

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Deliverability and Viability	<p><i>Has the site been included within the SHLAA: Yes</i></p> <p><i>Has the landowner shown clear interest in progressing development? Yes</i></p> <p>The entire Coker Option comprises of land within at least 5 different ownerships and its total delivery is dependent upon agreement between the interested parties. Local developers, Abbey Manor and Charles Bishop have confirmed that they either have ownership or in-principle agreements with owner of the relevant land to achieve the 1565 dw.</p>	<p><i>Has the site been included within the SHLAA: No</i></p> <p><i>Has the landowner shown clear interest in progressing development? No</i></p> <p>This option is located within West Dorset and as such South Somerset has no control over the delivery of a planning permission. West Dorset District Council has clearly indicated that they do not support the development of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk of flooding - Landscape impact - Impact upon the identity of the villages of Over 	<p><i>Has the site been included within the SHLAA: Yes</i></p> <p><i>Has the landowner shown clear interest in progressing development? Yes</i></p> <p>The option is understood to be within the ownership of two landowners although a single developer (Abbey Manor Group) has control over the majority of the developable area of the option. The developer has demonstrated a commitment to progressing this option by producing an indicative plan that has been discussed with the parish council. This was followed</p>	<p><i>Has the site been included within the SHLAA: Yes (except C)</i></p> <p><i>Has the landowner shown clear interest in progressing development? Yes (except C)</i></p> <p>The multi-site option does provide greater flexibility in that it does not rely upon one developer/landowner to deliver the growth requirements for Yeovil. There is a clear intent from developers and landowners to deliver development on sites A, B and D and the potential for elements of certain sites to deliver development could overcome some of the</p>

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

		<p>Compton and Bradford Abbas</p>	<p>by a request for an EIA screening opinion in relation to an indicative proposal for up to 800 dwellings (13/00286/EIASS)</p>	<p>more difficult landowner issues. Option D is next to an approved employment site (07/05431/OUT) and is within the control of the Abbey Manor Group. Recent discussions have taken place regarding the potential for residential and other uses on this site.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------	---	---

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Market Capacity	<p>There has been very little development to the south of Yeovil and it is considered that housing in this area would be attractive to buyers</p> <p>There would be a reduction in variety of 'offer' with the development of one single site</p> <p>Baker's Housing Requirement Assessment Jan 2011 (para 8.20) suggested that a single large site is likely to deliver a maximum of 260 dpa (on the basis of several different outlets) and that if SSDC were looking for a higher delivery then it should consider more than one</p>	<p>This site would provide a different 'offer' than other developments around Yeovil</p> <p>There would be a reduction in variety of 'offer' with the development of one single site</p> <p>Baker's Housing Requirement Assessment Jan 2011(para 8.20) suggested that a single large site is likely to deliver a maximum of 260 dpa (on the basis of several different outlets) and that if SSDC were looking for a higher delivery then it should consider more than one</p>	<p>Adjoins existing Wyndham park site (currently under development) and this may affect the marketability of this site</p> <p>There would be a reduction in variety of 'offer' with the development of one single site</p> <p>Baker's Housing Requirement Assessment Jan 2011 (para 8.20) suggested that a single large site is likely to deliver a maximum of 260 dpa (on the basis of several different outlets) and that if SSDC were looking for a higher delivery then it should consider more than one</p>	<p>The development of several sites would provide a variety of different products in different locations and any risk would be shared across various developers.</p> <p>The Baker Associates Housing Requirement Assesment 2011 (para 8.32) suggests that the maximum theoretical capacity of delivery could be achieved by spreading development across up to 4 urban extensions.</p>

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

	site.	site	site	
--	-------	------	------	--

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Infrastructure Deliverability	<p><i>Is there CIL evidence?:</i> Yes. Viability assessments indicate that whilst large urban extensions are able to meet their 106 requirements it is unlikely that they will be sufficiently viable to pay CIL.</p> <p><i>Are there any known exceptional infrastructure requirements?</i> No. It is considered that all infrastructure requirements can be addressed at the master planning stage.</p> <p>As the land is within</p>	<p><i>Is there CIL evidence?:</i> No SSDC have not assessed any sites within West Dorset however we are aware that whilst large urban extensions are able to meet their 106 requirements it is unlikely that they will be sufficiently viable to pay CIL.</p> <p>This site is located within West Dorset and there is uncertainty in respect of the infrastructure that would be expected by the adjoining local authority.</p>	<p><i>Is there CIL evidence?:</i> Yes. Viability assessments indicate that a large urban extension will not be able to contribute towards CIL due to the infrastructure costs that will need to be funded through S106.</p> <p>The option does adjoin an existing development site and it is probable that some of the upgrading of services/utilities has been carried out.</p> <p><i>Are there any known exceptional infrastructure requirements?</i> No. It is considered that all</p>	<p><i>Is there CIL evidence?:</i> Yes Development of a single urban extension is likely to be able to meet its S106 requirements for essential on-site infrastructure but are unable to make a CIL contribution. Smaller developments have the potential to make a contribution towards infrastructure.</p> <p><i>Are there any known exceptional infrastructure requirements?</i> No.</p> <p>A truly multi-site delivery may improve viability by making better use of</p>

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

	different ownerships the deliverability of the essential infrastructure will rely upon agreement between the various parties to ensure that the burden is equalised		infrastructure requirements can be addressed at the master planning stage.	existing capacity that could be enhanced through reasonable contributions rather than a requirement to provide totally new infrastructure e.g the improvement of an existing junction rather than a new roundabout
--	---	--	--	--

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Provision of Services and Facilities	The scale of this option and the potential for additional development beyond the Plan Period would allow for the provision of meaningful services and facilities to serve the development. Furthermore the scale of the site would allow the provision of a secondary and primary school. However, correspondence from County Planning	<p>This site is located within West Dorset and as such the delivery of services would be within the control of another authority.</p> <p>This site is also separated from the rest of Yeovil by an industrial area and it is unlikely that any facilities provided here would be widely used by the existing population.</p>	<p>The scale of the developable area is likely to enable the development to provide those services/facilities that are required to make this a sustainable option.</p> <p>The site is well related to a proposed school site and is within reasonable proximity of an existing secondary school.</p>	<p>The multi-site option does present an issue in terms of scale as it is widely recognised that smaller developments are less likely to be able to provide on-site facilities such as schools, community halls etc.</p> <p>The multi-site approach can potentially rely upon existing facilities and make contributions towards</p>

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

	<p>Officer (16th Oct 2013) indicates that the southern option may not be a preferred location for a secondary school because of distance from main residential areas.</p> <p>As the land is within several different ownerships the deliverability of services and facilities will rely upon agreement between the various parties to ensure that the burden is equalised.</p> <p>The provision of improved public transport links could be achieved on this site, making better use of existing bus services to the benefit of the surrounding community.</p>		<p>As the site is controlled by one developer the provision of services and facilities within the site is achievable.</p> <p>The provision of improved public transport links could be achieved on this site, making use of existing services to the benefit of the surrounding community. The impact of this upon the viability of the existing bus service needs to be considered.</p>	<p>improving capacity. Furthermore, developments of approx. 500 dwellings have historically been required to provide primary school sites.</p> <p>A multi-site approach has the potential to improve existing public transport links and make them more viable to the benefit of surrounding communities however the smaller the scheme the less likely it is to be able to support an improved bus service</p> <p>The future move towards CIL will allow funds from multiple developments to be targeted at meeting the need in the most appropriate location.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Further Mitigation Potential	<p>The scale of this option allows for the creation of a significant 'Buffer Zone' This site has the ability to provide the full 5 ha of employment land in a location close to a major road.</p> <p>The recognised impact upon landscape and recognised heritage assets can be mitigated through the masterplanning process. It is not possible to mitigate the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.</p>	<p>The site is remote from existing residential areas and it is not possible to mitigate this severance.</p>	<p>The impact upon landscape and recognised heritage assets can be mitigated through a masterplanning process. This may reduce the amount of achievable development.</p> <p>The majority of the site comprises of Grade 2 agricultural land.</p>	<p>The multi-site approach may result in several reduced sites and it is very likely that the visual/landscape impact of the developments could be more easily assimilated into the town. Conversely, the development of more than one site would clearly have an impact upon more than just one area</p>

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Added opportunities and benefits	<p>The scale of the site would allow provision of secondary education.</p> <p>The scale of the site would increase the potential for the delivery of a significant employment area in an appropriate location.</p>	<p>The restricted size of the site means that it is unlikely to be able to make a contribution towards employment provision or any other facilities.</p>	<p>This site does provide the potential to address the recognised dearth of community facilities on the adjoining Wyndham Park development and could help to deliver a larger primary school site.</p> <p>There is potential for a suitably sized area of employment land within the site.</p>	<p>Potential for one or more of the sites to provide the land that is required for employment.</p> <p>The impact upon the highway network (and other infrastructure) is likely to be diluted if the development was provided across various sites.</p>

Examination Suspension LDF Project Management Board Workshop 30, October 25th 2013 – Item 11

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	Coker - Option B	Dorset/Middle Yeo – Option C	Primrose Lane/Up Mudford – Option D	Multi Sites - Options A (Brympton), B, C and D
Ability to provide long term development	The entire site of the YSUE has the potential to deliver between 2,800 and 3,600 dwellings together with 11ha of employment and other services/facilities	This site does not have the clear potential to provide more than 1565 dwellings due to landscape and environmental constraints	The site does not have the clear potential to provide more than 1565 dwellings due to landscape constraints is unlikely to be able to provide the full 1565.	The multi-site approach provides the greatest potential to provide development beyond the plan period.

Infrastructure Notes from Draft IDP in Relation to Yeovil Development

Education

For 7441 dwellings over the Plan Period there is a requirement for:

- 1455 Primary places (requiring contribution and sites)
- 1062 Secondary places (requiring contribution and sites)

-

The education requirement for 1565 dwellings is therefore

- 313 Primary places
- 223 Secondary Places

Highways

Certain infrastructure identified but none specific to any of the growth option.

Sewerage

All sites will require certain works but no exceptional infrastructure has been requested.

Healthcare

The provision of 7441 dwellings within Yeovil is likely to require the provision of a new healthcare facility. The location of the majority of the new development will influence whether a new facility is provided or whether existing facilities can be improved/extended.