem to work but it feels unsafe and is not somewhere I would want to drive. At the moment in the town centre in Ilminster the traffic works well. There is plenty of opportunity for people to linger and talk, as they do, all the time, the traffic is slow moving, and so it is easy to cross the road, so keep the speed limit to 20 mph, there are cars parked along Silver Street allowing for quick shopping and drop offs, and this provides a buffer for pedestrians, there is also room for the cafe to have tables outside. At the moment it seems to me to be working very well. So I would prefer it to be left well alone.

All such tinkering is pointless, the centre of town is functioning. It just lacks public transport.

I assume 'frequent drop curves' should read 'frequent drop curbs' in the LB9 question.
There is no where near enough parking for the schools, dentists, cafes etc etc

The wording of the last question is difficult to understand

Free parking to encourage car parks to be used

The town curhas an appropriate balance of forma and function that should be preserved and not sanitised. Traffic and pedestrians are separated too readily and the current interaction works well.

Need to have Ilminster town centre access to home owners only keep cars out of the town
Consider making East Street one-way towards Yeovil from the Arts Centre onwards and then have parking all the way along the north side

Again - this is a very leading series of questions! Do you not have anyone who can write an unbiased questionnaire ?

We are fine how we are.

None

There is sufficient already in these areas

These are all important. In the absence of more detail how are we to prioritise?

Facilities to encourage cafes pubs and restaurants to permit us of external space e.g. pavements and the Market House.

Consideration to be given to banning left turn out of East Street into Ditton Street. This would encourage

many vehicles driving through town to access the town car park in Tesco and residential properties to the south of the town, to access Ditton Street down the one-way North Street. This will also make the left turn from North Street into East Street around the Market House, less of a dangerous corner.

Good' lighting doesn't just mean 'bright'. It should be warm and inviting, ensuring safety without making the town's night-time environment excessively bright, harsh, sterile and 'inhuman'. All gateways are absolutely crucial; both functionally (can vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians use them safely?) and aesthetically (what impression does this gateway give you about the town you are entering—the long-lasting impact of this first impression can't be underestimated). Would also be beneficial to residents to have 'no idling' zones on certain roads in and around the town, e.g. North Street, to reduce noise disturbance and environmental pollution.

PRESERVATION of the town centre means just that. PRESERVE IT DO NOT CHANGE IT.

Again traffic speed especially Station road, bringing more people into town is just going to make things worse. Please can something be done regarding this. giving pedestrians priority over traffic could cause long delays at busy times, and engines idling for longer will increase air pollution, which will be trapped between the buildings and take longer to dissipate.

Again so difficult to have an informed response to second two questions without detail. Obviously realistic compromises are often necessary.

Market Place and Silver Street are beautiful, let down by ugly tarmac and narrow pavements. Shared space with more attractive materials would be a great improvement, and, given that the plan aims to increase leisure and food facilities, the ability for some of our small food and drink outlets to use more outside space would be highly beneficial.

There are no crossings in the centre of town unbelievable!

It is essential that before building commences the problems with road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster are addressed with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles e.g. coaches and lorries which use these roads as rat runs, specifically along Moolham Lane which is very dangerous and through Kingstone To be honest, I don't really understand what you mean by no.1 but i have a suspicion you aim to stop the parking in the town centre, which gives Ilminster such a unique feel, like other towns in South somerset.

Phrasing of question 2 is pretentious gibberish

None

There should be a "stainless steel" public loo in the centre of Ilminster

Make parking free

We visited Axbridge this week. The pedestrianised area made the central area inviting and comfortable. The congestion in Ilminster needs to be addressed

Parking once again!

Make the town centre a motor free zone, apart from deliveries to shops.

Parent cafes would enhance the attractiveness of the town.

Improved access to disabled and better access routes into the town

Many of the people visiting Ilminster have to travel by car as it is a small town in a rural setting with a pau-

city of public transport. Park and ride is far too grandiose a scheme! You must remember that many people with disabilities use Ilminster and central parking for these people must be a higher priority than it is at present!

"As already noted it is essential to maintain access for the market, businesses, Greenfylde School and residents to Silver Street.

"

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

Whilst every effort must be taken to ensure cars for those less able-bodied can enter and park in Ilminster, I welcome the shift towards cycling and pedestrian provision. More must be made of this, including safe storage in key locations, safe routes in line with latest DFT guidance (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/951074/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf) and support in schools to get kids riding safely

So many cars go faster than the speed limits in town already - not sure how shared vehicle and pedestrian areas would work safely here

Oh yes! Please sort out Ditton Street. What lunatic decided to make that one way and force all traffic to go along Canal Way to get back into town? It is a disaster.

Do not pedestrianise the town centre it's vital for disabled to park outside shops and for deliveries, postal and emergency services

Would like some areas of town centre to be car free. For example the shops in front of the Minster or from the market place to the Arts centre.

Ilminster needs more public parking.

"Personally I think shared surface areas for pedestrians and traffic are unsafe and impractical. As a pedestrian I am not relaxed in these areas keep looking over my shoulder and therefore I don't enjoy lingering in areas of towns with them. I also think it would deter a lot of people from driving into town. Whilst this may be the INP's intention, this would have a huge detrimental impact on trade for the shops in town (I say this as a business owner). I know many businesses are extremely concerned about any loss of on street parking spaces because they are fully aware of how reliant on passing trade many of us are. I think there needs to be far more consultation between the Town Council/INP and local businesses because any changes will be affecting these people's livelihoods. Businesses and the Chamber of Commerce should be liaised with. We also have a lot of elderly residents in town, many who struggle to even walk from town car parks to the town centre, so I believe on-street parking spaces are vital to both businesses and customers and should be protected at all costs. High Streets are suffering all over the country, so we must be very careful to fully support the businesses in Ilminster to ensure they can continue to survive.

I don't know how pavements could be widened as our historic roads are narrow. I also don't see how we can make our historic roads anymore cycle friendly without it impacting on other areas (i.e. parking etc), but yes, any new roads should be cycle friendly and more cycle racks would be welcome.

More carparking is needed, but again don't see how this can be facilitated when areas that would have been ideal, have already been built on (i.e the garages in Wharf Lane etc).

Yes, portions of the CIL should be used for green initiatives, but a 'Green Chain' is not the best option - it is spreading our urban pathways into the countryside and spoiling it (public footpaths are less invasive as usually are just trodden down walkways - and we are fortunate to have many).

"

“public realm enhancements’ and shared surface approach’ are inappropriate planning jargon speak that do not provide an accessible context for a consultation document, they are essentially meaningless without detail and explanation.

‘Shared surface approach’ is essentially pedestrianisation, ie pedestrians will have priority over vehicles on what are now roads most of the time. This is a major change and should be made absolutely clear.”

Please see Green Ilminster’s formal response

“A raised shared surface throughout the town centre and Silver Street would greatly improve the ambience of the town and could be achieved with very little loss of on-street car parking, a major concern for retail businesses. It would slow down traffic, making the town centre safer and quieter.

The banning of the left turn into Ditton Street from East street should also be investigated. This would reduce the number of through traffic movements and ease the congestion in East Street outside both the Post Office and the Market House. Traffic from the east would be re-directed to North Street, already a one-way street and this would again improve traffic flow through the town centre and access to the Town Car Park in Tesco. It may also encourage residents coming from the east of the town into houses along Canal Way to enter via Riec-sur-Belon Way, a slightly longer but possibly reliably quicker route.”

The proposal for shared surface with pedestrians and vehicles is dangerous for sight/hearing impaired people.

Shared pedestrian and vehicular surfaces are dangerous especially to visually impaired and hearing impaired residents and visitors.

Avoid unnecessary clutter/signage/ road markings. The introduction of some planted areas and more trees would be nice. Also more flagstones and less tarmac.

All the planning jargon doesnt make the questions clear. This is not a valid consultation

There is a need to make the centre more pedestrian friendly and safer, currently it’s an accident waiting to happen!

The town centre is already pleasant and safe. Protection and promotion of appropriate main street businesses should be a priority.

Would like to keep traffic in the town to allow quick stop offs to pick up items from the chemist, Coop etc but make Silver Street more pedestrian friendly

what does No1 mean? No3 - wouldn’t that cause more traffic chaos? And No4??

Parking is an issue especially for residents in central town. If you want to have wider pavements with easy access then other arrangements need to be provided within walking distance

PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

What is a public realm enhancement?

Can old infrastructure deliver when there is not enough space.

Traffic will never slow down - people always in a hurry

If you build more houses/properties in Ilminster, you will increase the, already, far too busy town with cars,

this will make the town centre far less safe

Increased population = increased traffic and therefore increased congestion + problems

Don't ruin the park or Herne Hill Views - they make a huge difference

I worry 'public realm enhancements' will spoil the town's character. 'Shared surface approach' ditto ...

provide more off street parking

Pavement improvement very dangerous uneven surfaces

Disabled access. Disability awareness

Traders need to be consulted on any proposals

More disabled parking

Pedestrianize the Town Centre. Out of town parking. Park + ride until electric vehicles.

Central Ilminster's streets are not wide enough for improving access & servicing

Shared space safety depends on drivers being aware of frail users.

Very fluffy no substance

Pedestrianise town centre

Improved speed limit signage please. Make the whole of Ilminster a 20 mph zone!

20mph speed limit in all town streets

East Street has to be 2 way to facilitate entrance to Love Lane. Consult traders on these issues.

ILM15 – Any other comments on the policies under this theme?

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

I think it is very disappointing that sites which have recently been rejected following consultation and surveys (In Shudrick Valley) have been put in for consideration again.

I would have no problem with housing developments 17 and 31 if that area was incorporated into the green chain. Currently it lies outside.

All leading questions not very conclusive for a consultation.

Any large housing development must have sufficient amenities, parking, and link in with the town centre.

"Affordability.

Sustainability.

Housing Association options.

Protect the precious, irreplaceable natural environment.

The Shudrick Valley is an area of especial value. It supports deer, badger, foxes, 2 species of bat, a dozen medieval Oaks, bee orchids, a bluebell wood and innumerable other valuable and rare aspects of the natural world, as it has done for centuries. It has streams, springs and marshland with dragon and damselflies. The field patterns date back to Medieval times.

It is exquisite, beautiful and diverse. A rare gem in an increasingly concrete world. Generations of Ilminster families have protected it, thus far. The Council absolutely has to continue to value and care for it, for future generations. Let this Council not be known as the one that signed the death warrant for a very special and much loved ecosystem.

My home is called Holybourne. (On Townsend.) Meaning 'Sacred Spring'. Behind my house a small spring feeds into a larger one at the base of the valley, and from there, into the stream. For millennia this has been a place of water. Considered sacred by our ancestors.

This ever present water creates a special habitat for both flora and fauna. Just come and look!

What it does not do, is provide a suitable site for new housing. "

"PLEASE no more nasty little boxes! ""Affordable housing"" usually means boxes so horrible that no one wants to live there. It is based on a lack of understanding of how the economy works.

Rather, build more nice houses, so that they become affordable. "

"Provide more parking, to prevent roads from being constricted.

"

The discharge from existing developments (Canal Way, Tesco's etc.) is now enter the river isle, this is disgusting. This needs to be addressed and flood plans noted correctly on your drawings. The flood plan covers most of 21a, 21 and continues all the way to the East of the Daido factory's. Recently houses have had difficulty getting mortgages due to this flooding zone so why build more on these sites. There is also sewage coming out of the ground (proved through Wessex water May 2021) yet nothing done as this whole area is noted as a drainage problem area. It could be coming from anywhere so they don't know where to start. Look in the Shudrick stream entrance within 21a.

A totally disreputable document. No mention whatsoever of 220 houses in Shudrick Valley

We appreciate and support the need for new houses in and around our town, however, the new built houses

off Winterhay Lane are poor in the extreme with no care taken with design or materials. They look cheap and shabby and do nothing to enhance our town or encourage pride in their owners environment. If this is the quality of build the town council proposes I can understand why there is such opposition. By contrast, the houses along and around do actually look like homes where someone would like to live - they don't appear to be of expensive construction but do have appeal. They are a sensible mix of homes and flats with adequate parking, similar designs would appear the way forward.

All change is to be regretted.

The land between Tesco and Knott Oak should be allocated for housing in order to deliver a new through route in and out of the town to reduce the traffic build up around the library junction.

How is existing infrastructure going to cope e.g. schools, surgeries, with influx

If site 15 is the purple zone by the 303, it is a no brainer....That is the place to develop.

My view is that Ilminster needs to GROW, we are lagging behind nearby Chard and Crewkerne

Any new houses built need to have good sized gardens for children to play

Shudrick Valley has been shown to be a poor site for housing; development would have a significant adverse effect on the overall look and feel of the town. Development at this site is not supported by the majority of Ilminster residents.

Again while protecting as much of the natural environment as currently exists.

"The question of the development of the Horlicks site has not been addressed. Questions were asked last night and I feel that the development of the Horlicks and the Rose Mills site should be in the plan. These two sites are perfect for light industrial development. It was said that the site north of Horlicks which I believe must be no. 25, is designated for industrial and housing. It would be better to designate most of it for housing. With a good cycle path it is not far from the centre of town.

The two proposed sites in Shudrick Valley should NOT be included. A great deal of public and private money was spent just a few years ago fighting an application for housing in Shudrick Valley and the application was refused for a number of reasons. I think the inclusion of Shudrick Valley risks people voting against the whole plan in a referendum. People might support one development there, no 26 which is on the south side of Shudrick Stream and would level up with the houses at the back of Tesco's. However the other development in Shudrick Valley, no 15A, should be removed and space found for proposed 20 houses elsewhere. Perhaps in no 25. Also has the field to east of the Dillington Drive been considered (and to the north of main road). On the map this has the word Beacon Hill on it although is not Beacon Hill as the area is fairly flat. This land is owned, I think, by Dillington Estate, and as they wish to put houses in Shudrick Valley, they are likely to be amenable to houses in that field. This field is on the edge of Ilminster development, is not overlooked by houses (possibly by one or two but maybe not even that) and close to town. It would accommodate a lot of houses and could be a good viable solution. But Shudrick Valley no."

The target number of houses is unrealistic and unwelcome. This is not a neighbourhood plan it's an expansion plan. As such it suits the needs of developers not the community.

More detailed information is needed to understand the actual housing need and what brown fill options have been considered

I assume 'DO YOU THINK ARE IMPORTANT' should read 'DO YOU THINK ARE IMPORTANT' in the ILM15 question

Road networks must be up for the task of supporting these developments and this isn't going to happen. Ilminster can barely cope with the amount of residents it has now let alone introducing more without the infrastructure to support them. It is a small town which roads networks can not support large scale housing developments. I feel most sorry for the residents who will no longer look out on fields but instead the tell tale rabbit Warren of houses with tiny gardens, drab design and not enough parking.

"Adequate parking and access roads are hugely important. Also with a development of 400 houses local green areas within the development should be considered. Roads should be wide and tree lined. There needs to be a mix of houses spread throughout the site so families, the elderly and single people mix rather than being separated areas for the different types of housing."

Houses should be pleasing to the eye, to promote a sense of pride in the home. Increase in Social housing to house local families

Sites 17 and 31 seems unique in that they remove any greenspace between the town and the neighbouring villages. This is the thin end of the wedge which will inevitably see some villages absorbed into the town. There is currently a development site for sale on the old factory which will inevitably go through planning and this is not even on the plan. Including this would reduce the pressure elsewhere and should in my view should be swapped for the nearby sites to maintain a green break between the town and the villages. This is an area I know well but there will be other areas already being considered for development that are not included in the plan. I urge the council to consider brown field sites over green and the above is one such example. This will reduce pressure on greenfield sites throughout the plan.

Roads will not take the demand of more traffic

Totalling my acceptable housing developments only comes to 547 dwellings, but the shortfall could easily be made up by including more residential units in the future development of the brown-field site site known locally as the old Horlicks factory

As I don't agree with any new buildings on Canal Way due to it being a flood plain, Most of us feel that Dillington Estate should be asked to sell the land Above Bay Hill which would make much more sense. There is access to the main road into Ilminster and it would not impact on the Town centre regarding the lovely views as you enter Ilminster. Housing needs to be on the edges of the town.

Why are you asking these questions when we have already done this at the meetings? You haven't taken any notice of our views - so why keep asking the same questions?

It is appalling that the previous rejection of the Shudrick valley as an unsuitable site for development should be ignored and you are including it again as an option in the neighbourhood plan.

No

"I object strongly about any houses being built in Shudrick valley, 15a and ref 26 as this would just be the start the developers want. They have already stated that Ilminster would be well placed for future development.

Since lockdown so many people have enjoying this walk and amazing views which once built on would be lost forever.

This site has been turned down three times for planing nothing has changed and I strongly disagree. I also feel at NP there wasn't any photos to show."

Of equal importance is recognition of the need to bolster the infrastructure to support the new builds. We need a new school building to accommodate the merge of the primary and middle schools. This could be done by using the current Swanmead playing fields and then erasing the old buildings to make new playing fields. Building too far out and away from the centre of the town is likely to lead to a fragmenting of the town which will take away the soul of a market town. More building is therefore needed near and around Shudrick lane.

"I really don't want Ilminster green sites to be developed, compulsory purchase of the Horlicks site so less or NO development on green sites.

No houses should be built on ref15A or ref 26 because of its natural beauty, heritage, wildlife and because these plans have been turned down three times before. Yes less houses this time but I feel the developers want a foot hold in there, then build more houses which would have devastating consequences to our beautiful countryside.

My other concern on these areas that haven't been highlighted is the flooding in these areas, with global warming this is a big factor. I have witnessed first hand how it floods in these areas."

How can the Ilminster infrastructure and high street support another 400 houses on the Canal Way site? Schools? Doctors? Traffic?

I don't want to see houses built on and around Shudrick Valley, it's beautiful and I would like to keep it this way.

Consideration is to be given for suitable parking off road, many families are 2-3 car owners these days. Garages are too small for majority of the car makes today, so people park on the road more or access drives which causes arguments and damaged vehicles. Make the roads wide enough for emergency vehicles to access with resident parking.

Surely the proportion of dwellings under ILM13 should reflect the type of resident the town wishes to attract. I have no idea what those percentages will achieve in terms of moulding the future citizens of the town. Does it encourage a younger population? Or an older one? Is it adequate for a thriving mix of people or does it simply encourage a dormitory population?

"I don't want to see developments on our green sites, during lockdown I walked everyday around Pretwood and Shudrick Valley and appreciate its beauty and its spectacular views.

I believe there should be a compulsory order for the Horlicks site. Horlicks site is a real eyesore as you drive into the town this area should be first area to be developed. "

I understood development to the west of Ilminster was always the original plan (the old Horlicks factory, I seem to remember?) and access to the A303, does make more sense, as does smaller areas for housing. My concerns with further large development (Canal Way) is more potential flooding (River Isle) and the increase in Phosphates making their way via this river and The Parrett to the Somerset Levels. Has this been considered? Surely, building in the Shudrick Valley is going to risk flooding in the town as well as destroying natural habitat which needs to be preserved?

To combine 'four-bedroom plus houses' and 'live-work units' above (ILM13) is misleading. Whilst live-work spaces are increasingly vital for a thriving, mixed-use community, four-bed+ housing may be entirely unsuitable (especially if they confirm to the trend for generic, insipid and low quality 'executive-style homes'). I fully support the former but would need further evidence/information to endorse the latter.

Ilminster should NOT HAVE LARGE DEVELOPMENT sites. It is not in character with our wonderful Historic Town.

"The plan/map is almost impossible to read, or relate to an OS map. No opportunity is given to comment on area 30, which seems a good area for development as brownfield.

Area ref. 12 is wrongly described as 'to the rear of New Wood House'. It is in fact opposite the front door. More importantly, it is below a large number of houses on the east side of Beacon Road, and it is an important inlet of countryside into the town, and is extremely visible from many points in the distance. It should be excluded from the plan as it should remain a green space, it is viable for grazing, but equally well could be planted with native deciduous trees and remain 'green'. Additionally, there is a public footpath through this field, which could be greatly enhanced for public benefit.

Areas 19, 21A and 21B are very prominent in the landscape, viewed from all along Beacon Road, and in particular from the Beacon footpath, which you have analysed as an important view. They are also within the likely floodplain of the river Isle, and all the more dangerous in the current climate crisis."

ref 15A and 26 (Shudrick Lane) should not be considered for housing, being closest to the town centre and there being a shortage of car parking currently, this area would be best suited as additional parking facilities.

As a town centre resident myself with no on or off street parking, I regularly return home to find no spaces in my nearest car park (West Street). It has less than 40 spaces and around 20 local residents park there overnight - with many more using on-street parking at Ashcombe. By 9am it is usually nearly full with town centre workers cars, with some Greenfylde parents also using it twice daily for school drop-off and collecting, which doesn't leave all that many spaces for shoppers. Also, whenever there is an event at the church or theatre, the West Street car park can be full up until 10.30/11pm. Ideally, shoppers visiting the town would be better directed to a new and bigger car park at Shudrick Lane.

I reiterate my previous comments about the lack of mention in the plan for local services - doctor, dentist, etc. and also the "shrugging off" of public transport services, though the latter is at least acknowledged. Without these two elements, and without concrete action on providing local employment, we will end up with thousands more daily car journeys and waiting times even more beyond their usefulness for doctors and the dentist. We surely want to improve life in Ilminster, not make it worse. Oh, and Tesco's - all these people in their new houses won't be walking or cycling to Tesco's - they'll be driving. Families need lots of shopping. And if they can't park at Tesco's they'll be driving to Chard, or Taunton, or Yeovil.

only that you have failed to contribute positively to the local area, failed to provide any enhanced facilities for an already bulging population and are building a dormitory town for taunton and yeovil

It is essential that before building commences the problems with road safety on the outskirts of Ilminster are addressed with signage, traffic calming and bans on large vehicles e.g. coaches and lorries which use these roads as rat runs, specifically along Moolham Lane which is very dangerous and through Kingstone

See comment about developers, they will do what they want when building and the council will let them.

ILM12 not suitable for housing due to subsidence issues which led to the road at the Beacon being closed for approximately a year and evidence of ground movement in the field. Since then more cracks have appeared in the pavement and road.

How can you be considering anywhere on shudrick valley. wasn't it rejected in 2015? Or did it sneak in when no one was looking. Building 400 houses off Canal Way would create a beautiful lake the other side of the cycle path with the run off from the wood. the system already struggles when it rains hard. i bet no councilors live there. All in all it seems that this survey was devised between the developers and the land owners. seen this before in other towns, wish i was a councillor, i fancy a new car, or maybe a nice holiday somewhere hot...and expensive, enjoy!!

Having recently put our house on The Beacon up for sale, our buyer's solicitors discovered through searches that the area around The Beacon is "liable to moderate risk of landslide". This can cause issues obtaining buildings insurance and so how could such an area be suitable for multiple properties to be constructed? Winterhay lane is a flood plain and access is already restricted by it's geography. I absolutely support the need for affordable local housing but feel very strongly that in the Winterhay area development should be of existing brownfield sites.

None

It is outrageous the ILM12 includes development in Shudrick Lane. Public opinion is strongly against this and has been previously rejected. In addition this was confirmed in a recent online survey, showing 75.8% of respondents did NOT want Shudrick Valley developed, compared to 13.1% of respondents, who did.

Do not allow housing to intrude on Herne Hill

Regarding development site 12. Existing parking on the west side of The Beacon regularly extends to within 30m to 40m of the northern boundary of this proposed development. This leaves very little room for an access road for the proposed properties and no visibility splay. How you you propose to alleviate this issue?

Where are we to park our cars?

I consider that vehicle usage will reduce in future reducing town congestion and parking concerns

No

No notice appears to have been taken in this Neighbourhood Plan of the comments made by the Government Inspector in 2017 which dismissed the proposals for development in Shudrick Valley in part because of its significance as part of the Conservation Area. Instead decisions appear to have been made as a result of undisclosed meetings between the NPDG, landowners and developers during 2020

There are some huge questions here. Please see Green Ilminster's written response. Pointless to say affordable housing as the recent ones that happened in winterhay were not affordable they are also not in keeping with the rest of the lane. To also say you want to build more down winterhay lane is joke it's a struggle to get out on to station road at the best of times and road can not cope with anymore traffic you have all the older council houses there that don't have parking so they use the road for there cars. You keep saying you want green spaces well winterhay has plenty don't ruin it or the town with more hideous looking homes.

The town infra structure needs to support new residents. At present there is no public transport infrastructure. This means that you have to be a car owner to live here.

Use Brownfield sites to construct housing, such as along Station Road near the Powrmatic factory. Instead of building on Green sites

Ample parking

In todays world every household has approximately two cars. This will considerably increase the road usage. parking and traffic management are vital to ensure safety and security for all in the community. this would be proactive rather than waiting until serious injuries.

Important to have a balance of housing types for existing residents plus range to attract new people including families, bungalows for elderly population, young people to be able to afford to move onto property ladder and for new professionals bringing business and opportunities into Ilminster

I would be interested to learn what has been done to reach all residents in the area and assist them to find their voice to ensure fairness and equality in this matter.

Good to spread new housing around Ilminster in pockets so that it feeds into the whole community

These houses SHOULD NOT BE BUILT until there are suitable local jobs available for the residents. At least 50-75% should be community housing. The residents will need LOCAL jobs. Unless there is local work available Ilminster will become a dormitory town with no economic benefit as residents will shop near their work. The roads will become even more congested. The pressure on local services like doctors and dentists will be unsustainable. If people are to work from home we must have reliable fast fibre optic connectivity. If the houses are too expensive local people will not be able to afford them, they will require two incomes to pay the mortgage and that will probable mean two cars per house as there is not reliable efficient regular Public Transport.

I believe each area need an independent survey to establish the environmental impact and impact on biodiversity to establish which sites are better. I also believe we've be allocated too many houses for the proportion of growth and that this needs challenging. There is also no point in developing if we do not have the jobs and infrastructure to support people in moving to the Town and this needs considering too.

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

It is important that local services can cope ie sewage reducing discharge to water courses

We need small developers building small developments which retain the character of the town, infilling rath-

er than removing fields and green space essential to maintaining the roots of the community. We don't want to become like Taunton, Bridgwater and other local towns which have been over developed and lost their character

I would strongly recommend the councils to re-negotiate with Persimmon with regards to the housing allocation on Canal Way - this is a significant site and could accommodate many many more homes (which will inevitably be requested of Ilminster in the next plan period). 400 is simply not enough.

"1. Flooding: The Development sites 21 and 25 are on flood plains risk level 3 as shown by Environmental Agency DEFRA data. This is relating to the River Isle and Shudrick Stream. The Joint Level Strategic Flood Risk Assessment by Somerset West & Taunton and South Somerset Councils (<https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/media/2462/joint-level-1-sfra-final.pdf>) states that ""Risk from watercourses would need to be assessed in more detail if any development is proposed"". There is concern that flooding is: ""exacerbated by blocked structures and overwhelmed highway drainage"". Before the public vote in a future referendum I would like to a full flood risk assessment and flood modelling report of the proposed development sites and surrounding areas.

2. The road network into Winterhay Lane for sites 21 and 19 are not sufficient for further development. If new roads are intended they have not been captured in the INP nor the ECA Site Allocation Assessment. Therefore the extent of development here is missing details of proposed housing development road networks. If new roads are required this marks the site allocation assessment scores for site 21 to a score of 31 and 19 to a score of 33. Making 21 in the red category and therefore not desirable for development.

3. Development should be considered on brownfield sites e.g. Former cheese factory at Station Road 'Horlicks Site' to limit the damage to greenfield sites.

4. Daidos had ""opposed plans for a housing development opposite its existing factory site in Winterhay Lane because of concerns over safety."" (<http://www.ilminsterpress.co.uk/blog/2019/07/25/ilminster-news-may-or-delighted-at-aido-s-exciting-news-about-possible-new-factory-plans/>) - will there be some location change from this factory therefore freeing this brownfield site for future housing development?

5. I am concerned that new learning centres (schools, education hubs e.g. computer coding schools) that have not been provisioned for Ilminster's future generations. "

Parking in Ilminster is already an absolute nightmare so what is the strategy for parking. Most houses are going to have 2 cars as people will need to drive to work as the employment is not available in Ilminster. Also families/ friends visiting will cause more problems. Garages which the council sold on are now owned by Abri who are in the process of shutting down their garages rather than repair or replace them causing more parking problems. Parking is a massive problem that needs sorting out before building more houses and adding substantially to this problem.

If you're adding all these houses amenities need looking at ie dentists, drs, post etc

Drainage is massively important with the constant flooding risk issues we have in and around ilminster. And with climate change this is even more important for future development.

Ilminster children must be able to grow up knowing that they could afford to stay here if they wish. Therefore emphasis should be on affordable family/couples housing rather than retirement/luxury housing.

"Firstly, I want to point out the mistakes in the INP's Site Allocations Assessment Report. I see this report was carried out by consultants - quite why they don't seem to have taken advantage of the local knowledge from INP members who know the area, I can't understand. Locals would soon spot the mistakes! The report needs to be corrected so the sites within are accurately scored for their suitability.

I still think the Bay Hill site (site ref 18) is a preferable site for development, because of it's close proximity to

the town centre, on the edge of town with a good road link and does not impact on many view-wise or traffic wise etc etc, but it was only partially recommended in this report because it was incorrectly assessed. The site was scored as a development of over 100 houses even though it was put forward for 44 houses. The site was scored as having more than a 10 minute walk to amenities, which it isn't and was scored as having no pavement to the site - which it does. I've heard others have spotted other mistakes - THIS REPORT NEEDS CORRECTING.

Another mistake on your Proposals map is the yellow area denoting 'a site with outline planning for homes and education'. In outline planning, this yellow area is purely residential - it is the area that the INP have coloured coral that is the educational portion of the site.

As suggested at an INP meeting, it would be helpful if Ilminster could create a working group whose aim is to ensure any affordable housing goes to those which it is intended. Affordable housing should not be built in postcodes where you can't get insurance or mortgages because of the flood risk. These houses will only be snapped up by cash buyers (most likely landlords) so it is a wasted exercise building 'affordable' housing on such sites and just a box ticking exercise rather than providing the affordable housing that is desperately needed by locals in the area.

I have heard concerns from Winterhay Lane residents about flooding, hence why I have answered 'don't know' to building in the Winterhay Lane area. I answered the same for Canal Way development (though know outline planning has been approved) but answered so because it is concerning that Persimmon could be building more housing when they are already failing in their responsibility to maintain Canal Way developments already built and therefore are risking people's homes being flooded. A resident of Adam's Meadow posted on social media a photo of one of the storm drains which Persimmon are supposed to keep clear. The storm drain is 6 foot overgrown and desperately needs clearing.

I also feel Shudrick Valley should NOT have been put forward again. The INP is supposed to be a community led plan - many Ilminster residents spent thousands of their own money and much time etc previously protecting this area from development, so Shudrick Valley should not have been included on the Proposals map. This is causing a divide in the town, whereas the INP should be uniting us. Very disappointed this has happened and is overshadowing the plan. Development in Shudrick Valley would also increase the risk of flooding for others in town. I have heard that holding ponds would be built to control the flow of water from the site, but surely this doesn't address all the other water that results from new dwellings as in all the water from toilets, showers, baths, washing machines and dishwashers etc. Surely this water will be feeding into existing systems in town which already struggle to cope on occasions and have resulted in incidences of flash flooding. Young families etc would struggle to get insurance and mortgages on properties on this site because the Shudrick Stream postcode area is flagged by insurance companies etc as an area in risk of flooding. I also think it would be wise not to build around the school field site (currently Swanmead) in case the town ever wanted to expand the school in future to meet future needs.

Whilst the INP state public transport is beyond the remit of the Town Council, I presume they are aware of Section 63 of the Transport Act 1985 which reads 'In each non-metropolitan county of England and Wales it shall be the duty of the county council to secure the provision of such public passenger transport services as the council consider it appropriate to secure to meet any public transport requirements within the county which would not in their view be met apart from any action taken by them for that purpose'. Considering the Local Authority promised after hours transport for Ilminster students attending Wadham before the school was even built so youngsters could participate in extra curricular activities, I find it astounding that the County Council have not considered it appropriate to provide a public bus service to Crewkerne when our children have no choice but to be attend an upper school there.

I request that the examiner read all my additional comments as per the relevant regulations (not just look at my ticked boxes). Thanks.

"

"The plan is so poor and effectively unreadable it is largely impossible to make any sensible assessment.

It is pointless to make judgements about whether or not there should be 6% of this or 14% of that as these are

micro decisions that should be made in relation to a specific application."

"There should be no housing developments allowed on sites 19, 21a and 21b for many reasons.

Winterhay Green and Manor Farm are of historical importance due to their medieval origin, and grade II listing for the buildings. These sites need to continue to be protected from urbanisation. The sites are also on flood plains and regularly flood even with a small amount of rainfall. They are also covered by a large number of trees, bushes and shrubs which are habitats to a large number of wildlife including deer, foxes, badgers, rabbits, owls, and egrets.

"

839 houses is far too many. I have disagreed with all proposals on this basis

I agree with potential developments to the west of Ilminster where it does not impact the views, and if large scale development has to be, I would keep such works with newer housing sites i.e Canal Way. But does not mean I agree with such scale of works.

It is impossible for a layperson to know what are the correct percentages of one bedroom flats, 2 bedrooms bungalows, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses or even guess what a live-work units is, now and certainly not in 15 years time. However the town needs to address what it hopes to become in that time - a dormitory for Yeovil and Taunton or an established community with its own thriving business community, whatever that becomes. It can then work towards achieving that.

Put cap on housing numbers and make it maximum not minimum

Naive to think developers will stick to numbers allocated so set as definite maximums

My grandmother lives in George Maher Court very frightened of idea of more traffic in Shudrick Lane.

No to Shudrick Lane options. My wife's gran lives there. Enough traffic already.

My mother lives in Shudrick Lane no more houses and traffic please

I see no significant infrastructure plans to support such a large amount of proposed housing. Existing facilities are already stretched.

"There should be no housing developments allowed on sites 19, 21a and 21b for many reasons.

Winterhay Green and Manor Farm are of historical importance due to their medieval origin, and grade II listing for the buildings. These sites need to continue to be protected from urbanisation. The sites are also on flood plains and regularly flood even with a small amount of rainfall. They are also covered by a large number of trees, bushes and shrubs which are habitats to a large number of wildlife including deer, foxes, badgers, rabbits, owls, and egrets.

"

There are too many houses proposed and this should have been contested

I think too many houses are planned for Ilminster and it will ruin the character of the town. I am also concerned that flooding will be more of a problem as the increase in housing is planned near streams and rivers that are not clearly marked on the maps or plans. With extremes in weather due to climate change becoming more frequent I think flooding risks need to be taken into account more carefully as increased housing creates increased flood risks.

Use permeable surfaces, stop using tarmac everywhere. Build houses that will actually enhance the town on brownfield sites. Discourage car use by providing alternatives.

Draining/flooding is a bit issue and should be resolved before any building work.

"Please see our letter for full comments (emailed to 'town.council@ilminster.gov.uk' and 'admin.support@ilminster.gov.uk' at 10:35 on 9/8/21)

Policy ILM12 Amount and Location of New Homes

We support the intention of the NP to allocate sites for new housing and also support the identification of

Land South of Shudrick Lane as a residential allocation. However, we do not agree with the reduced site area shown, nor with the proposed 'Suggested Number' of homes on the site; 20 on site ref. 15A and 29 on Site ref 26.

The Strategic Environmental Assessment provided as part of the evidence base for the plan incorrectly assesses the Shudrick Lane site by failing to consider the actual extent of developable and available site area. The area assessed is not the full site as submitted by us to the call for sites and only reflects a small area at the northern most part. This means only part of the site has been taken forward and had the constraints and opportunities appraised fully.

The land available for development at this site extends to 34.2 hectares. It is our view that Shudrick Lane should be identified as an appropriate site for housing within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for 220 new homes. This will ensure the Neighbourhood Plan remains consistent with the policies within the emerging District level plan.

The latest version of the emerging South Somerset Local Plan Review plan is the Preferred Options version consulted on in Summer 2019. This draft plan proposes to allocate the land C G Fry has interests in for about 220 dwellings. This emerging Development Plan has been underpinned by its own Sustainability Appraisals and Evidence base documents. The assertion in the draft Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan that the site is only suitable for up to 49 units is not supported by any justified evidence base. We consider that the capacity of the site at Shudrick Lane is in danger of conflicting with paragraph 13 of the NPPF by seeking to set a limit to development on a site that is already identified as contributing towards the strategic policy objectives of the Local Plan Review, namely draft Policy IM2.

Paragraph 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the following:

The application of the presumption has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies

Neighbourhood Plans should shape development outside of the strategic policies and not seek to limit or undermine the Local Plan Review. The NP should be updated to reflect the true extent of the developable area of the site, and the actual level of housing that needs to be accommodated in this location through the emerging Local Plan Review.

"

Any affordable housing should be based on the average earnings in the Ilminster area to enable local people to buy, especially young first time buyers. Affordable housing should be no more than 4 x average annual salaries. REF 10 Canal Way, 400 houses is a ridiculous number of houses to be built on a known flood plane, this number should be reduced.

All of the above Re. ILM12, I feel that it is important to maintain the 'green' walking route which goes from the top of New Road down the footpath to Winterhay Lane and thence back to Station Road and across towards Canal Way. This provides close access from the densely populated housing areas to attractive green areas, which could be better managed to encourage access (e.g developing a 'Community Orchard' with educational and leisure use).

The houses in winterhay lane were supposed to be affordable houses but the sure are not that for young local families and is very dangerous with children walking and playing in the road have nearly ran someone over as they walk on the wrong side of the road to the spar!!! And what about the wildlife we have badgers deer grass snakes and million of nesting birds to name but a few.

For such a large development, the impact of poor design features will be magnified and hence the integration and further discussion of this site is paramount.

Make all green space wildlife friendly and bio-diverse and ecologically valuable (i.e. not a patch of lawn and garden shrubs or trees packed in too tightly to thrive and support ground flora). Hedges should be replaced like for like. Water conservation solutions should be part of the development. Buildings should be eco-friendly.

Swamping the town with new houses would go against your intended vision of Ilminster. These houses must be for locals of all incomes, not for richer incomers

"All new development should be built to be low-carbon, energy and water efficient and climate resilient from sustainable materials. Also no mention of provision for self build and community house building projects. Housing also has to be protected for local Somerset people whose incomes are often below national average. With the proposed 839 houses to be built where is the provision to develop the infrastructure for: doctors, dentists, primary and secondary schools, Independent food shops (not more supermarkets) etc? Also the issue with traffic and bottle necks that we already have?

The plan discusses the importance of green areas offering bio-diversity-so why include Shudrick Valley in the proposed area for development? It could be a green space for walking with a path to Pretwood that could connect to Herne Hill so people can enjoy nature as well as preserving biodiversity. A cycle path could also be developed to link with Kingstone Road and take the pressure off cyclists on the main road."

Developers must NOT cut down existing established trees or hedgerows even though new planting may be part of the plans. To re-establish these environments takes a long time and wildlife diversity does not return. I would also like to point out that developing the Shudrick Valley after the rejection of such plans in 2017, seems completely at odds with your plans endeavouring "To preserve and enhance Ilminster's biodiversity".

Climate Change is not been considered. Bizarre.

I will vote no in referendum on plan if Shudrick Lane option still included after consultation

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

will any of these be enforced?

ILM 13 - Where are people going to work? ILM 15 - Ilminster will never be the same with all housing etc. (pity)!!

"ILM 13 - 14 houses - ref: 24??!! This would be madness - these is no parking on East St already.

ILM 15 - Difficult to answer this when you see what has gone before! More people - house built on flood plains - homes of poor quality!"

"ILM 13 - Build somewhere else! Why ruin the town we already have.

ILM 15 - With reference to drainage - why build on a flood plain? (Shudrick Lane). Local reports reference drainage problems on Canal Way.

"

ILM 13 - Surely we don't need an extra 839 homes in addition to the hundreds that have been built in recent years!

Questions not fully understood

"ILM 13 - What does affordable mean? Price and/or sustainable heating construction to address climate change + need rent or part rent.

ILM 15 - Lots of talk! - How much control remains local?"

"ILM 13 - A mix of housing types is needed. What [also] about attention to style, materials, good design + sustainable housing using renewable energy. The recent new housing [near] Canal Way is dire ...

ILM 15 - The proposed number of new homes 839, 400 of which 'greed' for South of Canal Way is far too high. See scale above. Ruin Ilminster"

"ILM 13 - Building on the Shudrick Valley should turn Ilminster into a soulless conurbation. It's part of the beauty of the town and must be preserved. Previous accepted rejections must be observed.

ILM 15 - But where is the infrastructure in place to accommodate all this?"

"ILM 13 - Gooch & Housego is now retail and very nice where would they put 14 houses? Bungalows would be nice and decent sized 3 bedroom house with good size bedrooms instead of 4 smaller bedrooms would suit many people.

ILM 15 - Yes builders need to maintain amenity space and although I know we need trees not right next to houses because of roots and leaves."

need traffic mangement in winterhay junction

"ILM 13 - Affordable homes to rent or buy very important. Bungalows usually for retired people 2 bedrooms usually adequate

ILM 15 - Provide adequate parking or each dwelling. Solar panels on all new houses."

"ILM 13 - Where are the 220 houses planned for Shudrick Valley mentioned

"

"ILM 13 - More social/affordable housing required, less 'executive' houses

ILM 15 - More green initiatives. More partnerships with housing associations/NGOs"

ILM 13 - 400 houses off Canal Way is too many. Surely the land on the old Horlicks Factory should have more houses and less on Canal Way and Shudrick Lane

ILM 13 - Important to include bungalows in all developments

ILM 13 - Affordable to mean affordable for the local annual salary

ILM 13 - Mixture of houses & bungalows. BUT NEED EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE A303 + 358 TOO BUSY NOW

ILM 13 - There is a national shortage of houses, so the more built the better. Also empty properties should be reclaimed

This should cover all provisional development

Would like to see a higher percentage of two/three bedroom bungalows.

Lack of provision for disabled and special needs. Lack of consultation with the public. Heritage assets in Shudrick Valley will be damaged.

No 45 bed house. More 1 bed. What about terraced houses? What does "positively" mean?

All new properties should have solar PV & solar hot water

No building should take place in Shudrick Valley. The proposal is not sustainable. Damage heritage assets

Homes are not required. Control of immigration needed.

Policy was decided before covid and any development must be seriously thought out and any disused premises in the town can be used for housing.

No more houses - the town can't sustain it!
Development requirements - depends on the size and age of the population
Many more affordable houses

Road speed signage at gateways.

Lack of consultation with the public. Heritage assets in Shudrick Valley will be damaged, risk of flooding in areas.

ANY COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN GUIDE? QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

I am amazed that sustainability is not at the top of this list - it doesn't even make it on?? The environmental impact of new buildings should be the number one priority of design considerations. This should tie in with the government's policy of new sustainable housing.

New building should reflect local character and be built using local materials

New housing should be designed with the future in mind, e.g. electric car charging points built in, solar energy, etc.

Without knowing the criteria for controlling these aspects, this is difficult to answer

For the well being of residents, A LOT OF light, air and green spaces are essential. A lot of trees must be planted, to maximise carbon storage and provide a therapeutic living environment.

Quality and sustainability

Who are these homes for? Locals or people moving down from cities. Need to be affordable for locals

No mention of provision of affordable housing

All the above elements are important but developments must also reflect the needs and desires of residents, not everyone wants a garden, many do. Green spaces between provide views and outside space for flat dwellers. Space between gives light and an opportunity for communities to develop.

None

Daft question - This whole form was clearly written by a double glazing sales person!!

The houses at the south west of Canal Way are good...

Maintain the character of the town without incorporating shoddy looking bizarre quick builds
Needs to be properly monitored to ensure builders stick to the plan and do not cut corners to make extra profit

Poorly designed question.

As above there is need to understand who the properties/buildings are intended to home. Who are you trying to accommodate?

If we need to prioritise anything with new builds it is a decent size garden and space between houses. It is not healthy for people to be shoved in together on top of each other and have no garden to access sunlight or space to play. Friends have gardens which don't get any sunlight and even grass won't grow or their children cannot play outside as their neighbours smoke and it fills the small space. When will we start providing decent family homes. Living in an ex council house we have 3 good sized bedrooms and a great garden. How times have changed and it is reflected in our children.

"These questions are all relevant to the overall lay out of the development.

If there are wide tree lined streets with grassed areas available for each street, and parking areas for each set of houses it doesn't matter if it is terraced housing. If however the roads are narrow with no green spaces

then individual gardens become vital"

It is important to control a of these but not restrict or hamper innovation either. Architecture should provoke comment and not necessarily be too bland and homogeneous

Guidelines need to be very broad-brush as we don't want all new houses looking the same and all pointing in the same direction. Provided developers submit quality plans that accurately depict the finished product and that in keeping then not much control is required

Again these questions are so ridiculous! What about Heating we should be looking at Geothermal heat pumps now! We have agreed all the above at the meetings. So why ask them again - infact this seems to be a rehash of those questionnaires.

Of course we want houses that fit in with the age of the town, but since no one listens to us I am beginning to think you don't care about what we want. After all we live here and chose to live here - you will be gone and we will have to live with something we don't want despite putting forward alternatives.

Not like properties currently being constructed off Winterhay Lane

"Parking is extremely important as many families have at least 2 cars and most of the houses sold will be to people not working Ilminster.

The houses should be in the same character of the area as this so often isn't upheld. "

There is no mention of school building increased medical services or the importance of the church in any of the design guide.

Good design and good quality of build and materials is crucial if ilminster's delightful character is to be preserved

Final comment on whole consultation: for us, environmental considerations are of a higher importance than anything else, given that we are in an environmental crisis.

No box houses built with the cheapest fake materials.

Give people space, don't make the developments cramped to maximize profit, the residents well-being is important.

The designs must make for provision for increasing age and disabilities e.g. wide doors

Designs should not slavishly replicate existing character. The aim should be a sympathetic style but should be high quality. Cookie-cutter design should be opposed. Large scale development should not be allowed as this encourages formulaic design with one development virtually the same as that in another town. Perhaps limit developers to a maximum of 30 houses in any one development.

DENSITY is the most important factor in an Historic Town in an area of outstanding natural beauty. A few spread out new builds should be the form.

Layout' we understand to mean layout of the site. We have not seen the design guide.

Shame we can't retro-fit these ideas to the failures of previous "design"

a vast improvement on the last few years would be a starter!

I wish!

you missed out 5mtr road widths so developers can squeeze in a couple more houses, but fire engines can't get through. some subjects are so vague its impossible to comment on them, apart from parking which developers hate because they want to squeeze more houses in.

None

I am a relative newcomer to this area but I can see that as a planning authority, you have allowed what must have been a very beautiful character town become scruffy and unwelcoming. The western approach to our town has been ruined over the years by very poor design control. This is the route by which most of our visitors will enter the town. They are greeted by a sign showing The Minster, a promise of rich character and heritage. Then they are then treated to views of derelict land, a mobile home park glimpsed through gaps in the scruffy and overgrown hedge rows, dreadful 1970's "design classics", some truly ugly commercial premises, highly visible and unattractive commercial signage and now as they approach the town, if they look to the left beyond the already unsightly car dealership they will see the rear view of your latest failure to control unimaginative and cheap design. Your aims include a desire to provide homes that "will reflect the character and appearance of the town". Well I have to say that you have not done very well so far. You have a long way to go to convince me that you have the capability and integrity to produce what your great plan boasts.

No

New builds are too densely packed together with minimal green spaces, developers are too greedy Please see Green Ilminster's written response. Construction is a huge issue.

To fit in with this historic town.

New buildings should blend with those nearby. Powermatic site at Winterhay Lane are totally wrong and look ugly.

There needs to be thought about gardens and parking plus providing people space rather than cramming buildings in for profit. We need to think about the well-being of people especially after knowing how important outside space was during the pandemic

It is impossible for the ordinary person to gain a good understanding of these concerns, due to the poor quality of information, inappropriate use of technical terms which are exclusive tactics which serve to keep those in power.

Recent developments throughout the county DO NOT plan parking facilities that match family expansion forcing parked cars onto the roads and making passage difficult and dangerous.

Realistically how much control would the INP have? The developers will start to build and then all the agreements will be broken or ignored and blamed on rising costs. Also Central Government will intervene and force the density of 839 homes on Ilminster whether we like it or not. JOBS should come first, then good public transport and lastly more homes.

Again - think sustainably carbon neutral housing by developer tgat care about their development. This ensures more attractive (less stock) housing

PLEASE READ GREEN ILMINSTER'S RESPONSE TO THE INP, WHICH I COMPLETELY SUPPORT.

New designs should not overlooked in favour of traditional designs

All properties should incorporate solar pv, rain water harvesting, ev charging, recycling area, cycle paths, swift bricks, hedgehog tunnels.

Although I live on a new estate in Ilminster and appreciate the need for more housing stock, I am fearful that Ilminster will be over developed and lose its integrity. People love living here because it is a small friendly town. Over developed it and you lose that

Avoid building lots of little boxes with no character

Please supply the town residents with a clear timeline as to the next stages of the design guide in the medium and long term - it is a simple thing to include but would provide much clarity and perhaps allay fears over fast-paced development
not building on flood plains and zero carbon buildings key

As stated previously I feel the space between buildings and green corridors are vital.

Most important is the installation of solar roof panels and car charging points.

Must avoid ugly houses such as the recent new development in Winterhay Lane. Must plant more trees and have green spaces near properties.

All new developments should be built with character not plain flat buildings as we have seen built in Ilminster recently.

all such judgements should be made in the context of a specific application

Buildings should be inkeeping with the style of houses in the town, to retain the historical character of Ilminster

A design guide is tricky. Whatever is stipulated as the minimum becomes the maximum. The over-riding feature has to be quality design and not cookie-cutter buildings built to a low price and sold at a maximum price. Perhaps limit the number of homes any one developer can be involved with to (say) 30.

Buildings should be inkeeping with the style of houses in the town, to retain the historical character of Ilminster

Green Ilminster have some very good ideas that I would support.

Application should comply with planning regulations and be compatible with surroundings
"Please see our letter for full comments (emailed to 'town.council@ilminster.gov.uk' and 'admin.support@ilminster.gov.uk' at 10:35 on 9/8/21)

Policy ILM13 Types of Housing

The principle of this policy seeks to ensure new housing developments deliver an adequate mix of dwellings, an aspiration we agree with and support. However, the policy seeks 20% of new homes to be Building Regulations M4(2) compliant, meeting Lifetime Home Standards. We agree provision should be made for M4(2) homes on all major new development sites but consider 20% of units to be a disproportionately high number. Based on our experience elsewhere, 10% would be more in line with what has been established as a reasonable level of provision in other authority areas. Furthermore, provision needs to be made in the policy that it is acceptable to provide 'adaptable' M4(2) units rather than fully 'accessible' from the outset. There is logic in ensuring units can be adapted to meet the needs of end users but it makes less sense to kit out units so they are full accessible from the outset without knowing what the actual needs of the end user are. The policy wording should be caveated to allow M4(2) units to be 'adaptable'.

Site Potential and Final Comments

We support the inclusion of the site as an allocation for new homes in the NP, although, as set out above we do not agree with the findings that only a limited number of homes can be accommodated on the site.

In addition to the points on policy and site specific set out elsewhere in this letter, we would like to make two further points on the evidence base.

Firstly, as indicated above with relation to views, we are concerned about the extent of the site that has been

assessed in the evidence base to the neighbourhood plan. The full 34.2 hectare site was submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan Group as part of the call for sites and only part of the area was assessed. There is no justification set out as to why. We have concerns about the scoring of the site in relation to landscape, particularly given the small area of the site that was actually assessed does not appear to be visible in the viewpoints shown (and used in the sites assessment) at Section 8.6 of the plan.

Secondly, we have concerns regarding the SEA consideration of the agricultural land value of the site (Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land [BMVAG]). Table 4.5 suggests there is a 'likely adverse effect' on land soil and water resources largely as the site is Grade 3a land. However whilst much of the site is classed as BMVAG, much of it is actually not conducive to modern day farming practices. The land at the Site is divided into a number of small fields, the largest of which extends to less than 3 ha (approximately 7 acres). The smallest field extends to around 0.2 ha. Fields are divided by mature hedges, trees and a watercourse. Unless the hedges and trees are removed, the practical use of large, modern farm machinery in these fields will be constrained by the historical pattern of land management. Whilst large parts of the Site are BMVAG, this classification is no higher than other non-allocated land around the edge of the town.

For the reasons set out in this letter, we have some serious concerns about both the wording of some policies in the Neighbourhood Plan but also with some elements of the evidence base and Appendices to the plan. With regard to the policy wording, we consider changes need to be made (as set out above) in order for the Plan to pass the Basic Conditions. We do not consider that a fair and unbiased assessment of the development potential of the Shudrick Lane site has been undertaken. Our comments regarding the site capacity are based on significant evidence presented as part of the previous planning application on the site (14/02474/OUT). The site is approximately 34.2 hectares and is an appropriate site to be allocated within the emerging Local Plan Review for development of about 220 units. The emerging Ilminster Neighbourhood Plan needs to carefully consider its relationship to this overarching strategic document and should not seek to alter or undermine emerging housing policies that are based on a robust emerging evidence base and which include site allocations that are a crucial part of the emerging Spatial Strategy for the District.

We would welcome the opportunity to engage further with the Neighbourhood Plan process in due course. Should the Neighbourhood Plan Group wish to discuss any of the comments in this letter with regard to the suitability of the Shudrick Lane site for development we would be open to work together on this.

"

I endorse Green Ilminster's response to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan

All of the above. The houses behind the Brakes / Ford Garage are absolutely appallingly ugly. It is hard to believe they are enjoyable to live in. How was this allowed? The same development viewed from Winterhay Lane is equally out of keeping with the character of Ilminster referred to in this document. It raises questions about how genuine the stated intentions might be.

As identified earlier, the character and appearance is paramount. The correct design can mitigate density, dwelling size, etc.

no more poor design as we see on other Ilminster estates. To destroy Shudrick Valley would be a blight your vision

We need innovation in building design and materials in a way that supports local distinctiveness in a sustainable manner. Buildings need to be designed to last and support affordable energy conservation strategies. It is very important to control all the above mentioned aspects of building design so long as it is that the layout is appealing and not at odds with existing unique buildings and spaces of Ilminster, that the density is not dense, that there are green garden spaces, that the character is in keeping, the appearance is in keeping, there are gaps between buildings and there is adequate parking that is subtle and looks appealing. Your statements are really ambiguous.

Ensuring it's clearly a newer design but in keeping with existing buildings and dwellings.

POSTAL RESPONSES

Side gardens are useful for bins or parking

Houses must have enough garage space (no front gardens but garage) for cars!! etc.

We have less Doctor's in the town than 20 years ago, 1 dentist and residents have to go to neighbouring towns. Children over 13 have to travel to other towns for school. How does, this make our town better if you increase the population without expanding these facilities first. There is a national shortage of GPs. How does this plan for the town make it a safer place to live!

All the question are designed to encourage support for the plan - this questionnaire is not designed to gauge the strength of local feeling or gauge how plans will effect residents quality of life - shameful!

This form is extraordinary long and rather complicated. I wonder if this was the aim.

“They all sound like sensible intentions.

General Comment: This form is overly complicated - simpler questions would have got better, more useful answers. The fact that it is so lengthy and difficult to understand is perhaps the intention - to frustrate and then not bother.

I do not understand why Shudrick Valley development is included in the ILP. The housing proposers were rejected by a thorough government enquiry, and [...] the appeal was also rejected.

“

Communal gardens in some area to encourage cooperation and integration of new comers.

What an excellent chance to build sustainable green housing that is varied, well designed + uses good materials in keeping with the town.

Is it inevitable that affordable housing means boring design, as with recent estate off Winterhay

“General Comment: I could not see any reference to workplaces and shopping facilities, schooling, medical etc. Section 5 only refers to housing sites. Section 3 refers to large sport facilities.

Nearly all sites quoted in Section 5 would require a car to transport children to existing schools and to shop in the town centre. Car Parking?”

Good size 3 bedroom houses would suit more people than silly sized bedrooms no use to anyone

Terraces can encourage community friendliness [...] some space. Provide communal areas of green space
Tree planting. Protection for indigenous wildlife + fauna

“Limit ambient light from street lighting

General Comment - I'm not opposed to change or for that matter the construction of some housing within the Town, as long as the right sites are used and what is constructed is affordable for the average annual salary.

But the town CANNOT SUSTAIN and extra 839 houses. The infrastructure simply isn't there and it can't be created. The roads can't cope as it is. I take my life in my hands every time I get on my bike because of the speed and the amount of traffic on the road at the moment. The doctors, dentist, schools will also not be able to cope.

Why are green fields being put forward to build new dwellings when there are so many brown field sites that would be more suitable? We are experiencing more rainfall as the climate is changing and we need our green fields to absorb this as well as protecting the habitat for wildlife.

I'm sorry to all concerned as I'm sure you have all spent hours pouring over different sites but surely this can't be the answer.”

Important to ensure builders comply with the town's requirements & not with the landowners financial schemes

Shudrick Valley site was refused on appeal in 2017. It should be left alone. Why is it being put forward again. How is Character defined? What is appearance? Big or small gaps?

Cynical as I am but developers & planners will do what they want with only minor changes. Developers are there to make money

Shudrick Valley site was refused on appeal in 2017. This should be the end of all development there.

The survey is too directing in its format

On what way are “character” and “appearance” distinct (ok I get it now) = character entails appearance. Appearance does not entail character. mmmm.

Need more doctor's surgeries and school facilities

Shudrick Valley site was refused on appeal in 2017. This should be final. What is this additional cost to the public??

