

**Martock NP 1<sup>st</sup> Consultation Version**  
**Comments and Recommendations**

	<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Steering Group Decisions</b>
	<b>General</b>		
1	A Bryant	<i>I have been a resident of Martock for almost 40 years now and have read with interest the Neighbourhood Plan. My thoughts are that whilst we obviously have to move forward with such matters as housing and transport, it is pleasing and reassuring to see that in all areas of the plan, so much consideration has been taken in terms of retaining the “village” feel, our historic buildings, our open plan spaces, the community and the needs of the local people in general, to make Martock a good place to live.</i>	No change necessary
2	T Slater	<i>It is essential for the area that the Neighbourhood Plan to be given very serious thought and in the most part be adopted. We will be very interested to see if action is taken on the points that it brings forward. We are not optimistic about the outcome.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Section 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	
	<b>Section 2</b>	<b>Martock Parish</b>	
3	A Clegg et al <sup>1</sup>	<i>2.1 Madey Mill Brook 2.2 Also mention Hurst (See 1.2). The settlement is often referred to by SSDC as Martock/Bower Hinton, but it is actually three, once separate, villages. Hurst begins at the Hurst Bow bridge and ends at junction just north of the Rose and Crown pub.</i>	Amend to read: ‘Madey Mill Stream’
4	J Luffman	<i>2.2 ‘Martock and the adjoining settlements of Hurst and Bower Hinton have ....’</i>	Amend para. 2.2
5	A Clegg	<i>2.3 This is, I believe, a net figure as some in-commute. It is the ratio of jobs/workers in the village.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Section 3</b>	<b>Strategic Context</b>	
6	A Clegg	<i>3.2 Do we need a reminder somewhere of the meaning of ‘sustainable’ in this context.</i>	No change necessary
7	S Moffatt	<i>I am concerned that the neighbourhood plan needs to “conform to SS Local Plan”, as it does feel that no matter what residents think SS will do what they want. We live in a beautiful part of the world which is being ruined by mass expensive housing not affordable housing for local people. You only have to look at Bathpool in Taunton which is horrendous, or the houses in Somerton or Wells which are crammed together on the edges of these lovely villages. The Foldhill site will become another of these if it goes ahead.</i>	No change necessary
8	A & L Hawes	<i>3.8 There are definite traffic pinch points, particularly in the Bower Hinton and Ringwell Hill locations. HGV’s regularly use the B3165 as a Southern access road despite signage on the A303 directing them via an alternative route. It is a laudable aim to try to increase cycle use but in reality, further housing development is only going to increase vehicular traffic and negatively impact even further on residential areas such as Bower Hinton where there is already unavoidable on street parking. 3.8/9 Like many rural areas, the lack of adequate GP/Health personnel and resources will only be exacerbated by further housing development as will the current situation of only a limited selection of retail outlets in the village/Rural Centre of Martock.</i>	
9	A Clegg	<i>3.11 historic, built and natural</i>	Add “historic, built and natural”
	<b>Section 4</b>	<b>Purpose of the NP</b>	

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the comments attribute to A Clegg throughout this table – incorporate in many instances the views expressed by member of the community that have discussed the 1st Version of the Martock Neighbourhood Plan with A Clegg at community events such as the Farmers Market.

10	J Luffman	<p><i>"The Neighbourhood Plan, once made, will be a statutory development plan..... its policies will have significant influence when being used by the local planning authority to help determine proposals for development submitted through planning applications."</i></p> <p><i>I feel that this needs to be highlighted to our residents perhaps, for example, by displaying large posters in the library window, in the noticeboard by the newsagent, in the Information Centre window etc. If people are made aware that they can, at this point, really influence things then they may be more likely to contribute.</i></p>	No change necessary
11	A Clegg	4.7 Pages on the Parish website, the Parish Facebook Page and on a dedicated Neighbourhood Plan website	Amend list for accuracy
<b>Section 5</b>		<b>Structure of Plan</b>	
12	A Clegg	5.4 Under the SSDC Settlement Policy we are strictly a 'Rural Centre', a centre with some of the services of a Market Town but not all. We are in fact larger than some Market Towns but we don't have the qualifying infrastructure. I worry about using the phrase 'Market Town' as we are under some pressure to become a market town with greatly increased population and annual building.	Amend phrase to say "rural centre"
13	A Clegg	5.6 Monitoring and review not yet well developed. Do we need a few key indicators and targets?	Add more detailed and relevant regime to section 13
<b>Section 6</b>		<b>Aims &amp; Objectives</b>	
14	J Luffman	<p>6.5 I agree with the Aims &amp; Objectives for the Natural Environment.</p> <p><i>'Protect and enhance our natural environment' ..... We are often being told how people are becoming increasingly removed from nature, even though it gives us such precious relief from the stresses of modern life.</i></p> <p><i>'Protect valued landscapes and views' .... I am shocked and saddened by the sight of South Petherton advancing towards the River Parrett when looking across from Bower Hinton - it has a similar impact to the Duchy development, Poundbury, on the skyline in Dorchester.</i></p> <p><i>'Protect and enhance historic buildings' ..... 'Protect historical and archaeological sites' ... these buildings and sites could be highlighted more by plaques, talks etc to educate our residents, young and old, so that they value them, and also to be an attraction for visitors and enhance their time spent in our village. Perhaps produce a booklet?</i></p>	<p>No change necessary</p> <p><b>Refer to PC</b></p>
15	A & L Hawes	6.5 The retention of valuable green spaces and views both within and outside the boundaries of the settlement is vital for the wellbeing and heritage preservation of the village/Rural Centre.	No change necessary
<b>Section 7</b>		<b>Natural Environment - General</b>	
16	J Luffman	7.1 'substantial urban core' ... perhaps 'dense residential core'?	Re-word para.7.1
17	T Slade	<p><i>Our main concern is the high risk of flooding</i></p> <p><i>The consultation document version Sept. 2018 para 7.7 identifies four pinch points and as far as we know nothing has been done to mitigate the risk of flooding at these points.</i></p> <p><i>It seems to us that when farmers used to drain their land using field drains the run off problem from fields was contained.</i></p> <p><i>We note the concerns about the drainage at Martock Leat and noted a little while ago that the debris grills were getting blocked.</i></p> <p><i>Who is responsible for the regular maintenance of the installed system?</i></p>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for reference in Flood Guide
18	A Clegg	7.3 built rather than urban .....notable and provides a mechanism for evaluating the environmental impact of development proposals.	Re-word para. 7.3
19	A Clegg	7.4 Expand a bit to mention other landscape elements of wildlife significance .....it is an area of diverse wildlife habitats straddling, as it does, the edge of the wetlands associated with the Parrett vale to the west and the higher land to the east beset with a variety of	Add to and amend para. 7.4 including: Add 'Coathay Common' to the 'such as' list

		<i>habitats that have evolved from the traditional land use patterns such as ridge and furrow fields, old orchards, old droves with their ditches and hedgerows and remnants of ancient woodland Cartgate Nature Area - the pond is only part of it</i>	Change 'Cartgate Pond' to 'Cartgate Nature Area'
20	A Clegg	<i>7.5 Rewrite in terms of species categories and species-rich habitats mentioning individual species of species of conservation concern as examples. Insert paragraph here on gardens and other habitats of importance within the development boundary. This is important because it is something we want to promote by policy</i>	Amend para. as suggested below: <i>"The Parish is a very biodiverse area, straddling, as it does, the edge of the wetlands associated with the Parrett to the west and the higher land to the east. The Somerset Environmental Records list many EU-protected species and many of conservation concern, both plants and animals. Examples of protected species are the nightingale, long-eared bat, yellowhammer, brown hairstreak butterfly and, in our streams, otter and water vole, all indicating a rich diversity of important habitats that the Parish is actively engaged in identifying, conserving and developing."</i>
21	S Gibson	<i>We live at Water Street and have a good length of Hurst Brook running through our garden up to Frickers Bridge. Not sure how much detail you want but for the record here follows a list of some of the species we've seen in the garden: Birds: Kingfisher, Grey wagtail, Pied wagtail, Little Egret, Heron, Moorhen, Mistle Thrush, Redwings, Owls as well as the usual garden birds. Animals: Hedgehogs, Shrews, Field Voles, Moles, Slow-worms. Other: on a couple of occasions we've seen crayfish in the river but not been able to distinguish the species; Otters have been reported just upstream from us but not ventured here as far as we know: Mallards use our section of the river as a nursery during spring and summer due to its accessible banks.</i>	Amend para.7.5
22	J Luffman	<i>7.6 'especially by dog walkers'.... not just dog walkers, plenty of folk walk just to enjoy our local natural environment.</i>	Amend para.7.6 by deleting " <del>especially by dog walkers</del> "
23	S Saltman	<i>7.6 ref. to not having "many bridleways" – we have only one as far as I'm aware and it's East St Drove/Venn Lane.</i>	No change necessary
24	A Clegg	<i>7.6 We suggest instead A number of the popular paths are farm tracks that over time have become used by the public and many landowners have instituted permissive paths linking different parts of the network. (i.e. praising cooperative landowners) many old droves which just happen not to be classified as bridleways.</i>	No change necessary
25	A Clegg	<i>7.7 suggest omit too</i>	Omit "too" from para. 7.7
	<b>Mart1</b>	<b>Protecting and Enhancing Natural Habitats</b>	
26	A Clegg	<i>Biodiversity (wider concept that goes beyond just habitats) . the design of both buildings, housing estates and infrastructure ... ....harm to, the biodiversity of the area will not.....</i>	Change title of Mart1 to "Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity"
27	Env Group	<i>Can we add at this policy statement level - Development should not be permitted in areas of important biodiversity such as the examples shown in Map 3 (should not tie us down to specific areas as these change over time and we may have missed some)</i>	Complete survey and Map 3 'Wildlife Habitats and Corridors' Relate policy to map and add reference to supporting survey documents

28	A Clegg	<i>7.9 Add to the examples list either here or to the bullets below, registered common land and ancient orchards (we have one large area of common land and quite a lot of ancient orchards all registered with Natural England.</i>	Complete survey and Map 3 'Wildlife Habitats and Corridors' Relate policy to map and add reference to supporting survey documents
29	Env Group	<i>7.9 Revise this after Map 3 is completed. Ensure that this list is not exclusive (Map 3 should include woodland areas and the common land to the north west near the railway line. It should include not just important hedgerows but also fields systems that provide connectivity for example the north west side of the parish with its mature hedges including those of the railway line Bulleated list should also reflect invertebrate and amphibia refuges and areas for small mammals, particularly hedgehogs. Either build into existing list or add a new bullet</i>	Complete survey and Map 3 'Wildlife Habitats and Corridors' Relate policy to map and add reference to supporting survey documents
30	S Saltman	<i>7.10 Can we refer to streetlighting as part of any development, that is, the need to maintain a dark sky or avoid light pollution? Bat and owl boxes can be built in or attached to something such as a tree. We need longevity, for example, a wooden box outdoors soon deteriorates and falls down and who would replace it? Is there potential with SUDS to increase biodiversity?</i>	Amend para. 7.10 by adding the word "robust" in front of swift bricks etc.
31	A Clegg	<i>7.10 Add a reference to streetlighting. Add a reference to garden corridors. Developers these days do not seem to like the concept of contiguous gardens which are very valuable in creating natural corridors. This pattern of gardens is traditional here and will be mentioned in the VDS. Add managed sustainable drainage retention ponds to the list</i>	Add, in front of swift bricks, a phrase such as "appropriate streetlighting that does not adversely affect wildlife"
	<b>Mart2</b>	<b>Landscape and Wildlife Corridors</b>	
32	S Saltman	<i>7.11 As they are corridors, should water courses be referred to?</i>	Re-word 7.11 to read; "Wildlife corridors are habitat that also connect wildlife populations which facilitate their movement. There are many different kinds within the parish, the more important ones are the rivers and rhynes, the old droves, important hedgerows and the disused railway line. The most significant ones are shown in map 3 and analysed in the <b>Martock Biodiversity Resource Manual.</b> "
33	A Clegg	<i>Give an example ....remedial action such as the creation of an alternative corridor, guided by professional advice, of appropriate dimensions with suitable planting. This should have its own explanatory paragraph below (or it could be part of such a paragraph)</i>	No change necessary
34	A Clegg	<i>7.11 Strengthen the above by adding in an appropriate place: - references to the wildlife map - a note that corridors should be identified in any planning application - a note requiring developers to show how they will conserve corridors both in the plan and during the building process - a note on how developers of more than one house will design the conservation and the promotion of wildlife corridors into the overall scheme.</i>	Re-word para. 7.11 as suggested above (at 32)
35	A Clegg	<i>7.14 Refer to Map as providing this network</i>	Refer to map 3 in para.7.14
36	Env Group	<i>More thinking needed here I don't think that these two matters fall easily under the same heading as they are two rather distinct issues. Suggest modifying this policy and move the Landscape issues to Mart8</i>	No change necessary

		<i>This would become a dedicated corridor policy - maintaining and enhancing wildlife corridors which are crucial elements in maintaining healthy biodiversity. They are its transport infrastructure. This could be done simply by removing the Landscape element from the policy</i>	
37	Env Group	<i>7.11 Give some typical local examples: Examples of corridors within the parish are the old railway line, the rivers, rhynes, the many old drives flanked with hedges, now often overgrown, and ditches and ponds, old field systems and also the traditional pattern of contiguous gardens</i>	Re-word para. 7.11 as suggested above (at 32)
38	Env Group	<i>7.12 Add a note somewhere on the conservation of corridors by residents after construction. Residents have the right to remove or restrict field or important hedges when they become part of their garden and something along the lines of a planning condition or a covenant with the sale if feasible would be needed to ameliorate this likelihood. Need to find out perhaps what can be done or not.</i>	No change necessary
39	Env Group	<i>7.14 Somewhere, perhaps in policy itself, Development proposals should avoid wildlife corridors if alternative sites are available</i>	No change necessary
<b>40</b>	<b>Mart3</b>	<b>Flood Management</b>	
41	T Slater	<i>The comments made in 7.15 should be investigated as it seems to us that a problem has been identified and action is needed to rectify the problems as a matter of urgency.</i>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for inclusion on 'Martock on-line'
42	T Slater	<i>In 7.16 there is a list of maintenance and we are concerned that this will not be carried out. Indeed, a section of bank has slipped to the west of Hurst bridge and is partially blocking the flow; nothing has been done. We wonder what action is being taken to encourage farmers and landowners to reduce run off. What steps can be taken to ensure that controls are enforced? This is a major issue as the drainage system is overloaded. Obtaining insurance for property in Water Street is not easy. New developments will make things worse.</i>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for reference in Flood Guide
43	A Clegg	<i>7.15 I suggest a bit extra describing in broad terms the flow of water through and around the village. We have learnt through experience that applicants often do not have this understanding and make rather stupid mitigating suggestions as a result How about? I suggest splitting the para with 7.16 starting as shown</i>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for reference in Flood Guide
44	A Clegg	<i>7.15 The parish soils are a complex pattern of clays with greatly varying depth and permeability (insert soil map xxx). Because clay soils can hold exceptionally large volumes of water the natural streams in the parish are few and small; most of the run-off taking place slowly through the soil. Centuries of agriculture have resulted in a network of ditches (rhynes or fosses) where drainage of land and tracks was needed. The flow through these, and through the soils, is broadly east to west. The 'main river' (an environment agency designation) through the village is Hurst Brook and parallel (and linked) to it a little to the north is Madey Mill Stream, the old Mill race. At times when the soils are saturated or when rainfall is too heavy to be absorbed effectively by the clay, the village, and its downstream neighbours, experience significant, and often quite sudden, flooding events.</i>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for reference in Flood Guide
45	G Swindell	<i>7.15 suggested amendment: There is only one river in the Parish which flows south to north, whereas 'main river', (Hurst Brook and Hinton Meads Brook), flows east to west and then in to the River Parrett..There are numerous streams, brooks, rhynes and other water courses which impact on flooding in the Parish.</i>	Amend para. 7.15 as suggested
46	A Clegg	<i>7.16 Add to beginning Martock has always suffered from periodic flooding and steps are being taken continually to reduce this risk. Climate change has, however, increased both the amount of rainfall and the frequency of heavy storms. In consequence the Parish has developed robust strategies for addressing the issue and minimising flood damage.</i>	Revise para. 7.16 to read....." the frequency and intensity of heavy storms"

		<i>Add an additional paragraph on maintaining, managing and operating flood control mechanisms for the benefit not only of the village but also communities downstream. This would include issues such as easy access to rhynes for dredging, avoidance of culverts and associated screens, identification and creation of deliberately flooded zones, retention and detention ponds that are not under automatic control. Mention Hills to Levels etc</i>	
47	G Swindell	<i>7.16 suggested amendment: It is part of a comprehensive local strategy to reduce floods and the risk of flooding. Martock Parish Council will seek to ensure that existing flood prevention measures are adequately maintained. This will involve the Flood Wardens liaising with landowners and tenant farmers in the Martock rainfall catchment area consisting of the Parishes of Stoke sub Hamdon, Montacute, Odcombe, Yeovil without, Brympton, Tintinhull and Ash, thus benefitting all the communities downstream, which includes Martock and all the villages, hamlets and settlements to The Levels. The work will include monitoring, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), penstocks, weirs, dams, trash screens, attenuation ponds etc.,</i>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for reference in Flood Guide
	<b>Mart4</b>	<b>Flood Risk</b>	
48	A Clegg	<i>Mart4 Beef up. All development on greenfield land and on brownfield land where the development will alter the existing drainage patterns should incorporate proposals such a sustainable drainage system that will ensure that surface run-off is not increased by the proposal and where possible, decreased. All proposals that are likely to change the existing run-off pattern of a development site should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment based on local fieldwork.</i>	Review policy wording
49	T Slater	<i>It is vital that the measures contained in 7.19 are progressed as soon as possible as is the case with 7.20</i>	No change necessary
50	S Bellows	<i>Any development has an impact on surface and ground water. The current infrastructure is at or very close to capacity, and, the community is adversely affected by issues of ongoing maintenance. Clarity of accountability and long-term responsibility is essential from the outset.</i>	No change necessary
51	A Clegg	<i>7.19 Some changes to this clause where I have highlighted and numbered (1) Replace with. Flooding has always been commonplace in the village and is likely to worsen in the future. 2)Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be developed that will ensure that surface run-off is not increased by development proposals and, where possible, decreased. The success of SuDS is very..... 3 (which can vary..).... can vary seasonally and varies very considerably throughout the village. For this reason flood risk assessors will be expected to carry out on-site assessments of permeability (ref to Wallingford maybe?) rather than using online data which, for this area, is insufficiently well-defined. (see below) 4 (management plan) Add a sentence. The use of automatic mechanisms for releasing flood water from sustainable drainage retention ponds will not be supported as they tend to release water downstream at the moment when downstream flood risk is greatest.</i>	Revise supporting text of para. 7.19 to include reference to matters mentioned
52	A Clegg	<i>7.20 including the downstream flood risk which, on the Levels, is frequently severe.</i>	<b>Refer to Flood Group</b> for reference in Flood Guide
	<b>Mart5</b>	<b>Public Rights of Way</b>	
53	A Clegg	<i>Add an additional clause to the policy. Add ..... supported, making them, wherever possible, accessible to child push-chairs and mobility scooters should be a high priority.</i>	No change necessary
54	A Clegg	<i>7.22 Include perhaps a short historical introduction at the beginning of 7.22 or maybe at the beginning of this section As an historic market centre for the surrounding rural community Martock is well-endowed with old droves, footways and</i>	Refer to two bridleways, two restricted byways and the long-distance footpath, the

		<i>footbridges. It is linked by many tracks with the Roman Fosse Way and it is also the main old coaching centre on the road linking the two coasts. The community has therefore long enjoyed good access...</i>	Parrett Trail, in para.7.22 or para.7.23
55	A Clegg	<i>7.23 Delete the note on bridleways which is a technical issue - its because we have not applied for any designation changes Mention the Parrett Trail, a popular modern cross-country path which goes through the village.</i>	No change necessary
56	J Luffman	<i>7.25 I agree 'more seats along popular routes' would be good.</i>	No change necessary
57	A Clegg	<i>7.25 An important bit missing - possibly after 7.25 but maybe best in the Transport section where I have added a similar note A significant matter of concern in the village is the lack of safe walking and cycling routes to the village centre, and most particularly the school, from the edges of the village. Footpaths exist that have the potential to alleviate this difficulty and proposals to support their development and upgrading will be supported.</i>	Amend para.7.25 to ensure the limitations and priorities are understood
58	Env Group	<i>We need a definition here of what are rights of way. These are on the Somerset Definitive map, a digital version of which is at <a href="https://roam.somerset.gov.uk/roam/map#">https://roam.somerset.gov.uk/roam/map#</a>. We should perhaps note that these are distinct from what we should call pavements (incorrectly) which are the paths along the village roadside which are covered in Policy Mart27. Cross reference needed. Or combine the two policies and place under the transport section. The distinction to be made somehow. This section, and Mart27 require developing using guidance in 'Streets for All' (Hist Eng). Section in VDS.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Mart6</b>	<b><i>Development in the Countryside</i></b>	
59	S Saltman	<i>Doesn't list heritage assets. Are not non-designated heritage assets already vulnerable to new PD rights, for example, allowing farm buildings to be converted to say holiday lets and so forth?</i>	Review and amend policy criteria
60	A Clegg	<i>Mart6 (iii) should we give examples, rhynes, droves, old hedges, footbridges, ponds? (iv) Suggest - best and most versatile - which I believe is the technical description. Most of the land around here is 2 and 3A, 2 in the valleys and 3A on the hills (iv) of historical, or archeol..... ridge and furrow fields and important hedgerows...</i>	Review and amend policy criteria
61	Env Group	<i>Rephrase list so that it is not exclusive - the six points are examples</i>	Add 'biodiversity' to policy list iii Amplify iii in supporting text to include harm to features important for maintaining biodiversity such as wildlife corridors, rhynes and ponds, important hedges, unimproved grassland. Amplify iv in supporting text to include rural heritage assets such as old orchards, ridge and furrow fields, footbridges, and similar locally important historic structures such as milestones, boundary stones, fingerposts, old railway features,
62	Env Group	<i>Delete "demonstrable"</i>	No change necessary
63	T Slater	<i>Not sure if this comes under the Plan but we wondered what is being done about the 'camp site', which appears to be coming established off Foldhill Lane (on the right going towards Tintinhull).</i>	<b>Refer to Parish Council</b>
64	A Clegg	<i>7.27 ...such as equestrian and farming-related activities and outdoor....</i>	Add "equestrian" to para. 7.27

65	Env Group	<i>7.29 'Outdoor recreation' opens a pandoras box as many examples of outdoor recreation are environmentally destructive. Need to rephrase second bit to oppose development that will harm biodiversity.</i>	Set limits to 'outdoor recreation' in the supporting text
	<b>Mart7</b>	<b>Farm Diversification</b>	
66	A Clegg	<i>also subject to the usual planning constrains and other policies in the Plan</i>	No change necessary
67	Env Group	<i>Can we have an additional clause to ensure that once the approved development is constructed it cannot subsequently be changed to something that will leave a negative legacy</i>	Consider adding additional clause to the policy
	<b>Mart8</b>	<b>Views and Vistas</b>	
68	S Saltman	<i>There are likely to be more important views.</i>	Re-write policy
69	A Clegg	<i>...compromise the characteristic landscape features exemplified (but not confined to) in the following panoramas..... This list is not exclusive More examples may be added that illustrate different landscape characteristics – e.g. view of Hurst Brook Vale north from Stoke road showing the setting of the listed Madey Mill.</i>	Re-write policy
70	Env Group	<i>Rethink this policy. Don't include specific views at the policy level as this excludes views not included. Give this list as examples of views listing aspects of the village environment Make general reference to characteristic views across the village typically including the near horizon of the low hills around the village and the distant horizon formed by the higher upland of the Blackdowns, Quantocks etc. Include the need to protect the nearby higher land and its typical natural and historical features from development Need to consider important views around Coat and Parrett Works and the astonishing number of landmark views – some outside the parish – from the registered common? A lean policy followed by expanded paragraphs which are still phrased in general terms, but which could use a reference to the view map and data as examples. This should be expanded. A separate policy on the view from Ham Hill noting that the whole parish is visible and also how recent developments have regrettably undermined its integrity</i>	Re-write policy
71	S Saltman	<i>7.33 – The text refers to views in the partnership area, but the map only shows views close to and towards or over Martock. Surely, there would be views out from Martock and also in the wider partnership, taking into consideration other settlement such as Coat and Parrett Works. Ham Hill plays a much bigger role in terms of its visibility than the text suggests. The Hill is a near neighbour to Martock</i>	Re-write policy
	<b>Section 8</b>	<b>Built Environment &amp; Heritage - General</b>	
72	S Saltman	<i>8.3 – The Martock bean is not mentioned. Didn't it play a major part in the village's wealth?</i>	Add reference to 'Martock Bean'
73	A Clegg	<i>8.4 Small addition. Suggest adding that the establishment of the railway allowed coal mined nearby to be brought into the village to fuel a local gasworks which provided lighting for streets and houses.</i>	No change necessary
74	A Clegg	<i>8.5/8.6 We could include that within the Martock village conservation area there are 163 listed structures of which 130 are buildings, the remainder being monuments and significant gates, walls and milestones.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Mart9</b>	<b>Heritage Assets</b>	
75	A Clegg	<i>Mention also design. Refer to the VDS which will address the small but very important design issues such as plastic windows, glass types, rainwater goods, doors, etc</i>	Include cross-reference to VDS
76	A Clegg	<i>8.12 add bridges, walls,</i>	Add "bridges and walls" to the list
77	A Clegg	<i>Some overlap between 8.12 and 8.13. Should we combine?</i>	No change necessary
78	A Clegg	<i>8.13 Issue for decision. Historic England only lists individual buildings, not groups. I think our list should include groups of</i>	No change necessary

		<i>buildings such as significant terraces and collections of houses. It could be inserted here as ..... local heritage assets or groups of assets nominated by.....</i>	
	<b>Mart10</b>	<b>Local Green Space</b>	
79	A Clegg	<i>8.19 Should this list be included here? it is not an essential element of the main story and is not intended to be exclusive.</i>	This must be a finite list by the time the Plan is submitted consider any additions to the list now
80	S Saltman	<i>8.23 Old Orchard, adj. Bracey Road Rec' has (not some) wildlife and habitat value that residents enjoy.</i>	Add reference to the site's wildlife status
81	S Saltman	<i>I note that the field with the TPOs that keeps Stapleton separate from Martock and provides an attractive entry into the village is not mentioned. How else is the significance of this green space going to be offered some protection in the NP?</i>	No change necessary to LGS list consider implications of other policies on this area
82	S Saltman	<i>What about the parish churchyard, is it not an eminent space, viewed and visited extensively?</i>	Churchyard should be reviewed as potential LGS
83	A Hall	<i>Local green spaces - those listed are all vital, as they are few in number and not extensive. The corner by La Fontana and the green area with trees in Church Close, which leads through to the churchyard could be added.</i>	Church Close should be reviewed as potential LGS
84	A Clegg	<i>8.29 Missing from here is a mention of non-designated green space. Such spaces are important to the village but do not conform to all NPPF criteria for officially recognised space. This issue is currently being discussed with SSDC who are developing a green space strategy and database which will, we are told, have a category of open spaces which do not meet criteria for registered space or other spaces such as nature reserves</i>	No change necessary consider in context of other policies on this area
	<b>Mart11</b>	<b>Local Character and Design</b>	
85	S Saltman	<i>Under Heritage there is no mention of the intention to produce a Conservation Area Appraisal. As conservation areas are designated heritage assets, why? The reference to such an appraisal in 8.34 is somewhat hidden for such an important document.</i>	Make reference in the overview
86	A Clegg	<i>Not sure what 'confines' means in practice. Should it be 'within or contiguous with' or some such? It should include all development proposals in and immediately next to the settlements</i>	No change necessary
87	J Luffman	<i>8.11 Policy Mart9 is intended to recognise both statutory and non-statutory heritage assets' ... 'and ensure that they are provided with an appropriate level of protection'.... Good!</i>	No change necessary
88	A Hall	<i>It is important to preserve the 'village' nature. Not only by caring for listed buildings but making sure any new developments and infilling are not overcrowded (as Fubers at Stapleton for example) and do provide adequate off-street parking to prevent even more cars being parked on the main road through.</i>	<b>Refer to VDS and CA Appraisal task groups</b>
89	A & L Hawes	<i>8.32 Despite "expecting very high standards of design for new development", in our view this is rarely achieved in practice, partly because developers try to cut costs and submit amended plans once an application has been approved.</i>	Emphasise concern in supporting text
90	H & B Etherington	<i>You have covered every aspect of life here, but I feel the damage has already been done. The vast amount of development that has already been allowed here is in no way complimentary to the old Ham Stone village houses and has swamped them. What we need are terraces of 2-bedroom affordable hamstone houses with little gardens. Instead the council let a developer build 2 bungalows [on the market for nearly £400,000 each!!] behind a house in East Street. I really don't see this situation changing any time soon. That does not mean we don't think it is worth trying.</i>	<b>Refer to VDS task group</b>
91	A Clegg	<i>...and show that the proposal conforms with the assessment of the context of the site detailed in the Village Design Statement (in other words, show that developers have taken note of it) beef up. Development proposals will not be supported unless they can clearly demonstrate that they conform to the spirit and the recommendations of the Village Design Statement. This could be point i of the list. Delete iii</i>	Re-consider wording to achieve objective

92	A Clegg	<i>Insert a statement that describes the VDS and how it should be used. ..character and setting of. 8.33 Need to look in detail at this section and split into several sections,</i>	Include a reference and summary statement. Something like: <i>"The Village Design Statement considers the detailed design references, materials, finishes, street scenes, and landscapes that collectively define the Martock sense of place, and also how these may be reflected in new developments"</i>
93	A Clegg	<i>8.34 The Parish has two conservation areas, in Coat and in Martock. The appraisal document for Martock is online(ref). The areas were established in ??? and are currently under review. The appraisal documents provide an additional source of guidance and cont.....</i>	Replace "additional" with "important"
	<b>Mart12</b>	<b>Infrastructure</b>	
94	A Hall	<i>School, Doctors and shops are already stretched. Public transport is inadequate.</i>	Include reference to concern expressed by several people in the recent consultation
95	J Mattock	<i>As it is, we get less shops and a problem getting to see the doctor, especially if it is at South Petherton surgery or hospital.</i>	Include reference to concern expressed by several people in the recent consultation
96	S Bellows	<i>The waiting times to see a named health professional are unacceptable. Locally the health and social services are at breaking point. Extra housing will bring more pressure on the services. This is not in anyone's best interest. If we become designated as a small town the entire infrastructure will require significant investment which inevitably lags significantly behind, by which time the developers will be long gone. The whole ambiance of the environment will change, almost certainly not for the better.</i>	Include reference to concern expressed by several people in the recent consultation
97	P Byrne	<i>I wish to point out that whether Martock is or is not classified as a market town makes no difference to the fact that the village currently has enough problems serving the community at its present size. There are frequent long queues at the Post Office and the few shops. Most significantly however, it is virtually impossible to make an appointment at the surgery. Any increase in size of population would put even more stress on the village's facilities, including the local schools. Common sense (not developers' interests) must surely prevail?</i>	Include reference to concern expressed by several people in the recent consultation
98	L Chesterman	<i>Amenities - already very busy, constant queues in local shops, doctors and dentist under pressure. Even the local park is much busier.</i>	Include reference to concern expressed by several people in the recent consultation
99	A Clegg	<i>.... Any infrastructure developed should conform to other policies in this Plan and reflect the overall character of the village as set out in the Village Design Statement and the Conservation Area Appraisal.</i>	No change necessary
100	A Clegg	<i>8.35 New para here on design of infrastructure something like: The design of infrastructure is an important consideration as apparently small and simple errors of design can have a significant and lasting impact. The design guidelines set out in the Village Design Statement and the Conservation Area Appraisal should be followed. Visible walls, for example, should be made of appropriate materials (usually hamstone) and finished in a manner that reflects the character of the village. Unsightly infrastructure elements, such as service supply boxes and satellite dishes should be out of view or camouflaged</i>	Include reference in supporting text to the fact that infrastructure design is important, and cross-reference to the village design statement and the conservation area appraisal.
	<b>Mart13</b>	<b>Accommodating Growth</b>	
101	Summerfield	<i>Draft policy supports the development of sites within the settlement boundary as shown on Map 7, and small-scale development outside of the settlement boundary where it meets</i>	Review BUAB and consider whether the Sparrow land

		<p><i>specific criteria. However, the proposed settlement boundary excludes the southern part of the Summerfield site, which departs from the settlement boundary defined within the adopted South Somerset Local Plan, without any explanation.</i></p> <p><i>The Planning Practice Guidance states that NP's should be in general conformity with the development plan. Where there is a conflict there should be clear rationale for the approach taken in the draft NP and the evidence to justify that approach. We have reviewed the criteria used for defining the settlement area and whilst we note that the site does not currently have planning permission, the recent discussions with SSDC and the associated benefits that the development of the site will deliver i.e. the redevelopment of PDL and facilitating the employment development to the north, we cannot see how the exclusion of southern part of the site can be justified. The previous appeal decision is clear that there would be no adverse visual impacts from the development of this site. On this basis we object to this part of the site being removed from the settlement boundary.</i></p>	should be included within the BUAB
102	S Saltman	<p><i>Ref small-scale development on land adjoining the Settlement Area Boundary may be supported if "it avoids areas of higher landscape sensitivity";</i></p> <p><i>Can this point be worded to allow a broader approach to landscape sensitivity? For example, the landscape sensitivity map, fig 2, shows areas as having moderate sensitivity, whereas development in these moderate areas could have an adverse impact on the countryside approach to Martock and the setting of the conservation area. In fact, I'm concerned that the map isn't necessarily recognizing the landscape and conservation area setting overlap, which is something Historic England recognizes.</i></p>	Review BUAB and the impact of the criteria used
103	S Saltman	<p><i>8.39 I disagree that the growth of Martock/Bower Hinton has been a gradual, incremental process over a long period of time. In my experience, growth has been excessive almost year upon year and harmful to the character and well-being of the village. The aim to have a more gradual and sustainable approach is of course correct.</i></p>	Consider re-phrasing of para.
104	A Clegg	<p><i>8.41 The issue of minimum number was analysed in depth by two Planning Inspectors. I suggest we call it here an 'indicative number' until we see what SSDC will call it under NPPF2. We should note that it is derived from the proportion of the overall housing growth number that should be shouldered by the Rural centre settlements (7% - needs checking). I suggest that in a footnote we refer to and quote the PI inspectors view and note their concerns that a significant excess would risk undermining the SSDC Settlement Policy. This argument noted that a 40% (need to check) excess was deemed unacceptable.</i></p>	Include reference to the latest working target for 2016 to 2036 of 210 additional houses. (This could change if any changes are proposed in the settlement policy, but we have been assured that significant changes are unlikely.)
105	Summerfield	<p><i>Para. 8.42 of the draft NP states that at the time of writing it, it is unclear what the housing target for Martock will be and that it is anticipated that it is likely to reduce over the plan period due to an overall reduction throughout the District as part of the Local Plan Review (LPR). Together with the level of completions and extant planning permissions with the NP area, the revised target is therefore likely to be exceeded.</i></p> <p><i>The LPR is at a relatively early stage and it is considered likely that the housing requirement will be revised in light of national guidance on the standardised methodology to be used when calculating housing need.</i></p>	As 104 above
106	J Luffman	<p><i>8.43 I agree ... "There is little support for large scale development and growth"</i></p>	No change necessary
107	S Saltman	<p><i>8.43 – I shall be interested to know SSDC Policy's comment on this.</i></p>	No change necessary
108	S Saltman	<p><i>8.45 Ref "Land that is recognised as an area of high landscape sensitivity by the Martock Peripheral Landscape Study (see Map 2) should be avoided". Please see my comment for Policy Mart 13.</i></p>	Review BUAB and the impact of the criteria used
109	D Elliot	<p><i>We have some concerns, despite assurance that the Sparrow Land has been considered within this plan we can see by the Settlement</i></p>	Review BUAB and the impact of the criteria used

		<p>Boundary that the Ringwell Hill part of the Sparrow land has been excluded.</p> <p>This Sparrow land had previously been included in the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 - 2028 (Adopted in 2015) therefore we feel that it should be also included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We are also concerned that this same land may be removed as a potential building site from the Neighbourhood Plan as in Para. 10.13 stating "The Local Plan allocates a site of 2.8ha for employment purposes on land to the West of Ringwell Hill. This site was originally allocated in the 1991 Local Plan and it has still not come forward for development. The Local Plan Review will consider whether it is appropriate to continue with this allocation. The allocation of large employment/business sites is a matter for the Local Plan."</p> <p>As you are aware that we are still in the process of gaining planning permission for the Sparrow Land and we do not want this new Settlement Boundary or Neighbourhood Plan to jeopardise this.</p>	
110	A Hall	<p>There should be no large developments beyond the present limits of the village. It already sprawls out. Any development on the Yeovil side would become a suburb of Yeovil stuck on the side of the village. Not only would it alter the character of the village, but there are no adequate amenities to encourage people to become part of the community. The drainage could affect existing properties.</p> <p>Growth should be through small in-filling, but not all large gardens should be developed. This is short-sighted, as there is still a demand for property with a good-sized garden.</p>	No change necessary
111	A & L Hawes	<p>Any further housing development should be of a small nature, in keeping with the area and avoiding locations where there is high landscape sensitivity.</p>	No change necessary
112	L Chesterman	<p>Environment - I left Yeovil many years ago for village life. If I wanted to live in a town, I'd have done exactly that. It would ruin the nature of what most people who live here want and pay a premium to do so. It would certainly make it a less attractive place to live and could it also potentially affect house prices in the area? The village would "lose" what makes it special. I am very against any future large developments.</p>	No change necessary
113	A Clegg	<p>.....Martock, Hurst and Bower Hinton is shown on Map 7. It is a single continuous area. development....</p> <p>Add additional clause perhaps after iii.</p> <p>does not encroach on land essential to maintain a separation with neighbouring settlements such as Ash, Stapleton and Coat; and..</p>	Make the point in the supporting text
	<b>Mart14</b>	<b>Renewable Energy</b>	
	<b>Mart15</b>	<b>Sustainable Development</b>	
114	A Clegg	<p>8.50 VDS should refer to energy design codes</p> <p>Although we cannot insist on the application of any particular level from the code for sustainable homes I hope we can put in a clause encouraging developers to meet Level 6 requirements and maybe offer some kind of carrot if they do.</p>	Consider revising the wording of the policy or adding emphasis in the supporting text
115	A Clegg	<p>VDS should also have something on energy efficient estate design</p> <p>Suggest a para here also on the contribution of good estate design to sustainable design, including orientation optimising solar gain, fenestration to improve solar gain, the value of terraces in reducing heat loss and the avoidance of building houses in the shade cast by neighbouring ones.</p>	Review Mart 15 and Mart 21 to consider and, if appropriate, remove, any overlap
	<b>Section 9</b>	<b>Housing - General</b>	
116	A Clegg	<p>There is some overlap between this section and the previous one. Should we consider combining them or perhaps removing from section 8 all the policies that are not related to design, either of houses or the village – i.e. Mart 12 to 15</p>	No change necessary

117	A Clegg	<i>9.2 Should we note that this contradicts our own research which suggests that the waiting list for social housing within the village is seldom more than two or three.</i>	No change necessary
118	A Clegg	<i>9.3 Revise using 2018 figures</i>	Up-date figures to 2018
119	A Clegg	<i>9.5 Beef up a bit maybe with a quote on small developments from NPPF2?</i>	Include quote from NPPF
120	A Clegg	<i>... In order to ensure a growth rate that the village can absorb we favour a gradual expansion of around 10-12 houses per year rather than the development of large estates.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Mart16</b>	<b>Housing Development</b>	
121	A Clegg	<i>Despite this last catch-all clause I suggest insert; vi do not harm areas of significant biodiversity either permanently or during construction. Followed by the catch-all clause as vii</i>	No change necessary
122	A Clegg	<i>9.9 I suggest something like The planned rate of building is 10-12 houses per year. We are currently ahead of this target and the current building rate exceeds the expansion of local employment opportunities. We are consequently seeing a year-on-year decrease in the already low employment density (around 0.4, ref) and an increase in unsustainable out-commuting. Substantial increases in housing numbers will therefore only be supported if it is shown that they meet the needs of, and support, local economic development Look at possible overlap between this policy and Mart 13</i>	Review para. and purpose in the light of latest targets
	<b>Mart17</b>	<b>Housing Mix</b>	
123	A Clegg	<i>Omission here How do we encourage small entry level and affordable houses when they are built in small numbers below the level where developers are obliged to include small ones? I suggest we have a paragraph to state that the village will not support developments of more than x houses unless around 30% at least fall in this category. It probably will not make the slightest difference but at least we have done our bit</i>	Consider what the evidence shows and how it can be best used to ensure housing mix is appropriate
124	A Clegg	<i>9.14 Suggest beef up. Proposals not meeting the objectively assessed local need for different housing types will not be supported.</i>	Revise para. in light of the evidence
	<b>Mart18</b>	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	
125	A Clegg	<i>9.16 Beef up as for Mart17 Can we develop a stronger form of words that says that developments of under 10 that do not offer some small units will not have the support of the village.</i>	Consider re-wording policy
126	A & L Hawes	<i>9.18 We particularly like the point that "Martock Parish Council will be liaising with adjoining parish councils regarding local housing need".</i>	No change necessary
127	A Hall	<i>Affordable housing should be built first - before the builder goes bankrupt!</i>	No change necessary
128	A Clegg	<i>This is taken from The Petherton Plan. Is it overly complex? Can we simplify it by referring to 'neighbouring rural parishes' I worry, for example, about including Yeovil and other more urban parishes as one of our main aims is to reduce out-commuting to Yeovil on sustainability grounds.</i>	Consider whether policy can be simplified or streamlined
	<b>Mart19</b>	<b>Community Housing</b>	
129	A Clegg	<i>9.20 Can this stipulation be made a requirement in perpetuity. How can misuse be prevented – e.g. a local buyer then offering the house at a high rent to anyone. There seems to be a hint in NPPF that this is possible but how?</i>	No change necessary
130	S Saltman	<i>9.21 Ref "Development proposals within areas of high landscape sensitivity, as shown on Map 2, are unlikely to be supported". Please see my comment for Policy Mart 13.</i>	Ensure landscape quality is a key criterion in the development policies
	<b>Mart20</b>	<b>Self-Build Housing</b>	
131	A Clegg	<i>9.25 Do we need a clause that stipulates that self-build house must meet all other criteria laid down in this Plan.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Mart21</b>	<b>Energy Efficiency</b>	

132	S Saltman	<i>9.26 Ref "and where necessary, complies with Conservation Area Management Plan". The CA Management Plan needs to be explained, including its relevancy to a Conservation Area Appraisal, especially as it follows on from an appraisal.</i>	Up-date reference in 9.26
133	A Clegg	<i>Mart21 Look at possible overlap between this policy and Mart15. Should we move the whole of Mart15 to here?</i>	Refer to Mart 15 in supporting text
<b>Section 10</b>		<b>Local Economy - General</b>	
134	A Clegg	<i>10.5 Correction ....notes the current development of a new industrial site initially of 1.6 hectares south of Stoke Road. A plot of 2.8 hectares of land to the west of Ringwell Hill was granted outline industrial planning permission in 2006 but has never been developed</i>	Amend to ensure it is correct
135	A Clegg	<i>10.6 Is the focus correct here? Alternative might be Martock has two convenience stores, a Post Office (now the only bank) and a substantial hardware as well as a variety of smaller specialist shops. Most are centred ..... Library. Shopping beyond daily needs involves a trip to a larger settlement, usually Yeovil some 8 miles distant.. Many parishioners....</i>	Add a couple of additional sentences about development of SMEs
136	A Clegg	<i>New para on tourism. How about: Martock has a long history of providing travel and tourist accommodation. The B3165 is the old carriageway connecting the two coasts and Martock is a traditional coaching stage around halfway along it with many inns. Two hotels remain (White Hart and Hollies - check?) along with a number of houses offering bed and breakfast catering for an expanding local business and tourist trade.</i>	Include reference to hospitality industry
<b>Mart22</b>		<b>Business Areas</b>	
137	Summerfield	<i>Draft Policy 22 supports business development in the identified business areas shown on Map 8. Site D includes part of the land which is controlled by Summerfield. Whilst any future residential development proposals would not directly conflict with this policy, the appeal decision concluded that the market and viability evidence submitted by the appellant sufficiently demonstrated that the proposals would not result in the undesirable loss of employment land. We therefore suggest that the boundary for Site D should be updated to reflect this appeal decision and this part of the site should be removed from it.</i>	Check site D boundary
138	A Hall	<i>I'm all for business premises on Stoke Road, but could they not do something about their roadside image?</i>	<b>Refer to Parish Council</b>
139	Boon Brown on behalf of Paulls of Martock.	<i>Whilst Paulls are generally supportive of a policy promoting economic growth in Martock (especially at Stoke Road) they wish to object to policy Mart22 in its current form. Their main concern lies with the limiting nature of the policy restricting potential growth of the identified business areas (as identified on Map 8). The Stoke Road (incorrectly labelled C) identified 'Business Area' includes the recently approved and currently under construction Martock Workspace as well as the adjacent chicken sheds. Permission was granted for the conversion of the existing agricultural buildings under application 15/05167/FUL and amended under application 16/05479/S73 which forms the eastern side of Business Area C. Land and buildings at the South Somerset Poultry Farm on the western half of the identified area did not form part of this application and are in separate ownership. Several businesses currently operate out of the former poultry farm although the full extent is unclear as there is not a full planning history available nevertheless it would appear that the access point to the site is poor thus a likely need to link through the Martock Workspace to fully utilise this area. Paulls are concerned that Policy Mart22 is overly restrictive and does not allow for potential expansion of the Stoke Road site. As identified in paragraph 10.5 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan the Ringwell Hill allocation has remained undeveloped since 1991 therefore to ensure there is a long-term strategic approach to</i>	Correct the labelling on map  Amend policy Mart 22 to include proportionate outward expansion of site subject to.....

	<p><i>employment land other options should be explored. The neighbourhood plan also states that ‘self-containment’ is an issue with 50% of employed residents out-commuting. To assist in encouraging more self-containment (thus reducing travel through the village) appropriate land needs to be identified with policy support for sensible and proportionate growth of existing business areas. South Somerset’s Employment Land Review highlights there has been no increase in commercial floorspace in Martock since the start of the plan period however this was released prior to the commencement of the Stoke Road site.</i></p> <p><i>The new Martock Workspace has received considerable interest. The site is well located to the main village core and has excellent links to the A303, its location to the south east of the village means that any traffic from the A303 does not have to travel through the village. Whilst there are no immediate plans to expand the site, long term strategic expansion of the identified business areas should not be constrained especially given the number of recent residential approvals in the village.</i></p> <p><i>The current iteration of policy Mart22 does not fully comply with the revised Framework which states that employment land may have to be found outside or adjacent to existing settlements. Paragraph 80 of the Framework states that policy should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt and that significant weight should be placed on economic growth. The current wording of the policy does not allow outward expansion of the existing business areas which would likely limit their growth. On the other hand, policy Mart23 appears to support the creation and/or expansion of new businesses outside of the identified Business Areas which appears contrary to policy Mart22 which currently does not allow the outward expansion of existing businesses beyond the defined boundaries.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, Paulls would request the following amendments to Draft Policy Mart22.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Amend the boundary of the identified Business Areas on Martock NP Map 8 to include the land shown below (in red).</i></li> <li><i>2. Rewording of Draft Policy No. Mart22 to allow for appropriate and proportionate outward expansion of the identified business areas. Suggested rewording (in red):</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Business development in the following business areas (and identified on Map 8):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>A. Martock Business Park</i></li> <li><i>B. Parrett Works</i></li> <li><i>C. Sparrow Works</i></li> <li><i>D. Stoke Road</i></li> </ol> <p><i>will be supported provided it is in keeping with those uses and business activity already on the site <del>and does not lead to the outward expansion of the site</del> including proportionate outward expansion of existing business areas. All business/commercial development should:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. respect the character of its surroundings by way of its scale and design;</i></li> <li><i>ii. not harm the surrounding landscape;</i></li> <li><i>iii. not have an adverse effect on its neighbours;</i></li> <li><i>iv. not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the transport network and parking; and</i></li> <li><i>v. safeguard residential amenity and road safety.</i> <p><i>Paragraph 10.4 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan states that there is an essential need for the continued supply of small business units and the suggested change will allow for established business areas to meet this identified need.</i></p> <p><i>As set out above Paulls are generally supportive of the Neighbourhoods Plans objectives for economic growth and expansion however as a local business investing in new commercial</i></p> </li></ol>	
--	--	--

		<i>floorspace they are concerned that the current policy Mart22 is overly restrictive thus will hinder economic growth.</i>	
140	A Clegg	<i>Correct the letters in map 8 or correct this list (C and D in wrong places) Replace with: Some outward expansion could be envisaged for some sites subject to the conditions below This could apply to all the sites as all have adjacent undeveloped space. Additional item - Some mention of softening the impact by landscaping, planting indigenous trees, low profile buildings. This is important for Sparrows and Stoke as both are on, or next to, land of moderate to high landscape value Undefined business areas - the village has a lot of small industrial and commercial entrepreneurs who are based at home or who use outbuildings on their plots that have traditionally been used in such a way or for agriculture. I suggest there should be some planning guidance for expansion. What should this be? Is this covered by Mart 23?</i>	Correct the labelling on map  Consider an additional clause (as per 139 above) that would allow outward growth subject to strict criteria and the other policies in the NP
141	A Clegg	<i>10.10 Allow boundaries to expand as long as all planning requirements are met as set out in Mart 23. This has always been the case with Sparrows where there has been a long enduring permission to expand south and we have received a similar suggestion from Paulls for Stoke Road.</i>	Re-phrase para. 10.10 to reflect any change in the policy wording
	<b>Mart23</b>	<b><i>Business Development</i></b>	
142	A & L Hawes	<i>10.13 We feel that the land the west of Ringwell Hill should no longer be allocated for employment purposes or indeed for residential development. We understand that the decision within the 1991 Local Plan was made with minimal consultation and that such an allocation does not stand up to current planning ideals and requirements, not least in terms of it being beyond the village settlement and would severely impact on Landscape Sensitivity. This view point was upheld by the latest Planning application and dismissed Appeal (for residential development on the specified land).</i>	No change necessary
143	A Clegg	<i>10.13 Is this so? Exclusively? Can we not take this upon ourselves to initiate or support a proposal to initiate?</i>	Discuss with the LPA
144	A Clegg	<i>10.14 Should we be more specific or are we covered? Light night skies are an issue as well as noise and other forms of pollution.</i>	Consider adding additional clauses to the policy
145	A Clegg	<i>10.15 A few more things that could be considered for this section. Are these covered? If they are in the generic clauses, is there benefit for them to be mentioned specifically. In particularly hospitality. The use and possible extension of domestic premises for business purposes - this is common already. How working from home might be encouraged. A view on mixed developments - like Stoke sub Hamdon A view on the development of additional retail premises A policy on encouraging hospitality and tourism</i>	Review scope and purpose of the policy, and ensure supporting paragraphs facilitate what is intended
	<b>Mart24</b>	<b><i>Communications Infrastructure</i></b>	
146	A Clegg	<i>Now that we have it (or are supposed to have it) into the village centre cannot we make this a black and white stipulation – ... premises must have access to high speed broadband.... where is available in the Parish</i>	No change necessary
147	A Clegg	<i>10.19 Some additional items to consider: Fibre to the door for new developments, particularly industrial and commercial developments. Removal of above-ground telephone wires; a long aim of the CA Appraisal dating from the eighties, never fulfilled</i>	Consider adding further community aspirations to the para.
	<b>Section 11</b>	<b><i>Transport &amp; Travel - General</i></b>	
148	T Slater	<i>The volume of traffic has increased substantially and in particular the very heavy lorries coming through Bower Hinton. Our roads are not designed for these vehicles and they are causing damage to the</i>	Add additional examples i.e. damage to road, footpaths, bollards and garden walls, to

		<i>substrate of the carriageways hence the recurring problems with water and gas main fractures.</i>	the list of unacceptable traffic consequences in 11.2
149	A Clegg	<i>11.5 Extend last sentence .....disabilities, particularly relating to the narrow pavement and the absence of dropped curbs. Add somewhere? - Many of the pavements are narrow putting walkers in danger from passing cars negotiating the narrow carriageway. The walk from the Centre to Bower Hinton involves the frequent crossing of the main road at unmarked crossing places where the view of pedestrians, particularly children, is obscured by parked cars. Frequent topic - generates a lot of traffic for the school run.</i>	Add paragraph regarding accessibility and lack of suitable pavements, dropped curbs, strategic seats, dedicated for paths, negotiable chicanes, etc. Consider impact on policy Mart29
150	A Clegg	<i>11.6 Add two cycling issues, lack of places to secure cycles in the village centre and the particular danger experienced by many cyclists is that posed by oncoming vehicles forced onto the wrong side of the road by parked cars. These have been frequent topics at the FM.</i>	Mention lack of places to secure cycles in para. 11.6
	<b>Mart25</b>	<b>Public Transport</b>	
151	A Hall	<i>Really reliable buses at more frequent intervals might enable some people to manage without a car.</i>	<b>Refer to Parish Council</b>
152	J Mattock	<i>What about more buses, perhaps smaller ones from the top of Hinton to Martock</i>	<b>Refer to Parish Council</b>
	<b>Mart26</b>	<b>Off-Road Parking</b>	
153	S Saltman	<i>11.11 Ref "Policy Mart26 recognises that it would be good to reduce on-road parking and provides support for development proposals that create off-road parking spaces as long as it can be done in an acceptable manner, which includes respecting the integrity of the historic environment". Is this for new development or for all? Already existing street boundaries are being lost as are front gardens to off-road parking and this is not only affecting village amenity but the character and appearance of the conservation area. Would this policy unintentionally encourage this?</i>	Refer to VDS in para. 11.11
154	T Slater	<i>On-road parking is getting worse and will continue to do so if not enough provision is made for adequate parking in new development. A good example being Brooks Garage. This development will cause a nightmare in the area of the mini-roundabout, as the parking provision will not meet the needs of the occupants.</i>	No change necessary
155	A Hall	<i>To improve bottlenecks, there should be more off-street parking.</i>	No change necessary
156	A Clegg	<i>11.11 Need to beef this up. Reference the SCC minimum parking standards which are the ones quoted by developers and which are based on Manual for Streets. We have examples where these minimum standards have been rejected in favour of increasing the numbers of houses on a space using SCC get-out clause that applies to urban areas. The reason given was that the development was within walking distance of the centre. We need to note that our centre only supplies the daily requirements necessitating a greater need for cars than in urban areas. We should not support developments that do not meet minimum parking standards for unallocated parking and that we would prefer the higher of the several standards. Need a discussion on the efficient use of space within development proposals leading the preference of carports and parking spaces over garages (2015 survey in Bower Hinton suggested only 5% garage use, leading to on-street parking). I note that this is now happening, albeit driven by the economic benefits to the builder able to squeeze more houses into a tight site. Electric car charging points in new builds. The SSDC policy on this is being ignored where allocated parking is not next to houses.</i>	Include reference to parking standards in supporting text for Mart16
157	A Clegg	<i>Need a para somewhere discussing environmental standards for parking areas, particularly within the CA, on both existing and new</i>	Refer to VDS and CA in para. 11.11

		<i>builds. Tarmacking of gardens, removal of natural corridors, obscuring good design by cars, blocking views, etc</i>	
	<b>Mart27</b>	<b>Footpaths</b>	
158	A Clegg	<i>Is there overlap between this policy and Mart 5?</i>	No change necessary
159	A Clegg	<i>Expand to include wheelchair, mobility scooter, pushchair and cycle routes 11.12 Separate para on cycle routes. In particular to promote the development of safe cycle routes from the village periphery to the centre, particularly the school. The routes should also be passable by wheelchairs and mobility scooters</i>	Add reference to safe cycling routes to the supporting text
160	J Luffman	<i>11.13 Hopefully the old raised pavements in Bower Hinton will not be altered.</i>	Include para. regarding safeguarding of historic pavements
161	A Clegg	<i>11.13 Additional paragraph - Note on supporting infrastructure development resulting from house building that improves access for the sight and mobility impaired and provide increased seating at strategic points to allow the elderly to take better advantage of footpaths and pavements. This includes issues like dropped curbs at junctions and knobbled pavements.</i>	Add reference in the supporting text to the need to cater for the less mobile or disabled
162	J Luffman	<i>11.14 Make the main road through the village 20mph so that safety is hugely improved for everyone, young and old. Then far fewer other methods of traffic management would be needed. Simple!</i>	<b>Refer to Parish Council</b>
163	J Mattock	<i>Maybe some seats part way down the road and even "our end" of the Recreation Field?</i>	<b>Refer to Parish Council</b>
164	S Bellows	<i>Martock Hurst and Bower Hinton are already adversely affected by the volume and noise of motorised transport. Some pavements are hazardous for pedestrians who are at risk of being clipped by wing mirrors of vehicles passing close to the pavement, especially Water Street and Church Street. We want to reduce the number of motorised vehicles on our streets. As things stand, if most homes have just 2 cars, 1 home will produce 4 journey per day. Therefore 100 homes will produce 400 journeys per day. The impact on the wider community must be considered, walking and cycling must not be compromised any further.</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Mart28</b>	<b>Traffic Management</b>	
165	S Saltman	<i>Policy Mart28 Ref i. "of a design that is in keeping with the character of the area with regards to scale, layout and materials; and" In order to beef up protection, can we say instead "of a design that is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area with regards to scale, layout, design and materials"?</i>	Add "and appearance" to the policy Include cross-reference to VDS
166	S Moffatt	<i>The added concern is traffic as the roads in Martock and BH are not designed to take the volume of traffic already let alone adding more houses with at least 2 cars each. Parking is a big problem particularly in BH as is the speed and volume of traffic and the size of trucks using this route. I have lived here for almost 6 years and the traffic is getting worse day and night, there is no let up and despite the many times residents complain and ask for traffic calming, restrictions etc nothing has been done. We live with the noise, damage, pollution every day. This does not inspire any confidence when we have the two housing plots yet to be built on in Water Street which is going to make village life feel like you are living on a motorway.</i>	Ensure that community concern is reflected properly in the introduction to the topic and traffic management is referred to the PC
167	L Chesterman	<i>TRAFFIC through the village is a big one. I live on Bower Hinton and it's already pretty busy in volume and artic vehicles coming through when they shouldn't be. It makes the houses dirty inside and out if you have windows open and makes it pretty noisy. Considering we are supposed to be in a quaint village this is already a major issue.</i>	Ensure that community concern is reflected properly in the introduction to the topic and traffic management is referred to the PC
168	A Clegg	<i>This is the most frequently discussed issue in the Plan. Can we do better?</i>	Ensure that community concern is reflected properly in the introduction to the

		<i>How far can we take this? Can we welcome speed and weight restrictions?</i>	topic and traffic management is referred to the PC
	<b>Mart29</b>	<b><i>Disabled Access</i></b>	
	<b>Section 12</b>	<b><i>Community Wellbeing - General</i></b>	
169	S Saltman	<i>12.1 This rather proves the point in 8.39 about excessive growth.</i>	No change necessary
170	S Saltman	<i>12.2 Seems to imply that Martock regrets not being a town in the fullest sense. I think it's meant, and 12.4, to explain the pickle we are in because of over expansion but we are obviously not living in say Yeovil but in rural Martock. Is not the Co-op a supermarket albeit a small one in keeping with character and amenity? The ever-important PO is providing some banking facility.</i>	Re-word para. 12.2  add "large" to supermarket
171	A Clegg	<i>12.1 and Parrett Works? 12.2 Should we add that these are the reasons why the Local Plan Settlement Policy defines Martock as a large village ('Rural centre') based on comparative research throughout the District by Baker Associates in 2009 (I can give ref). Or should this be mentioned earlier, perhaps in the Introduction. It is important that this be included somewhere as there is very strong pressure to 'upgrade' Martock to the status of a market Town by adding 1000 house plus associated infrastructure and commercial areas between East St and Cartgate. 12.3 Rephrase as more positive e.g. because the old centre of the village has physically impaired the growth of urban structures, the settlement has retained and enjoyed its village character, able to meet the primary requirements of the villagers while relying on nearby towns for anything more. 12.7 Should these 'existing community facilities' be mentioned? Toddlers playgrounds? Not sure how many; I know of two but there may be more. Who services them? Should there be something on the gradual loss of community services and facilities over time? We now have only one post office and no banks except the Post Office, only one bakery, butcher and fresh local vegetable show, no dairy, etc, when just a generation ago there were several. Bower Hinton now has no retail outlets with the recent closure of the last two. The library now and then comes under threat (it has just escaped the latest). The cause is the ease of access for most to Yeovil, which makes life very difficult for those who have not got transport. This is an important issue with considerable planning implications but I'm not sure we want to advertise it as gaining these structures will endanger our village status. Mention monthly Farmers' Market somewhere - promoting local producers and businesses Allotments. Two, privately owned and leased to the PC. Both, date back to shortly after the 1908 Act. One is owned by the Church, the other has recently been sold and we await a note from the new owner.</i>	Add Parrett Works to list of parish settlement areas in para. 12.1  Rephrase para. 12.3 to make it more positive as suggested?
	<b>Mart30</b>	<b><i>Existing Community Facilities</i></b>	
172	S Saltman	<i>12.8 Is the library not a community facility?</i>	Add Library to list in 12.8
173	A Hall	<i>Measures to keep the library and encourage more shops would be good.</i>	No change necessary
174	A Clegg	<i>Add an additional clause (iv) that will address the main cause of the decline in viability of the village centre. To oppose development proposals that are likely to lead to the decline or loss of the vibrancy of the community centre such as the establishment of large housing estates on the village edge with their own facilities that will draw trade for the old centre. (See below and LP Policy EP14)</i>	Consider additional policy if the SG agree
175	A Clegg	<i>12.10 Suggest split this clause into two, one of which promotes village centre growth and diversification by actions such as opposing the development of 'out-of-village' facilities that will lead</i>	Consider additional policy if the SG agree

		<i>to the degeneration of the centre. (Local Plan EP14 - Development of Neighbourhood Centres shall be of a scale and type to meet the local needs of the area within which they will be located and must not adversely affect the vitality and viability of any town centres identified by the local authority.)</i>	
	<b>Mart31</b>	<b><i>New Community Facilities</i></b>	
176	A Clegg	<i>Add a clause iv) they do not undermine the viability or vitality of existing facilities in the village centre</i>	Add additional criterion to policy Mart31
177	A Clegg	<i>Does this policy apply to both free and open services and those limited by subscription or by cost? Should this distinction be made?</i>	No change necessary
178	J Becker	<i>The 'Our Place' project is mentioned, and that the project continues to support etc. The 'Our Place' name and logo has been dropped, and this work continues under the more general heading of 'Community Services' The reason for this was largely because many of the people who were being helped by the 'Our Place' team, and indeed the public at large were unaware that Martock Parish Council had initiated and were/ are funding his project. A small point, but I think worth clarifying.</i>	Add footnote to up-date situation regarding project and name
	<b>Mart32</b>	<b><i>Sports and Recreational Facilities</i></b>	
179	A Clegg	<i>Add a clause extending this policy to other areas that currently exist or may exist in the future such as the two allotments and Cartgate nature area (we are actively pursuing registering this with Natural England)</i>	No change necessary
180	A Clegg	<i>12.20 What about other recreational activities that may have planning implications. Main ones are probably equestrian, dog walking, cycling and allotments?</i>	No change necessary
	<b>Monitoring</b>		
181	S Saltman	<i>Does the NPPF 2018 not require a review every two years and the same for the Local Plan? If so, how will this demanding monitoring be met?</i>	Consider what is required and what can be committed to
	<b>Glossary</b>		
182	S Saltman	<i>The GPDO 1995 has likely been superseded by the GPDO 2015</i>	Amend reference in glossary