

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PANEL**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on 1 February 2017  
at 2.30 pm**

**Present:**

Councillor K H Turner (Chairman)  
Councillor B Heywood  
Councillor J Parbrook

Councillor S Y Goss  
Councillor B Maitland-Walker  
Councillor T Venner

**Members in Attendance:**

Councillor M Chilcott  
Councillor A Trollope-Bellew

Councillor P Murphy  
Councillor R Woods

**Officers in Attendance:**

Tim Burton, Assistant Director - Planning and Environment  
Andrew Goodchild, Assistant Director – Place and Energy Infrastructure  
Nick Bryant, Planning Policy Manager  
Martin Wilsher, Principal Planning Officer (Policy)  
Krystyna Kowalewska - Meeting Administrator

**Also in Attendance:**

Lin Cousins, Consultant - Three Dragons

**LD8 Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received.

**LD9 Minutes**

(Minutes of the Local Development Panel held on 3 October 2016 – circulated with the Agenda).

**RESOLVED** that, subject to replacing ‘not’ with ‘insufficient’ in the last line of the third bullet point of Minute No. LD5, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Local Development Panel held on 3 October 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

**LD10 Declarations of Interest**

Members present at the meeting declared the following personal interests in their capacity as a Member of a County, Parish or Town Council:

Name	Minute No	Description of Interest	Personal or Prejudicial	Action Taken
Cllr S Goss	All Items	Stogursey	Personal	Spoke and voted

**WEST SOMERSET COUNCIL**  
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PANEL 1.02.17

Cllr K H Turner	All Items	Brompton Ralph	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr B Maitland-Walker	All Items	Carhampton	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr J Parbrook	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr K H Turner	All Items	Brompton Ralph	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr T Venner	All Items	Minehead & SCC	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr P Murphy	All Items	Watchet	Personal	Spoke
Cllr A Trollope-Bellew	All Items	Crowcombe	Personal	Spoke

**LD11 Public Participation**

Dr. Teresa Bridgeman, Secretary of West Somerset Flood Board spoke on Agenda Item 6 – West Somerset Approach to Urban Design and Masterplanning.

Dr. Bridgeman advised that the information contained within the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) relating to Flood and Water Management (Section F.6) was out of date and required to be rewritten, and she was of the opinion that the statutory consultees and the Flood Group would recommend substantial changes. In addition, neither Section C and D fully integrated flood and water design management and the Flood Group recommended changes to these sections and was prepared to provide the necessary input. Her concern was that as the revisions to the flood and water management text were going to be substantial, she asked Members to consider whether going out to public consultation at this stage was the most effective way to revise and consult on the document given its early draft state in some sections, and would there be a way for the Council to consult on the new text which would inevitably be generated.

She also raised concerns relating to the Minehead strategic sites and issues concerning masterplanning for Minehead within the SPD.

**LD12 West Somerset Infrastructure Delivery Plan**

(Report No. WSC 14/17, circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report was to present the Final Draft West Somerset Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for sign off by the Panel.

Councillor K Turner, Lead Member for Housing, Health and Wellbeing introduced and welcomed Lin Cousins, one of the consultants from Three Dragons, to the meeting.

The Planning Policy Manager presented the report, summarising the key issues contained within. He advised that the IDP was an important part of the planning preparation process in terms of identifying and costing the infrastructure required to support new development over the Local Plan period to 2032. He drew Members' attention to Appendix A of the report which documented all the infrastructure which had been identified by key stakeholders. The document was a useful tool for the Council to support its future development agenda. The officers felt the IDP could be used as a guide to give a steer as to whether or not it would be appropriate to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in West Somerset. It was explained that CIL was a mechanism by which development helped to pay to deliver the essential infrastructure. The IDP had taken longer than anticipated to produce, the reason being was to ensure consensus from the infrastructure providers was obtained as to the necessary requirements, and it was noted that, as a result, some of the references contained within the document may now be out of date. Officers had the ability to make limited factual changes prior to the document being signed-off, and it was recognised the IDP would be reviewed on a regular basis to bring it up to date.

Various questions and issues were raised by Members including the following points:

- A question was raised as to whether the IDP would be updated to take into account the need for attenuation in terms of masterplanning for the Hopcott and Periton Road site, and it was agreed to acknowledge the fact that this was a concern and would be looked at when housing developments came forward.
- The IDP was a living document and would be kept under review, to inform the Council's decisions with regards to priorities and infrastructure funding; and some of the work on masterplanning for the strategic sites could have a bearing on the cost of infrastructure required and what would need to be included in future revisions.
- The information within the IDP contained best available evidence which was based on representations and input provided by the key stakeholders, and included agreed costed proposals. Omissions of any proposals would be rectified.
- Concerns were raised about the quality of information supplied by Somerset County Council pertaining to education as it was believed to be incomplete in terms of levels of schools and classroom provision and requests were made for the omissions to be included in the IDP. The various issues were noted for consideration and it was confirmed that officers would re-communicate with SCC on education matters. In terms of the capacity issue, it would be verified with SCC whether schools outside the Exmoor National Park taking pupils from within the ENP had been taken into account in the figures given.
- In response to a concern raised, it was confirmed that Wessex Water had been consulted at each stage during the process and no issues were raised as part of their representations in terms of how to deal with water capacity for larger housing developments.

- Only costed infrastructure items had been included in the quoted IDP 'infrastructure bill', there are some items which may be required over the plan period which are not currently sufficiently progressed to be included as costed proposals. This does not imply they could not be required.
- Maps of the proposed Watchet pedestrian bridge and the proposed road at Cleeve Hill were requested. It was noted Local Plan Policy WA1 recognised the need for an improved connection within Watchet because of the railway but did not specify the location - this would be determined at a later date when specific, detailed proposals have been developed. The need for re-alignment of the road at the top of Cleeve Hill was recognised in Local Plan Policy LT1 as a policy requirement and thus would be fundamental to the layout of any scheme and would provide access to the site. This would be a matter for the planning application and any detailed masterplanning of the site to address.
- The IDP was an information report supplementing the evidence base within the Local Plan already in place.
- Concern was raised on the inconsistencies within the IDP with regards to costed and non-costed projects.
- A correction was highlighted in paragraph 3.15 of the IDP in that reference should be made to the fact that LPA's had responsibility for sustainable drainage systems for new developments under 10 dwellings.

In light of the requests for additional points to be included in the IDP (not limited to those referred to above) and for officers to clarify some of the detail which concerned Members in respect of education, it was proposed by Councillor B Maitland-Walker and seconded by Councillor B Heywood that the report be amended and presented to the next Local Development Panel meeting for consideration.

**RESOLVED** that the item be deferred until the next meeting of the Local Development Panel held on 14 June 2017, subject to the Draft West Somerset Infrastructure Delivery Plan being amended.

**LD13 West Somerset Approach to Urban Design and Masterplanning**

(Report No. WSC 15/17, circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report is to outline the proposed approach to urban design and masterplanning, including endorsement of the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Design Guide and Major Developments.

Councillor K Turner, Lead Member for Housing, Health and Wellbeing introduced the item and the report was presented by the Planning Policy Manager. He provided detailed background information and advised that there were areas of the draft SPD which required to be amended further. The Planning Policy Manager noted down and responded to the comments raised by Dr. Bridgeman and agreed that substantive factual changes could be made to the document before going out for consultation. There was no formal process in which to publish the SPD other than the need for it to be subject to formal public consultation prior to its adoption. If Members were mindful, officers could informally consult with the Flood Group or any other relevant parties prior to going out for formal consultation.

The Planning Policy Manager drew Members' attention to the proposed approach that was being recommended in respect of the Local Plan strategic sites as detailed in the report.

During the debate the following main points were raised:

- It was noted that more detailed information in respect of flooding issues would be dealt with after the meeting.
- There were complex issues and challenges regarding the masterplanning for the Minehead sites and a significant budget would need to be identified to enable it to be managed appropriately.
- It was acknowledged that the SFRA was not up-to-date with the latest practice guidance and, although it had a relevance, it would not impact on the SPD being adopted.
- Reference was made to 'lifetime homes' and on consideration of the concern raised it was agreed to incorporate more detailed points into the document. The issue would also be addressed during the review of the Local Plan.

It was proposed by Councillor B Maitland-Walker and seconded by Councillor J Parbrook that the item be deferred to enable further consultation work to be undertaken. A two-stage consultation process was proposed, which would involve an informal consultation with stakeholders and, subject to the Local Development Panel's approval of the SPD at the next Panel meeting, the document would be published for a period of six weeks formal consultation.

**RESOLVED** that the report be deferred until the next meeting of the Local Development Panel held on 14 June 2017.

The meeting closed at 4.32 pm.