

APPENDIX 6

Monkton Heathfield: SS1 Policy Area and MH2 Concept Plan and Design Principles

Responses to Public Consultation

Name of Contributor	1. If you wish to make general comments on any aspect of the Framework Plan, the Concept Plan or the Design Guidance please set out your comments below specifying which plan and/or page/section your comment relates to.	2. Please set out the changes you consider necessary to resolve the issues you have identified above. Please explain why these changes will make Plans or Design Guide more effective in shaping the development of the Monkton Heathfield area.
Creech St Michael PC	Due to the size of this representation it has been attached in full at the end of this table.	
West Monkton PC	Due to the size of this representation it has been attached in full at the end of this table.	
Persimmon Homes SW	Due to the size of this representation it has been attached in full at the end of this table.	
Redrow Homes	Due to the size of this representation it has been attached in full at the end of this table.	
Claire Searle	<p>MH2. What is the need for this? We had a lovely village, the roads were quiet, the wildlife was thriving. The crime rates were low.</p> <p>Now because of money grabbing councillors and Housing developers our once beautiful village and surrounding countryside has been destroyed. Enough is enough.</p> <p>The main road through the village has become a rat run for lorries and commuters, even with the bus lane this will continue as a rat run, the roads are no longer safe and very few stick to the speed limit. With the current Nerrols farm site the traffic control has been awful. None of these builds were wanted by the people.</p> <p>With yet another new development you are allowing wildlife to be killed off and taking away our ever decreasing countryside.</p> <p>This survey only asks for answers to which you can control in your favour.</p> <p>You have merged bathpool with Monkton Heathfield and with it destroyed the heart of the village. No one here wanted that. Yet again you did not listen to what the people really want and you manage to manipulate people's responses to suit.</p> <p>We are no longer a village. You have destroyed that way of life.</p> <p>For once listen to the people who live here. If it's isn't broke, why try to fix it!</p>	<p>My suggested changes are to take the plans and destroy them for good. Use the money to help those already living here that are in need.</p>

Eddie Eatwell	<p>My comment relates to the Framework Plan, and specifically to the location of the new bus gate.</p> <p>By locating this bus gate adjacent to Procters Farm all traffic from West Monkton, Monkton Elm Garden Centre, the residential part of the MH2 development and Alder King Residential will have to travel through the Monkton Heathfield phase 2 local roads.</p>	<p>If the new bus gate could be moved slightly to the north east, adjacent to Alder King, this could be avoided.</p>
Mark Essex	<p>Addressing the Draft SS1 Policy Area Framework Plan (specific comments in answer 2.)</p>	<p>In short - I do not understand why land has been allocated to industry / employment at the current Langaller Manor Farm site (just slightly west of the green wedge and necklace).</p> <p>There is a currently a massive under supply of housing and a more recent huge downturn in office leases (given upward trends in people working from home). Surely this site would be perfect to rejuvenate a listed building whilst offering more suitable housing to meet the local demands?</p>
Michelle Baxter	<p>I'd like to know what plans there are for traffic joining the M5 Taunton junction from these new houses, as the majority of homeowners from the new houses will be commuting out of these villages and developments, either into Taunton town centre or further afield for work.</p> <p>Am I correct in assuming that all Monkton Heathfield traffic will be sent through Bathpool, past Aldi to join the Creech Castle crossroads? The congestion is already terrible on that road, combined with a lack of speed signage and permanent speed control. The Hyde Lane junction at the New Mill pub is dangerous due to lack of visibility or care from other drivers, as is the junction to Acacia Gardens.</p> <p>Children use this main road to get to Heathfield school and it's not safe for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Create a new exit point for vehicles to access the new M5 roundabout and dual carriageway to avoid causing congestion on A38 by diverting traffic away from Bathpool/ Bridgwater Road * Creation of junction 25B to cope with the thousands of new visitors/residents of Taunton & avoid peak time standstill on existing routes * Reroute the A38 away from this residential area/school route to keep children safe * Put up more 30 mph speed signs, speed humps, and other traffic calming measures through Bathpool, starting at St Quintin Park and ending just past the Aldi exit * Put up a permanent speed camera to cover the Hyde Lane/Acacia Gardens junctions to improve safety - similar to the successful ones installed on Greenway Road by the Texaco garage. * Use mobile speed vans to monitor speeds/traffic flow at peak times if permanent speed cameras are unviable. * DO NOT MAKE MONKTON HEATHFIELD AND BATHPOOL A RAT RUN TO CUT OUT THE DUAL CARRIAGEWAY CONGESTION! <p>People pay a lot to live in this area, both in house prices and council tax - more attention should be given to these long-standing loyal Taunton residents and their rights should not be overlooked in favour of expansion.</p>	
David Fowle	<p>I am strongly in favour of diverting all traffic around the outskirts of the village by way of the planned Eastern and Western Relief Roads.</p> <p>However I am concerned by routes that still cut through the heart of the extended village. These routes will inevitably be used as "rat runs" as they are clearly more direct than the new relief routes and it is well known that drivers will utilise such routes even when they are not suitable or have traffic calming measures in place.</p>	

I am also concerned that traffic to and from Monkton Elm garden centre and Procters farm will be diverted through Bawler Road. This will lead to a large volume of traffic, especially during the weekend when there is a large car boot sale. Bawler Road is not large enough to handle that volume of traffic or the associated larger commercial vehicles. It will become a very unsafe area for children, where currently the road is quiet enough for children to cross and play on the surrounding green areas without being concerned.

Overall I would like to see more done to stop traffic on the current A38, A358 and Bawler Road (or any other roads through the village). The current plan is not clear about whether there will be a bus only route on the existing A38 section - I would be in favour of this but it would need further work to reduce traffic through the village. The current plan splits the village and that leads to poor safety (especially for the young and elderly), increased air and noise pollution and a less integrated community.

Separately I would also like stricter rules to be put in place about the area immediately surrounding the new relief roads. The current section of the relief road has some banks and trees but the planting and maintenance is very poor to non-existent. Given the proximity of the relief roads to the village a priority must be given to better banking and screening with trees. I would like to see more details around this area of the plan.

I would also like to see more detail around how Monkton Heathfield, Taunton and the surrounding area will be linked up with foot and cycle paths. The current routes to Taunton are less than ideal in terms of safety.

The relief roads are a good start, but the plan for the village needs to go further. The roads going to the interior of the village should not be usable as through roads for general traffic - buses should be the only exception to this so bus gates should be deployed for this purpose. We must plan for safe pedestrian and cycle access and residents must be able to access their homes by car and customers must be able to reach Monkton Elm Garden Centre and Procters Farm sites.

Looking at the current planned road network, the only way to achieve the goal of reducing traffic through the village would be to alter the bus gates so that there was an additional bus gate at the south of Bawler Road (where it joins Bridgwater Road) then, if the section that is marked "opportunity to deliver bus only route" actually allowed traffic this would allow vehicle access to all locations in the village whilst removing the option to use the village as a "rat run".

Alternatively, since the entire existing network around the existing A38/A358 junction is being changed, it would be sensible to revisit the location of the bus gate on the A358 (south west of Monkton Elm Garden Centre). The A38/A358 junction will no longer be hazardous so that bus gate is not actually required to stop traffic at that point. If a bus gate could be placed on the A358 at the Aginhills end, or just moved slightly south west to the other side of the "New Roundabout" then this would allow free flow of internal village traffic whilst increasing safety of the A38/A358 junction. This would seem to be the best option to meet the aims set out above.

To go further, the planned road network would need to be revisited. I would suggest that the road between the Alder King residential plot and the new school could be removed (or changed to bus only) and a new route could run around the north of the Alder King plot to allow access to the aforementioned commercial sites. This would further increase the cohesiveness of the community by not splitting the Alder King plot away from the rest of the village.

	If these suggestions were put in place, the interior of the village would form a single community with easy and safe access to all areas by pedestrians, on bicycle or potentially using public transport. Air and noise pollution through the village would also be reduced.	
Philip Bisatt - Railfuture	<p>A former Somerset County Council transport officer said to me that the scale of development proposed on green fields around Taunton simply cannot work without a major switch in travel behaviour from car to public transport. Having lived in Taunton for 40 years, I feel sure that this is correct. Unfortunately, what is now being proposed on the urban fringes seems unlikely to adequately address this.</p> <p>The proposed district centre for Monkton Heathfield is fundamentally in the wrong place. Urban centres develop at junctions of established routes, as can be seen by settlements such as Wellington, Wiveliscombe, and indeed, Taunton itself. They do not arise (as this one does) in the middle of what were previously fields!</p> <p>This is important not just in functional terms, but also to make sure that a place evolves which has the sense (as established places do) of having grown organically, rather than being a 'thing' that could have been dropped into the area from outer space. Travelling around (and after allowing for any 'bypass' roads) one should arrive 'naturally' at the centre of the community.</p> <p>The district centre should therefore be located more or less where the A3259, the A38, the lane from West Monkton village, and the road from Creech St Michael meet, and as far as possible, should front directly onto these roads. These are the historic routes - albeit re-shaped to a degree, to meet the demands of motor traffic - around which development should be structured. Interestingly, the established commercial use at Monkton Elm already occupies such a location: why develop a new district centre remote from this, instead of consolidating around it?</p> <p>As drawn, the proposals are more akin to what might be termed 'the Milton Keynes model', whereby the main routes pass around the centre, rather than through it. Milton Keynes may have virtues, but as an exemplar of how to design an area to support public transport, it most definitely is not. Applied to the design for Monkton Heathfield, such an approach will mean (amongst other things) that buses will not be able to serve the district centre without having to depart from their direct route, thereby slowing down the service and making it less attractive to users.</p> <p>This should be a major concern. Around the UK, there has been a widespread failure to design new Garden communities adequately for the needs of public transport (as identified by the organisation 'Transport for New Homes' - whose criticisms include the</p>	<p>The proposed school next to the A38 and the district centre should exchange places, or else the district centre should be located on the land to the west of the school.</p> <p>The existing roundabout on the A38, which destroys any place character, should be replaced with a smaller priority junction.</p>

	<p>development to date in Taunton). The result has been - and will continue to be, unless current plans are revised - high car dependency. There are key public policy imperatives (which should now be well-known) why this needs to change.</p> <p>Monkton Heathfield is actually quite a long way from the centre of Taunton, meaning that relatively more emphasis needs to be placed on bus travel rather than cycling as a sustainable means of getting to the town centre. (Cycling should, of course, be given a high priority for more local journeys).</p> <p>Given that the existing Relief Road is proposed to be extended to join the A38 further east, there is no reason why a district centre cannot front onto (a downgraded) A38 opposite Monkton Elm. The Upton urban extension in Northampton, often seen as an exemplar, has just such a centre, facing the dual carriageway A4500 - it is not located 'somewhere in the middle' of the new development.</p> <p>I do not believe that the development as proposed will work properly in sustainable transport terms. There should be a connected hierarchy of transport provision, whereby people can walk, or cycle, from their homes to the district centre, where they will then find the bus stops located if they wish to make a journey further afield, such as to the town centre or the railway station, and indeed (let's not forget) towards Bridgwater. The existing bus routes are primarily along the A38 and the A3259; the latter is especially important as it takes buses into the town centre from the north past the railway station (although bus deregulation, found in the UK for 34 years, but which exists virtually nowhere else, has left bus operators free not to serve railway stations).</p> <p>Instead, as designed, people in Monkton Heathfield will walk to the district centre only to find either that (a) there are no bus stops there, and they will have to walk further on, or (b) to pick them up, the bus service will need to meander through the development, often obstructed by parked or turning vehicles, providing a quality of journey that will not entice anyone with a car to leave it at home. Service 22 is one of the few commercially viable bus routes in the Taunton area; it would be bizarre if it were to be made slower and less direct for its existing users by having to trundle through Monkton Heathfield on new estate roads, instead of sticking to its current route on the A38.</p>	
Edwin Hughes	<p>Living within the existing development for four years now.</p> <p>Seems that landscaping is very low priority and has still not been completed.</p> <p>The pitches due to go by the A38 have still not been put in.</p> <p>Shops have been built opposite the school but still not occupied.</p>	<p>There should be penalties built into any contracts with builders to ensure that ancillary landscaping etc. Is completed during and not after completion.</p>

	<p>Bus services have now been drastically reduced with the 2 and 2A Half hourly service being replaced by 12 hourly service Starting and finishing later than previous service.</p> <p>This is currently just a residential community with no service provision whatsoever other than the school. Leading high reliance on vehicle movements in and out. I hope these things will be rectified before any expansion is authorised and that the same mistakes will not be allowed to happen in any future development.</p>	<p>Transport needs and retail provision need to be the prime focus of any further development to ensure vehicle movements are minimised.</p> <p>There needs to be more focus on engendering community activity particular for older people.</p>
Sue Wheatley	<p>Why does Taunton need another bus and ride area? We currently have 2 park and ride schemes, where one is situated close by at J25 (M5). How financially viable is this 3rd scheme? The 2 current park and ride schemes have been under threat of closure and bailed out by the district council! What makes this one more viable? What evidence do you have that this scheme will be successful, cost effective, well utilised at all times and not at just peak times of the day. Are the existing schemes at full capacity at all times that we require a 3rd bus and ride facility to just connect north Bridgwater?! (14.1 in the design guide). How confident are you that local residents and those visiting the town will use the service. Bearing in mind that a number of shops are closing in the town centre. Living locally a lot of the buses that travel through the village are often empty and under utilised. It has also been reported that double decker buses are unable to follow the current bus route via Milton Hill due to the overgrown trees! Why is another bus gate required? The current bus services does not function 24hrs a day and are not fully utilised and the buses don't run much past 8pm. Once again a decent A road into Taunton is being closed off. The word rapid is mentioned in the design guide. Please tell me how this bus service is rapid. Once through the bus gate the bus will eventually meet the usual commuter traffic going in to Taunton! Perhaps these bus lanes would only be functional during certain hours of the day when the actual bus service runs! We don't operate a 24hr bus service why take perfectly good roads out of action 24/7?! Looking at the state of the current bus lane and the old A38 road in Monkton heathfield it doesn't take long for it to look untidy (weeds along the road and pavements).</p> <p>You mention green space and planting trees etc. What have will you put in place to ensure the area is maintained. Looking at the state of phase 1, very poor grass cutting, verges not maintained weeds grow between the roads and pavements and overgrown hedges and walk ways. How are you expected to maintain this when you can't maintain what we already have?!</p> <p>The plans do not yet state what traffic system will be in use at the walford junction cross. Will these proposals be put forward for consultation?</p> <p>The district area being built which will include shops etc. How confident are you that they will be fully utilised? In light of COVID 19 are the current plans fit for purpose?</p>	<p>Don't build another unsuccessful park ride schemes.</p> <p>Review the usage of the bus lanes. Think how this will effect local businesses bearing in mind recent COVID 19, how are these businesses coping, what effect this will have on their future. As stated above we don't operate a 24/7 bus service so we take a perfectly good road out of use?</p> <p>Ensure local council services are in place to maintain the green spaces because they are certainly not at present.</p> <p>Ensure the builders developing the land actually finish the sites.</p>

Paul Tuff	<p>Framework Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Relating to West of Greenway area. There already exists major delays from Mead Way onto the A3250, more cars resulting from any development would greatly exaggerate this issue. -Regarding access to Greenway from Mead Way, the sharp left, that one would have to take to enter the new proposed development, that corner is an accident waiting to happen. Lorries currently are unable to turn into Greenway without passing the turning and then reversing back. Any building related transport would have huge issues. Any cars from people living in the new development again would experience issues. Currently turning left, the car has to cross into the other lane to gain access to Greenway, with traffic there this junction is unusable. The footpath is narrow. Too narrow for a pushchair or wheelchair, dangerous. Crossing over to get round the corner? This is peoples lives. - Your Design Guidance waxes lyrical about walking and cycling around, no provision has been made for this. Clearly no one who contributed to the document has ever walked or cycled down Greenway and that's with current volumes. - The Design Guidance talks of 'sowing and generating green areas' , why then are you taking away green fields west of Greenway to build houses on them? - Everything is based around the car on all phases. In addition to basing your planning around cars, you have designed them such that electric cars are untenable. Your Design Guidance talks of green forward thinking. However there is no evidence for this on existing estates. 'Electrification' when my car is no where near my property? Where are the opportunities for renewable energy? It appears that homes are crammed in. Not designed to maximise their solar gain. Renewable heating? This needs to be included in the buildings now. Water collection to flush toilets? All great words in the Design Guidance but no evidence to back up the claims that will be provided. - Your phases are not joined up. Walking or cycling between is dangerous. Regarding West Greenway, families walking and cycling to school have a very dangerous journey to school, safer by car. There appears to be planning for play pitches, how will people safely access these? -You talk of the garden town status in the Design Guidance, why then destroy all the hedgerow in the Hartnell Farm development? The hedging that provided a pollution filter, offered noise reduction, removed wildlife. Garden design in existing estates, tiny, maximising houses rather than offering gardens seem the priority. - West of Greenway site is high land. Building on this land will increase flooding into the exiting homes along Greenway. It will have a detrimental impact on the look and feel of the area visually. It will hugely impact the vista of Hestercombe House given the height of the land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build a ring road away from Monkton Heathfield. Better more efficient motoring. - Build homes with good renewable energy sources. Climate change, green incentives, better for the people and the planet. - Allow for larger gardens. As above. - Allow for bats. Keep a strip for them. Protect the bats home. - Keep existing hedgerows. An air detoxify-er, reduces noise and protect wildlife. - Access the West Greenfield site from the A3259. Protect the air and movement around existing homes and new homes. - Flatten the land on the West of Greenway site, install drainage and anti flooding devises. - Build bungalows to protect the feel and current heights of Greenway properties. Also to protect Hestacombe Houses views. - Ensure homes have large gardens. For the planet and their mental health. To protect the Taunton Garden Town status. - Think about widening footpaths around Mead Rd and Greenway, creating cycle paths to prevent accidents. and improve the health of the community. - Connect Monkton Heathfield's many estates with safe footpaths and cycle paths suitable for all the family. Increase fitness and mental health of residents. Create a green mentality. - Widen the road at the Mead Way Greenway junction. - Only build where the living conditions for the existing residents will be greatly enhanced and increased.
-----------	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - West of Greenway is also a bat area. This requires darkness no street lighting, has this been considered? - The Design Guidance talks of retail opportunities. These were promised in front of the new school. Nothing. The community needs facilities and employment. Will the proposed facilities in phase 2 materialise? - Roads. Rat runs will appear through Monkton Heathfield. From East of Taunton into town was a straight road. Drivers will not use the proposed wiggly winding road, full of roundabouts. They will find a better way, creating rat runs. 	
Darren Scott-Dowsett	<p>Can't see any suggestion of making areas for retail or entertainment/hospitality. And if there are can they be implanted sooner rather than later. Already with the amount of housing now in the area one small village store is not enough. Can a larger supermarket chain be persuaded to uptake a plot for A more suitable size store for development ? Will electric car charging be free to encourage the both uptake of EVs and to use the B&R? Has this been costed ? Why downgrade a perfectly useable road -A38- just for the sake of it? With the lack of a second motorway junction for Taunton the link to the Bridgwater junction and beyond from this side of Taunton with more and more houses, is of more importance.</p>	
Stuart Parks	<p>I have read the consultation and I can see very little about the actual design of the houses. I appreciate that is a matter for the detailed planning consent but some overarching design principles could be useful. The recent developments at Monkton Heathfield are generally very poor, generic design.</p> <p>My other point is around transport, and specifically walking and cycling provision. The design plan includes a spine street and mentions that cycling and pedestrian facilities will be encouraged, but does not go into design standards</p>	<p>Why not encourage more contemporary design like the recent development at Firepool?</p> <p>I would suggest having a spine pedestrian and cycle route with clear separation of cycling and pedestrians, similar to the existing subway between Victoria Park and Leycroft Road. This should be the most direct access for residents between the school/local centre and homes, so that non-motorised transport is the most obvious option. There should be the highest standard of walking and cycling provision in any new development, not just shared paths with a bit of paint</p>
Martine Gough	<p>MH2. I would just like to point out that my house and that of neighbours does exist. On the plans we are not shown!!! The shutting of the A38 is ridiculous, if there is an accident or road works now the traffic backs up through Thurloxtton/ North Pertherton or backs up in Bathpool/ Monkton Heathfield/ Taunton. The A38 is a busy main road at all times of the day but especially mornings and evenings. Who is going to pay to park up in a park and ride car park?? [author-final comment removed]</p>	<p>Leave the A38 where is. Then the roads and roundabout for the houses will be free moving .</p>
Katie Inglis – Monkton Elm Garden Centre	<p>Monkton Elm Garden Centre are concerned that the operational necessities of the Garden Centre have been ignored by the Monkton Heathfield Garden Community Concept Plan and Design Guide, which results in a proposal that will create serious negative transport and highways effects for customers and deliveries to and from their site. It is considered that this constitutes poor spatial planning and results in a strategy that serves to potentially decimate the business and turn its back on the most</p>	<p>The Garden Centre request that their access concerns are taken into consideration and reflected in amendments to the Framework Plans. Whilst the Garden Centre acknowledge that some change is required to the local road network, the combination of the removal/pedestrianisation of the section of the</p>

	important existing economic asset that the Garden Town area possesses. Further information and maps identifying the impact on the Garden Centre has been submitted via separate email.	A38 between Hardy's Road Roundabout and the Bridgewater Road Roundabout and the "bus only" route on the A38 to the east of the site is extremely damaging to the business and should be removed. The reinstatement of the section of the A38 between Hardy's Road and the Bridgewater Road, as a minimum, would enable the Garden Centre visitors and deliveries to the A38, without too much diversion from existing access arrangements. Therefore, it is requested that the Framework Plans are updated accordingly before being adopted.
Nigel and Annette Finch	<p>We are concerned about:</p> <p>1. The lack of a Noise Attenuation bund on the Western (Langaller) side of the realigned A38</p> <p>Our house, and two other houses in Langaller, are Listed Buildings and cannot have double glazing.</p> <p>A noise attenuation bund is proposed on the Eastern side of the realigned A38 to protect residents in the new development from noise and they will benefit from double glazing.</p> <p>We argue strongly that the lack of a Noise Attenuation bund on the Western side is discriminatory.</p> <p>2. The SUDS drainage area next to Langaller Manor Farm has been removed. Why has this been removed?</p>	<p>1. Noise Attenuation bund</p> <p>A bund must be also built on the Western (Langaller) side of the realigned A38</p> <p>Existing residents in Langaller, and especially those in Listed Buildings, should not be impacted by additional noise.</p> <p>2. Removal of the SUDS area next to Langaller Manor Farm</p> <p>This SUDS area needs to be re-instated.</p> <p>With all the major new development and the increased risk of flooding, this important SUDS area was proposed after extensive planning in Monkton Heathfield Phase 1. It must not now be arbitrarily removed.</p>
Simon King – Alder King	<p>I write on behalf of my clients Mr Nowell and Mr Meade-King who control land within the Policy SS1 allocation and is identified as the 'Alder King Residential' land north of the A38 and east of Doster's Lane.</p> <p>We are generally very supportive of the proposals and acknowledge the need for a document of this nature to guide future planning applications and act as a material consideration in their determination. We are pleased to see the relocation of the secondary school south of the A38 onto the principal development area and the identification of residential land north of the A38; we do however have comments on the extent of the development area, which are described below. The comments below relate entirely to the 'Alder King Residential' parcel. The comments are provided in the order presented in the masterplan document:</p> <p>Section 2 About this Document. The first asterisk under paragraph 2.8 appears misleading as it only refers to the green necklace following the M5 corridor. From reading the rest of the document and concept plans it appears that the green necklace is intended to encompass the development area.</p>	

Section 9 Green Necklace. Under the banner ‘the Green Necklace should’ the two bullet points are not clearly expressed and should be re-worded.

The concept of the green necklace is understood and supported. We do however have concerns with the manner in which it is presented on both the framework and concept plans. In the first instance we recommend the deletion of the graphic notation ‘open space/land constrained by bats’. It is not clear whether the notation is specific to that particular location; it is assumed not but it adds very little to the known intent of the green necklace. The document makes clear that the necklace can serve an open space function and the entirety of the northern edge of Taunton is to some degree constrained by bat activity from Hestercombe House. The ecology constraints plan attached demonstrates that the site is not subject to any heightened level of bat activity that justifies this notation.

We are concerned that the concept plan fails to maximise the potential of the ‘Alder King Residential Land’ and could place an unnecessary constraint on the efficiency of the land. The extent of the original allocation is shown on the framework diagram and envisaged development extending much further north. It is acknowledged that the green necklace north of the development could meet most of the green infrastructure needs arising from the development (public open space, allotments, SUDS etc). It is also acknowledged that the ‘white haze’ around the northern edge of the development parcel might afford a flexibility as to where the development boundary should be. However, there is no need or rationale to restrict development unnecessarily at this early stage.

In 2017 a pre-application enquiry submission was made that included a constraints plan and masterplan, which are enclosed with this consultation response for convenience. The masterplan shows a larger development area on the eastern field parcel that will still protect the integrity of the green necklace concept.

If the LPA is not willing to adjust the concept plan then it is strongly recommended that text is inserted into the document that affords flexibility to test the robustness of development boundaries at detailed design stage.

Section 13 Downgrading of the A38. We strongly support the intention to ‘downgrade’ the A38 which will undoubtedly help integrate the development parcels to the north with the principal MH2 area to the south. The section does read as somewhat focused on development to the south of the A38 rather than encompassing development to the north also. There are various minor changes that could be made to remedy this:

“13.4 The PRoWs provided on site and to the north and south of the A38 site currently terminate at the A38 road. No pedestrian crossings are provided and a pedestrian connection between the northern and southern footpath network is broken as a crossing and is quite dangerous.”

The fourth bullet point under positive interventions states that accesses should be restricted to a maximum (presumably not minimum as expressed) of two:

- “Access south from this route into the new development of MH2 can be delivered but should be restricted to a minimum maximum of two and exclude an access off south of Elm Monkton Garden Centre and Heathfield Gardens development.”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The downgrading of the A38 will create the opportunity to deliver an attractive pedestrian and cycle route and will connect more safely with the existing network of PRoW and proposed footpath within the proposal site south of the road and the surrounding;” <p>There is then reference to the utilities easement along the ‘northern development boundary’. The easement runs along the southern edge of the A38 and not the northern development boundary of MH2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Due to the utilities easement corridor along the northern development boundary southern edge of the A38 the housing proposed here will have limited direct connection to the downgraded A38 road. The easement will have to be landscaped to provide a green linear open space along the existing planting along the southern edge of the A38.” <p>The section drawings are also incorrect as these show the allocation site boundary on the south side of the A38 and there are no dwellings shown to the north. This is misleading to the public and appears to have been drafted by the promoters of the land to the south. In that sense it is not entirely clear by what is meant by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The existing hedges and hedge trees framing the A38 corridor should be maintained and enhanced with new planting where gaps are present;” <p>Whilst there is no objection to this in principle, it is not clear what the design intention is for the development north of the A38; if the intention is that it should be shielded from view altogether it would be a limitation to providing an attractive and vibrant street scene to the downgraded route. Whilst we would not advocate the loss of any mature hedgerow, if there are gaps that present glimpses of development to the north then perhaps these should be celebrated?</p> <p>We look forward to seeing the next iteration of the plans and documentation; please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or require further information.</p>	
Mark Besley	<p>Why am I asked to provide reasons for my answers here ? this contradicts the comment above which asks for general comments and not answers???? Could you please reply with specific responses to my comments and not with a generic response - thank you.</p> <p>Why is the proposed bus gate on the 3259 not included in the consultation? - can you tell me when local businesses and residents were consulted on the bus gate ? - can you tell me what modelling on the effects of the bus gate were made at the time of the decision to install the bus gate? We have repeatedly been told that the bus gate is a legal requirement - can you show me exactly what documents make it a legal requirement? Why is the bus and ride located far from the heart of the development? Why are there no employment opportunities within the main development - all that will happen (as we have seen with MH1) is that the developers wont deliver the infrastructure and if they do it will be at the end of the build. Why is the road between the Langaller roundabout and Cricket Club roundabout not shown on the design map? Why is there consideration being given to forcing all through traffic through the centre</p>	<p>A bus gate should not be put on the 3259 - this will force traffic along unsuitable roads - the 3259 should be heavily traffic calmed with a weight restriction (not for local businesses) with the bus gate being located either on the junction of the A 38 or at Walford Cross at the start of the ERR. If the decision to put the bus gate on the 3259 goes ahead it will open SCC up to legal challenge as due process around the decision is unlikely to have been followed - no consultation was made with local businesses and residents and no analysis of the effects of the bus gate was made. The bus and ride should be integral to the proposal to get people using it - out of town bus and ride systems don't work as well - this will tie in with the declaration</p>

	<p>of the development? Why are there not more small parks and squares throughout the development to fulfil the garden town ethos? Finally why are the roads in the area outside of the red development line?</p>	<p>of a climate emergency. People should be able to walk to work - putting the employment are in one block will result in it being delivered last if at all - the developers are in the business of building houses and not employment infrastructure. The road between the Langaller and Cricket Club roundabouts should be made a boulevard, heavily traffic calmed and access between MH1 and MH2 opened up - forcing traffic through the local centre will not create a pleasant environment for pedestrians. Putting most of the green area to the east of the ERR will make it less likely that it will be used and potentially make it dangerous - far better to put more small parks and squares throughout the development to create a pleasant living environment, re design the route of the ERR and reduce the green area between the ERR and the M5. The developers in MH 1 have increased the density of houses, not delivered the sports fields, not delivered any employment opportunities, not delivered the WRR, not delivered the shops and reduced the social housing allocation. What we have in MH2 is unattractive urban sprawl. There should be clear legally binding trigger points when non housing infrastructure has to be delivered.</p>
Jonathan Conibere	<p>Disturbed to see that provision is made for 'opportunity to deliver bus only route' on current but to be down-graded A38 to the 'east' of Monkton Elm area (ie in the direction of Bridgwater). It is important that this route is maintained for those who live in the Walford Cross area and beyond who need to drive to get access to residents on this part of the A38, to West Monkton in general (church/pub/village for example) , Monkton Elm etc. It is not appropriate or environmentally friendly to send such people on a large detour around the new relief road and then back on themselves to get to these areas.</p>	<p>Given the current A38 is a wide dual carriageway it would be relatively simple a low cost to use this current road to deliver a safe cycling route, car route (even if only narrow 30mph roads), and a bus lane (similar to plan being considered). This will ensure that local residents east of Walford Cross are not regularly travelling excessive distances to move around in their local area but will also allow for important commitments to public transport and cyclists to be reached.</p>
Emily Reilly	<p>My concern is for the ever decreasing space for the local wildlife. There is a proposed 'green necklace' which is great but it crosses many roads, including the Main A38.</p>	<p>I would propose a green belt through the middle if the development for wildlife and humans to enjoy. This would encourage people to take an interest in their environment and a space for animals to connect</p>

	<p>The local countryside is disappearing fast and forcing wildlife to move out, have less habitat to live and feed from and creating danger on the roads as animals are being forced to cross paths with human activity more often.</p> <p>You have a huge responsibility for implementing an environmentally supportive housing development. Uk wildlife has been proven to have decreased dramatically so please help support its growth.</p>	<p>across the necklace. Also as I have seen in other countries and other parts of the uk, an animal access bridge/tunnel that goes across the A38.</p>
Jane Hennell – The Canal and River Trust	<p>Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust (the Trust) in respect of the above document.</p> <p>We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals & rivers. Within Somerset West and Taunton District we own and maintain the Bridgwater & Taunton Canal. Which runs to the south of this site.</p> <p>Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation.</p> <p>The Bridgwater & Taunton Canal is as valued multi- functional green infrastructure asset within Taunton Garden Town. its towpath can play an increasingly important role as a sustainable, active travel route from Monkton Heathfield towards the town centre and to Creech St Michael. Improvements to the towpath to facilitate improved connectivity is mentioned within the Garden Town Design Guide and the Garden Town vision highlights the need to Green infrastructure corridors and improved sustainable transport along with increasing carbon neutrality.</p> <p>Theme 1 of the Garden Town Vision, ‘Growing our town greener’ includes linking up our watersides and requires the re-establishment of connections to green corridors and waterspaces.</p> <p>We are therefore very disappointed that this masterplan does not seize an obvious opportunity to comply with the Garden Town Vision and look to improve opportunities beyond the site and through the existing and proposed new development to improve sustainable linkages from the site to the town centre and to Creech St Michael by using the canal towpath.</p> <p>The lack of interaction with the canal and towpath within phase 1 of the Monkton Heathfield development has been noted as a missed opportunity by the County Council, Monkton Heathfield and Cheddon Fitzpaine Parish Council and by the Canal & River Trust. It is imperative that the Garden Town policies seek to ensure that this is remedied and that alter phases of the wider Monkton Heathfield development include linkages which can continue through earlier phases and improve their connectivity at the same time.</p> <p>Both Monkton Heathfield & Cheddon Fitzpaine and Creech St Michael Neighbourhood Plans identify the need for a high-quality comprehensive cycle network within the Neighbourhood Plan areas. The canal towpath is an existing traffic free, direct route to achieve this and so linkages should be created to it.</p>	
Brendan Brighton	<p>Design Guidance</p> <p>In order to be a Garden Town there need to be front gardens, thus retaining a green area to each property. No rear courtyard parking or parking areas, which will lead to "parking wars with neighbours". Sufficient parking for each dwelling should be provided at each property for number of</p>	

bedrooms, with on street parking being for "visitors" only, preferably on a grassed grid system. People want to be able to load/unload their children/shopping immediately outside their own property, they don't want to have to walk around the back or down the road, and, unfortunately, in the world we now live in it is vitally important that you have sight of your vehicle due to the amount of thefts/break ins! MH1 suffers a lot with potential thefts/break ins to vehicles. CCTV is easier to install to cover your driveway, whereas it goes out of focus/close detail if a car is parked down the road etc. It's important that MH2 is a Garden Town not Parking Town.

Good sized rear gardens to all dwellings should be provided for wellbeing.

Dwellings should not be characterless, as well as chimneys there should be many different stone finishes, as well as brick and render. Important that roads should have many different individually designed dwellings within them, not a run of same style as can be seen on MH1, as this will create a very different feel to the area.

It is very important that buildings, roads, district centre, footpaths/cycle paths are designed for ease use of visually impaired, disabled and elderly residents and well signposted.

I think that a 4 storey district centre would be too high, to sit comfortably within the surrounding country area, it should be a maximum of 3 stories, in order not to be more fitting to a town setting.

Retention of the existing A38 between the Langaller and Cricket roundabouts is vital. It needs to be downgraded, well traffic calmed, made visually attractive with extensive planting, have safe crossing points, cycle/footpaths on both sides of the road, 20mph, maybe reduce the width as this will be a road link for local traffic. Removal of the bunds would certainly improve the visual look to that area.

Rapid bus service will be good but will need to be affordable otherwise people will not use it. The existing park and ride at Henlade used to be very affordable between the hours of 10 and 4, so it paid to catch the park and ride bus rather than drive into town and pay for parking, but sadly since the price was increased it is cheaper to drive into town and park, which is not what should happen! For the cost reason, personally we never use the park and ride now whereas we always used to use it.

The area is at risk of becoming "bus gate MH" - no one wants to live somewhere where all commuting roads, apart from one, all have bus gates on them. As there is already a bus gate on Bridgwater Road, and one proposed for the A3259 close to Bawler Road, no further bus gates should be included until the completion of the build out of MH2 and proper traffic modelling can be done once the new ERR is taking the majority of the commuter/holiday/through traffic.

Existing roundabout will have to be upgraded and repositioned for the addition of the new ERR - suggest approaching local businesses such as Monkton Elm and Proctor Farm to sponsor this roundabout so that it is an attractive feature with colourful planting.

Flats should not be gateway buildings into the new development, they are never an attractive feature, as can be seen on MH1, they look out of place, and create real problems with parking on the road as residents do not use the rear parking areas but choose to park on the road backing up to the roundabout etc. All flats on MH2 should have Juliet balconies as well as a communal garden space in order to promote wellbeing.

Neither West Monkton or CSM have modern developments specifically for the elderly and it is very important that a sheltered housing scheme is part of MH2, as well as 10% of all properties should be bungalows, with a range of terraced, semi and detached.

All new dwellings should have an electric car charging power points, in view of the Governments plans for the UK to have electric cars only by 2030 I believe is the year. It is so much easier to install something like this at the time of the build, than at a later date and new purchasers would expect this to be a feature of their new Garden Town home. Additionally there should be charging points at the district centre, school, B&R and employment land.

Micro allotments sound a good idea but potentially could end up as very scruffy overgrown/unattended areas.

Are there going to be cycle paths connecting to the town centre, Nexus and railway station which is part of the Government's Garden Town ethos?

The B&R site should be softened with lots of trees planted in between parking bays, whereas hedges should be used around the perimeter (hedges should not be used within the car parking bays as this would give cover for thieves/damage to cars etc. Are there going to be toilet facilities at the B&R? Toilets are a very important, especially when travelling with children, or having travelled a distance in order to use the B&R. There should also be a closed in shelter with seating, for people waiting for the rapid bus.

School - I was very pleased to see the proposal for sensory & therapy rooms, warm water pool and medical space, as well as sensory gardens. It is so very important that less fortunate children are well catered for within the school and play areas, especially as there will be a percentage of affected children due to the build numbers for MH1, MH2 and surrounding areas, parents need local special facilities where their children can integrate more easily.

I am concerned about what could be the lack of drop-off points at the school, as realistically this is the way the majority of the children will arrive and depart from the school. Unfortunately, the reality of children walking to and from is a distant dream, although scooters (so appropriate safe keeping would be required) do appear to be one of the latest ways to get to school! Personally I still would like to see the main entrance/staff parking into the school from what will be the downgraded A38, which will presumably have a 30 mph, rather than from inside the development. School times are chaotic with parking on all nearby roads as can be witnessed at West Monkton and CSM schools and this is one time when it would be possible to site the entrance to the school away from new estate roads.

Energy - solar panels on every property are really beneficial, but it's important that the energy gained is firstly extracted for that dwelling's use, not as is the case on MH1 where it all goes to the national grid with a very low financial rate/return for the owners.

Trees - good size trees, not the usual whips, need to be planted in order to soften the area quicker, and a watering programme by the builder needs to be instigated in order for the trees to survive. Woodlands should have large percentage of native British trees, and it would be nice to see some strategically sited specimen trees such as oak, which will make a real focal point in years to come. Willow trees near the stream/in the flood plain areas would make lovely features as well.

Specific comments on West Of Greenway		
Jayne Whaley	<p>SS1 Policy area. West of Greenway.</p> <p>I do not agree with the residential development to the west of Greenway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is an emphasis on blending new development with old. I do not see that this has been achieved particularly well in this area so far and fail to see how this would be any different. 2. The plans do not take into account the gardens that currently extend out into this area..indeed 2 houses are already being built in one of theses areas. 3. Most importantly the access is not adequate. I have witnessed several delivery lorries recently being unable to make the sharp left turn from Mead Way onto Greenway. In order to deliver they have had to drive part way up Greenway and then reverse back down into Greenway. With the increased traffic that such a development would result in, I think that this situation would not be sustainable and indeed at times potentially dangerous, especially considering the speed that some people travel up Greenway and around that bend. 4. The designated residential area is also some distance from the services that are going to support it in terms of shops and new school etc. 	<p>I would suggest that the new housing area should be to the east of the new A38 relief road.</p>
Specific comments on Land South of Manor Farm, Langaller		
Stephanie Essex	<p>Regarding Langallor Manor Farm site (nb: not Langallor Farm):</p> <p>Plans with industry are not a good fit with the farm</p> <p>Industry not suited to the site</p> <p>Restoring of the farmhouse, outbuildings and barns would be far more suitable</p> <p>Addition of Residential housing on earmarked industry site would be better fit and greatly needed</p> <p>Industry totally unsuitable to be so close to the farmhouse</p>	<p>Major changes to plan needed:</p> <p>Restoration of once beautiful Langallor manor farmhouse</p> <p>Conversion of outbuildings and barns to make the listed farmhouse the focal point of the site</p> <p>This area desperately needs residential housing so conversion of outbuildings and barns would be far more suitable</p> <p>Current plans - ridiculous to have green necklace so close to industry, who will want to walk there?</p> <p>Plans need to coordinate with the listed farmhouse and reflect its restoration</p>

GTH	<p>Please refer to correspondence sent for the attention of Mr A Penna on 5th June 2020 on behalf of our client, for a full response to be considered as part of this consultation relating to Manor Farm and the land to the south.</p> <p>Key comments relating to the Framework Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed employment area is likely to generate longer journeys, higher traffic flows and make sustainable modes of travel less desirable. -The proposed siting of the employment uses would become out of reach of the rest of Taunton, with phase 1 of Monkton Heathfield only just within 800m which is considered to be the benchmark for a walkable neighbourhood. -The employment uses also have particular activities associated with them, and the relationship between these and the adjacent green wedge and green necklace will be stark with a lack of natural surveillance outside working hours. - Other than the immediate land of Manor Farm indicated as employment use, the remainder of our client's land is indicated as a substantial part of the 'Green Necklace' buffer to the M5 motorway to provide 'significant' recreational opportunities. Noting the significance of its delivery, there has been no direct engagement with our client to ensure the proposals are realistic and deliverable, especially as there is a concern that other areas will benefit from building at higher densities due to the extent of greenspace proposed. -Overall we admire the ambitions set out within the recently consulted Design Guidance and Masterplan Framework (DGMF), and the Framework Plan to support the delivery of a garden community to complement the development carried out to date and we hope that our points in our correspondence relating to transport, design, sustainable development and mixed use potential are constructive to help towards achieving this. -We can confirm that our client is willing to consider the provision of strategic green space, however, the land in their ownership is also suitable for some residential development. In particular, a well designed residential development would offer an enhanced setting for the Listed farmhouse than a commercial business park as currently proposed. -It is noted that our client's involvement is critical to the successful delivery of this key strategic allocation to ensure sufficient public open space provision is secured. If these 	<p>Please refer to submitted correspondence as detailed above.</p> <p>We suggest that residential development on our client's land be considered further in order to create a truly mixed use community for the future to complement the more sensitive landscape setting of the site in contrast to the larger office blocks.</p> <p>In light of the points raised in the correspondence to Mr A Penna on 5th June 2020, we would be happy to discuss these points in greater detail to help ensure the aspirations set out in the DGMF and Framework Plan are fulfilled.</p>
-----	--	--

	significant areas of public open space cannot be secured, it would undermine the delivery of the wider strategic allocation as well as the Council's Garden Town Vision. This highlights the importance of joint working with our client to help ensure a comprehensive and deliverable masterplan is developed.	
William Thorpe	It there are some valuable character buildings, that reflect the true historic character of the area in and around the "langaller farm area". And these would be eclipsed by the proposed industrial (employment) areas proposed in that area.	<p>It would be far better to continue residential areas northwards from "land south of the manor farm" up towards the monkton phase 2 development. Creating a familiar link for commuters and school children to access the proposed facilities there.</p> <p>This would result in residential use of land around listed buildings, which will uplift the character of the area immeasurably.</p> <p>As planned residents of "land south of the manor farm" will be forced either through convoluted streets of Phase 1, along A38 or through proposed industrial. They will no doubt drive instead, faced with these poor active transport choices.</p> <p>A traffic free central boulevard could be created that links areas of residential development running through entire length of Phase 1 and Phase 2, enjoying character of listed buildings, and green areas, and culminate in green necklace around school.</p> <p>Case studies have shown that if an off road route is provided for active transport that is pleasant, and uninterrupted it will be used beyond modelled expectations. For example Bristol > Bath cycle way.</p>

CREECH ST MICHAEL PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman PCllr Simon Hutchings.

Clerk: Steve Altria, 23, John Grinter Way, Wellington, Somerset, TA21 9AR

Tel: 01823 666295 Email: clerk@creechstmichael.net

To Andrew Penna Esq
Garden Town Coordinator
SWTC, Taunton.

Via a.penna@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk

Friday, 05 June 2020

Dear Andrew

Land South of Manor Farm Langaller Consultation on SWTC Master Plan and Design guidance

This is the CSM PC response to the SWTC consultation on Land South of Manor Farm Langaller Development Master Plan and Design guide documents. The Parish Council thank SWTC for the consultation and we look forward to seeing revised plans and being fully participative in the stated engagement with Developers and Highways in due course.

1. Strategic Points;

1.1. Road Safety within CSM. Following the building out of MH1 and other nearby developments, the priority of CSM PC is that the identified road safety issues along St Michaels Rd/North End must be addressed and be in place ahead of any further development (including this site) is commenced.
(CSM NH Plan Page 32. Point 7.1.10).

There should be a significant contribution via S106 from the development of housing and employment to mitigate the additional traffic on Hyde Lane, St Michaels Rd and North End.

1.2. Need for the Employment site. In a post Covid environment, and with land earmarked for employment at Walford Cross and Nexus, the need or desirability (given classification 8) for this further employment site, which is located alongside housing, is questioned. The PC would like this to be replaced with other uses possibly further Housing. In any event there should be no through route this part of the development site for vehicles from the ERR roundabout No 2 through to Hyde Lane.

1.3. Employment site entrance onto Hyde Lane. If the employment land is to be built out then the entrance from it onto Hyde Lane **must** be removed. This entrance would cross the newly provided "safe route to school" and as a result there would be increased traffic movement of cars/vans/lorries travelling along Hyde Lane, past the village primary school into CSM Village and beyond as a short cut to A358/M5. Access to the employment site for vehicles should only be from the ERR. Pedestrian and Cycling access should be provided onto Hyde Lane and also link with CSM, Langaller Lane and MH2.

1.4. Employment site. Little detail is provided in the Thrive reports on the employment site (page 46 on the third report). As insufficient details are provided of the proposals these are requested; particularly as the land has been given classification 8. The road should not be shown as a principal route.

1.5. Key Buildings. It is noted that some buildings are planned to face the roundabout (2) and along Langaller Lane; these will provide the setting for CSM and Langaller. These are key buildings and sites and more details are required please of what is envisaged.

1.6. Key areas. There are 6 identified in Thrives 3rd report. The PC particularly welcomes the Main Green shown in the Green necklace between Hyde Lane and Langaller Road. However, the PC does question why this was not included as a key area? The PC request more details of what is planned please for this area, particularly Footpath and Cycle routes.

1.7. **Design.** The PC would prefer a rural design influence to the development, which needs to integrate more with the rural area beyond it.

1.8. **Facilities.** There is a lack of planning gain for CSM, despite the fact that the large designated site for employment within the development is sited within the Parish. There appears to be a total lack of community facilities. What facilities will be provided for CSM Parishioners in the S106 agreement?

1.9. **Bungalows.** There is a need (CSM Neighbourhood Plan Policy CSM3) and the PC would welcome the site including provision for older people.

1.10. **Courtyards.** CSM PC does not wish to see parking provided in side or rear courtyards, these (changed from they are) are underused in MH1 and the PC does not wish to see them repeated.

1.11. **Play grounds.** What provision is there for equipment? e.g. LEAPS, NEAPS.
The Parish Council would expect the proposed new play areas to be provided with quality equipment and to be ready to use, i.e. not loads of builders' rubbish with a thin skin of top soil spread over it, as was the experience in MH1.

1.12. **Connectivity for pedestrian and cyclists** i.e. through the green necklace to Bathpool, Hyde Lane to Langaller, the Tunnel under M5 at Langaller to CSM is sought.

1.13. **Controlled crossings in Langaller Lane**Two are required, one either side of the Langaller Hamlet.
The first towards MH2 from the development, and the other alongside the M5 in order to facilitate access to the MH2 Allotments, Green necklace and onto the Walford Cross Employment site.

1.14. **Buses** are needed to link the new South of Manor Farm development to CSM.

1.15. **Education Provision.** It is not clear from the proposals what provision for Schools is being made from this development. There should be s106 money forthcoming to contribute to both primary and secondary schools in the locality.

2. Specific points;

2.1. **Design.** The importance of the quality, character, mix and variation of design and materials is recognised and welcomed. The painting of houses and front doors different colours, housing with chimneys, for example, is desired.

2.2. **The Manor Farmhouse and Langaller Hamlet** are Listed Buildings and the PC recognises the importance of supporting the aim that their setting and status be respected.

2.3. **Building height.** CSM PC do not wish to see buildings on the development above 2 floors in height (although it will accept 2 ½ high in non-key places and away from open spaces i.e. not as previously permitted in the nearby Hopkins Field Dev. The PC does not wish to see block of flats or so called "statement" buildings on junctions.

2.4. **Green Wedges.** DG Part 1 would benefit from mentioning the new Green Wedge in CSM up to Creech Heathfield as this would strengthen the proposal.

2.5. **Safe Route to School.** DG Part 3 Point 6.43 refers to the current uses of Hyde Lane. The important aspect not stated for CSM PC is that it provides a safe route to Monkton Heathfield Secondary School for the village children.

2.6. **M5 Barrier Planting.** DG Part 3 Point 43 Point 6.52. The development would benefit from barrier planting alongside both sides of the M5 in order to reduce noise and bring health benefits to the residents.

2.7. **Hyde Lane** floods annually in periods of heavy rainfall. Please be aware of this problem and ensure this problem is addressed.

2.8. Statement buildings. Nor does the PC wish to see flats on junctions or corners as these both encourage parking on the roads at key points, thereby blocking the roads and making access difficult for all, but particularly larger vehicles such as refuse lorries, buses etc. DG Part 3 Item 6.24 refers.

All flats should have outside communal spaces, balconies or Juliet balconies as they are important for well-being.

2.9. Parking. All properties to have at least two parking spaces (with adjacent parking not one vehicle behind another as shown in DG Part 3 Item 3.9) as a minimum or on street parking provided (these could be grassed blocks) together with drop off points.

2.10. Shop. It is appreciated that this development is in itself too small to justify a local shop, but the PC does support the provision of a shop in nearby MH1. As this is a requirement of the MH1 planning permission this should be enforced by SWTC.

2.11. Roads. The PC wishes to know what the different road widths will be? The roads in MH1 are too narrow. The primary routes should be wider than 6.3m.

2.12. Private drives. Can it be explained who will ensure that the "private drives" referred to at DG Part 3 Point 2.4 item 2.8 are repaired and replaced when they wear out? The PC is concerned these "routes" will be beyond the affordability of many households and prefers they be adopted highways.

2.13. Electric charging points. DG Part 3 Point 3.3 uses the word preferably. The PC wishes ALL dwellings to have Electric charging points, but the expectation is some are also installed in the public realm as part of the development.

2.14. Sports. What provision is (other than pitches) being offered? A Bowling green, BMX/Skate Board Park etc are identified in the CSM Neighbourhood Plan.

2.15. Design guides frequently show and refer to "natural" furniture such as benches. The PC prefers quality recycled plastic as these are longer lasting, less prone to vandalism and require less maintenance

2.16. District Heating. To be provided with dual fuelled powered by solar heating.

2.17. Community Cohesion. The expectation is that the developers will take action to help positively integrate the new development with the existing community in Creech St Michael as well as Monkton Heathfield.

2.18. Urban Gardens. DG 3 Page 79 shows urban gardens are to be provided. The PC does not support. Can these areas be grassed areas initially so that community led planting over the site can take place once a community is established and a need identified, if any? Planting of daffodils on the site would be welcomed.

2.19. Trees and Hedgerows. Existing Trees to remain. The Parish Council would expect *plentiful* and appropriate species of additional tree planting. If tree planting cannot be done within the street scene, then compensatory planting must take place elsewhere, demonstrating equivalent biomass. Trees must be planted in and staked correctly, with a maintenance and watering regime immediately in place to ensure their establishment. The profligacy of tree planting in MH1, where trees were planted and not watered during a dry summer, leaving them to die, shocked many residents. Species planted in community orchard areas should produce edible fruits and have sufficient tree numbers to reasonably expect community harvesting days. The PC would welcome more discussion on planting; seeking a proper diversity of planting with greater use, for example, of ornamental cherry trees.

2.20. Green space and wildlife. The expectation is that the existing green space, water and woodland should be protected and maintained, and new areas and planting should support Somerset Pollinator Policy (SCC). CSM PC would expect as many of the existing hedgerows to be retained as possible. The hedgerows are over 30 years old and therefore may be classified as 'Important' under the terms of the Hedgerow Act 1997. Although the removal of Important Hedgerows is allowed where planning permission has been granted, it would be expected that a compromise could be reached which accommodates the aspirations of the Taunton Garden Town, the declaration of Climate and Ecological Emergency, and the Neighbourhood Plan revisions as well as the desire of the developers to build as many houses as the site can take.

2.21. Water and Flood attenuation/water conservation/drainage. The PC would expect habitat appropriate planting to take place, particularly in swales and rain gardens, in accordance with Somerset Pollinator Policy. The Parish Councils would expect all houses to be fitted with rainwater butts.

The SUDs for the entire MH2 site need to be available with an explanation of how the proposed swales, rain gardens and attenuation ponds interlink, with proper drainage strategy and plans before the Parish Councils can make their observations on the proposed attenuation ponds shown on the Indicative Masterplan. The attenuation ponds to have different size inlet/outlet pipes rather than be of a control valve type.

The PC notes the plan to relocate the SUDS area and whilst appreciating there is no detail at this stage regarding relocation would wish to consider any proposals as they emerge and feel sure that we share the aim that the residents are not impacted by additional flood water.


2.22. Broadband. Fibre to be provided to inside of each house from occupation date. Is an upgrade of the telephone exchange required as current broadband in the area is very weak?

2.23. Climate change. The expectation is that buildings will conform to new legislation in terms of extra insulation and suitable external materials to increase energy efficiency of buildings getting as close to net emission rate of zero as possible within viability argument. Materials used are to be compliant with the declaration of Climate and Ecological Emergency (SCC, SWTC, WMPC and CFPC). Layout and orientation to maximise solar gain.

2.24. Dark Skies. The expectation would be that installation of all lighting, including employment units, external lights on dwellings, footpaths and street lights would use warm white LED or other equivalent and that lux levels should be such as to not disturb habitats and resting places or prevent their use by bats and other wildlife. The expectation would be that such lighting units when installed would be connected to appropriate power sources (unlike the delivery of lighting in MH1).

We trust these points will strengthen the development and look forward to working with SWTC, Developers and Highways to deliver the plans.

Yours Sincerely



Steve Altria
Clerk
for CSM PC

Monkton Heathfield Garden Community: Draft Concept Plan and Design Guide

West Monkton Parish Council Comments

Final Version

West Monkton Parish Council welcomes this consultation and the opportunity to put forward its comments in relation to the proposals.

The Parish Council, jointly with Arts Taunton, commissioned Create Streets who are well recognised experts in 'placemaking' to review the Draft Concept Plan and Design Guide as part of this consultation. The Parish Council endorses the Create Streets report which can be used to better fulfil the requirements of a garden town initiative. It is hoped that Somerset West and Taunton Council will view the report as a source of information that can help the Council develop guidelines to ensure that MH2 is an exemplar development that provides for the better health and wellbeing of residents.

The Parish Council would welcome a follow up discussion regarding the Create Streets report and the comments in this consultation response if it was considered to be beneficial.

Objectives for West Monkton

The following objectives are those agreed by West Monkton Parish Council, these objectives should be secured through the design and delivery of MH2:

- The enlarged Monkton Heathfield to be a single, thriving integrated community, one which is not bisected by arterial roads. The road network / usage should be designed to enable one community.
- To this end, our aim is for all through traffic to use the Eastern and Western relief roads – not the roads through Monkton Heathfield nor those through the surrounding villages.
- The transport and delivery requirement of farms and local businesses which are the employment lifeblood of the community must be enabled.
- To deliver measures which address the Climate and Ecological Declarations of Emergency made by SCC, SWTC, Cheddon Fitzpaine and West Monkton Parish Councils and reduce the impact of climate change.
- To deliver the MH2 as a garden neighbourhood based around green spaces with a strong sense of placemaking, and high-quality distinctive design reflecting local traditions whilst embracing innovative architectural ideas.

A Statement from Cllr Stuart Haskins, Chair of West Monkton Parish Council

Having been a Councillor of West Monkton Parish for 10 years and the Chairman for the last 3 years I have seen MH1 progress from the planning stages to the near completion of the build.

During that time, as a Parish Council we have endured numerous frustrations and considerable stress as the development was changed, plans were amended, key deliverables and trigger points were not met, and important dates were missed.

The failure to ensure the development progressed and delivered basic amenities to the new residents is a lesson learnt and one that must not be repeated on this development, for example the provision of public transport from first occupation, recreation spaces or shops. The new residents of this development should not have to wait for years to have the basic qualities of life at the expense of developer financial games and pressure.

The approving bodies must ensure that suitable clauses, trigger points and controls are correctly put in place and not compromised or sold away to deliver other unplanned requirements.

This development must exercise 'a get it right first time' culture so that the Garden Town Vision is truly delivered.

Points of clarification / discrepancy in the consultation documents:

It is assumed that the absence of the road between Bawler Road and Pippin Road on the SS1 map, SOME 190507 FWP.01 P3 under the legend of 'existing local roads' is an error. If it is part of the Design Guidance, then WMPC strongly object to its removal, as it would seriously exacerbate the existing congested traffic flows. The road is shown in its entirety on the Concept Plan SOME 190507 CP 03 P2.

It is also noted in the same plan that the existing road between the Cricket Club Roundabout and Langaller Roundabout is not included as an 'existing local road'. The Parish Council requests that this existing road is illustrated on this plan more clearly.

Finally, it is noted that the existing bus gate on Bridgwater Road does not appear on the concept plan. The Parish Council requests that this is reinstated.

Comments

Extent of Development

- Noted that some of the areas on the Concept Plan fall outside the red line of the site – an explanation of how this could affect deliverability is needed e.g. existing A38 dual carriageway between Monkton Elm and Walford Cross, existing ERR between Langaller roundabout and Cricket Club roundabout, parts of the land designated as green necklace.

- Will the areas of the green necklace outside the red line be part of the Public Open Space, or remain in private ownership? The red line which follows the M5 corridor should continue all the way along the motorway boundary with the exclusion of the 'Penfold' field to enable maintenance / improvement of existing tracks as part of these proposals.
- Will the proposed road improvements to the Dual Carriageway A38 and the traffic calming of the road between Langaller roundabout and Cricket Club roundabout be made a condition of the development?
- Apart from the brief reference of the impact of the utilities easement corridor along the A38 limiting access by northern housing to the downgraded A38, ref page 22 of the Design Guidance, are there any further constraints due to the gas main. Could clarification on the location of the gas main be provided? In addition, can confirmation of how it is going to be diverted and when be provided?
- Please could a realistic effort be made to accommodate self-builders?

Staging and Review of Development

- An implementation plan and triggers are important, as certain details of infrastructure need to be in place before very many houses are built e.g. school, District Centre facilities e.g. health centre.
- The Parish Council would like to see a detailed staging plan for the development to show how access into the development will be achieved throughout construction of MH2. This will enable the Parish Council to understand the impact on the community throughout the construction of MH2, although it must be noted that the Parish Council would prefer that the construction of ERR2 is completed as part of phase 1. The Parish Council would like to be consulted on the staging plan prior to its approval and to be kept informed of amendments to the staging plan, especially in light of the duration of the build.
- Due to non-delivery of the retail units in MH1, the Parish Council seeks the inclusion of the construction of the District Centre in phase 1 of the construction.
- To demonstrate the 'enhancement of biodiversity of the development area' (ref Ecology section in Design Guidance and Environment Bill currently going through Parliament), the Defra Biodiversity Metric (calculation tool) or the Somerset Habitat Evaluation Procedure should be applied at regular intervals and the results published i.e. the development of the site as it progresses is to be accountable using data based information.

Trigger Points

- The Parish Council considers that the delivery of the District Centre, School and ERR2 are the priorities for the local community. As mentioned above a detailed staging plan should be developed confirming when these key priorities will be delivered. In addition, trigger points should be agreed for their delivery. The Parish Council would like to be consulted on the trigger points, including any re-negotiation of them.

Once the trigger points are agreed they must be enforceable and preferably guaranteed by a Bond.

Access

- The detailed staging plan referred to above should include the access arrangements for construction traffic and vehicles carrying aggregate onto site. It is suggested that a temporary access point could be provided from the existing A38 if ERR2 is not built in its entirety at the beginning of the development.
- The detailed staging plan referred to above should include how access for residents in MH2 will be provided by a car, bicycle and by foot. In particular, how a safe route to school will be maintained for those living in MH2 accessing the schools in MH1 and how MH1 residents will be able to access the new school to be located in MH2 if the ERR2 isn't complete and the road between the Cricket Club Roundabout and Langaller Roundabout continues to be used by the existing volume of traffic once the District Centre, housing and school are occupied in MH2.
- During construction all use of Heras fencing must include adequate safety signage on these panels warning people of the dangers of a building site with the hazards this creates.

Highways

- West Monkton Parish Council agrees that the A38 dual carriageway between Walford Cross and Monkton Elm road should be downgraded to accommodate the rapid transit bus route, but also to allow access for local traffic, ref page 22 of the Design Guidance. Single carriageway access for local traffic is essential.
- While integrating MH1 and MH2 is supported, the road link between the two roundabouts at Langaller should be kept open and heavily traffic calmed with adequate pedestrian crossing points in order to create a tree lined Boulevard with a cycleway and footpath along side. This will enable easier movement by foot and bicycle between MH1 and MH2 and will continue to enable large farm vehicles and lorries accessing businesses and farms in Monkton Heathfield off of the A3259. This will in turn remove the need for large vehicles needing to navigate the roads through the District Centre.
- In addition, to ensure that visually aspects of MH1 and MH2 become one village the Parish Council requests that the design guide, where possible, removes the acoustic fencing along the top of the existing earth embankment and looks into opening up and possibly lowering the earth banking in two additional places between Cricket Club roundabout and Langaller roundabout to facilitate one community.
- The Parish Council considers that the most appropriate location for a bus gate is near to Walford Cross. The Parish Council does however note that a Bus Gate cannot be constructed at Walford Cross until ERR2 is constructed and open. In the interim, agreed traffic calming measures should be constructed on the A3259 now and when the Western Relief Road is open, following traffic surveys if traffic volumes aren't reduced on the A3259 a temporary bus gate could be constructed on the A3259 at a

location to be agreed. When the ERR2 is open, a permanent bus gate can be added at Walford Cross thereby diverting traffic away from the centre of Monkton Heathfield (A3259) and along the ERR and WRR. When the permanent bus gate is constructed at Walford Cross the temporary bus gate can be removed from the A3259 as there will then be no need for a bus gate on the A3259 as traffic will have already been diverted away from the village at Walford Cross.

- To enable better traffic flows in the interim, the Parish Council requests that lanes are clearly demarked on the ERR as it joins the canal roundabout as far back to the Hardys Road Roundabout.

Tree Planting

- Tree size needs to be specified and would suggest at the least 8/10 standard is required (i.e. girth of trunk one metre from ground is 8-10cms) which would be 2.5 to 3metrs tall.
- All trees that are planted should be triple staked to at least six feet in height to both deter vandals and promote strong tree growth.
- Would strongly urge that a maintenance schedule is required immediately on planting to include ground preparation, watering, mulching, staking, protecting trunk at ground level against animals and strimmers. Duration of the settling in maintenance period to be at least 18 months to ensure trees become established. Quote from Persimmon, (paraphrased) 'once planted, no watering is needed' and waste of trees is shameful.
- Overall tree management and maintenance schemes should be set up to be as chemical free as possible, with reduced frequency of grass cutting. (See management document for County Park).
- Planting of edible fruit trees should be continued as part of the 'Orchard Trail' initiated in MH1.
- Community Orchard with bench seating would be supported, as per page 30 Design Guidance. Where wooden slats are used on benches these should be constructed of hardwood not softwood
- Trees planted within the built environment should always complement the architecture, historic environment and the local landscape. The colour of the backdrop should also be taken into consideration, for example, a birch will not be shown to its best advantage against a light background.
- Space needs to be allowed for trees to reach their full mature height and spread without threatening building structures, causing other structural damage or causing obstruction or nuisance.
- British grown trees should be purchased to reduce the risk of importing diseases and remove the need to quarantine the stock prior to planting. Trees and shrub planting should be plastic free i.e. no plastic tree guards and supports. Bio-degradable plastic is not acceptable, because the degrade time is too long. Tree stakes should be of FSC certified wood. The management plan for trees mentioned above is essential. All

home and business owners should be positively encouraged to join in and follow the tree management plan. Enforcement should be in place in the event of breaches.

Other aspects of Public Open Space

- Provision of allotments sufficient to support the MH2 population and if possible the MH1 population as no allotments were provided as part of that development, with access by car, bicycle, and foot, with water supply and electricity supply for lighting and security. The Parish Council consistently has a long waiting list for allotments in the Parish and would welcome provision of more, in proportion to the POS areas of MH2, as per page 30 of the Design Guidance. (WM Parish has 11 garden allotments, CSM Parish has many more due to a recent gift of land). The Parish Council would request that at least 30 allotments are provided.
- The area does not need yet another football pitch, but support would be given for open access tennis courts (ref Cheddon Road/Hope Corner Lane), bowls -perhaps as part of the area around the District Centre.
- It is suggested that a MUGA should be located adjacent to the retained woodland area in order to increase the natural surveillance of the woodland. Additionally, a Scout and Guide hut should be located adjacent to the retained woodland so that uniformed youth groups can assist in the general care of the area.
- West Monkton Parish Council agrees that opportunities for dual use should be maximised and the school should be constructed to allow separate secure access for use of facilities by local residents. This will facilitate use of sports pitches out of hours. Needs attention in construction – aim was for this to happen at WM Primary School, but construction removed option for secure separate access. As described on page 22 of the Design Guidance.
- The area between the motorway and the proposed ERR could accommodate a skate park, with half pipes. These parks are acknowledged to be incredibly noisy and therefore bad neighbours to houses; but provision for older youth is seriously lacking in MH1 (MUGA still not completed), so addressing this need is essential in MH2.
- The Parish Council would like to use the Walford Stream to create a lake within the flood area in the green necklace. West Monkton Parish Council welcomes the opportunities being taken to protect, link and enhance green spaces, water and woodland for both people and wildlife. WMPC would encourage support in the landscaping for Somerset Pollinator Action Plan, whilst access to a variety of habitats is proven to have important benefits for health and wellbeing of people. Planting schemes sensitive to these requirements will also help to moderate temperatures, reduce air pollution (especially reducing particulates PM 2.5), and provide sanctuaries and movement corridors for wildlife also under stress from climate change.
- The Parish Council would like consideration to be given to the reduction of the size of the green wedge between ERR2 and the motorway. The location of the green wedge, across ERR2 is less accessible for users and unless lighting is provided it may not be an attractive area to visit. There is a very clear link between health and

wellbeing and open spaces – the Parish Council would wish to see more green spaces throughout the development. The open spaces would not need to reduce the housing density instead three storey housing, if designed and located correctly, is acceptable and the line of ERR2 could be moved further to the east and closer to the motorway thereby moving some of the green space from the green wedge so that it can be provided throughout the development instead.

Footpaths and Cycle paths

- Only one pedestrian crossing is shown on the concept plan. More are required for the ERR, three on demand crossings should be provided to encourage use of the green space between the ERR and the motorway.
- Footpath and cycle ways through woodland and tree planted areas need to have low level, motion triggered LED lighting to provide safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists no matter what time of day. 'Trim trails' to be installed on some of the paths. All paths to be wheelchair accessible.

Bus Services

- All bus stops to be built with a serviced shelter to allow electronic timetable information to be displayed.
- Travel Plan needs to be strongly enforced and delivered.
- Bus company or private contractor needed to provide city shopper style of service, every 10 minutes, running for a long day (early morning, late at night).
- Bus and Ride Centre buildings – suggestion for green roof, pergolas, other features represent a genuine attempt to impress – as per some of the P+R areas outside Bath. Green roof suggestion could be reflected by roof gardens and green walls proposed for nodal / focal points.
- Consideration should also be given to the development of minibuses and ride areas for pedestrians / cyclists (with undercover bicycle storage) throughout the development, rather than one Bus and Ride Building to the north of the development. This would enable rapid bus transit throughout the development.

Street Furniture

- All seats to have a litter bin in close proximity to them. As above, where wooden slats are used on benches these should be constructed of hardwood not softwood.
- A sufficient number of dog bins should be installed throughout the development.
- The provision of some mailboxes should be included in the development.

Parking

- On street parking areas to be grasscrete, so that the impression of grassy verges is maintained rather than parking areas ending as compacted bare earth (see Church Hill West Monkton where the green verge has virtually disappeared in the past 5 or so years).

- In high density housing areas, the concept plan and design guide should include the requirement to park car at ground level under the housing provision, this will improve the street scene and avoids roads being congested with parked cars.

Streets in the Development

- The Parish Council would like the Design Guide to include design templates for all street types with detailed interpretations of what street scene is required. It is hoped that this will avoid the watering down of the design of streets when a Planning Application is made.
- Review hierarchy of streets and move away from industry standard 'Manual for Streets' dimensions to realistically allow for on street parking, both sides of road, delivery vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, emergency vehicles, visibility splay and turning circles.
- All streets to be laid out to include dedicated cycle paths and footpaths. West Monkton Parish Council recommends that secure, high quality and easy to use cycle parking is provided at public places in the new development.
- Ideas for street names please to submit to SWTC (if they still have the street naming section). Need names of old families (most have been used – person has to be deceased), and old field names. Contact is S.Donkor@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk

Accommodation for the Elderly

- West Monkton Parish Council would support the opportunity to deliver specialist accommodation for the elderly in the proximity of the District Centre; but that provision must not be allowed to replace the 10% provision of bungalows, throughout the site. Bungalows should be encouraged on the sites to the north side of the A3259 to allow uninterrupted views of/from the Quantocks.

District Centre

- The features of the District Centre should be such that it becomes a destination, not just functional, to enable the growth of the community in MH2.
- A sufficient number of retail units should be included in the District Centre for both the MH1 and MH2 development as no retail units have been delivered as planned in MH1.
- Therefore, it is suggested that there should be a medical centre including pharmacy, doctors, community nurses, dentist, optician, and hospital outreach.
- Community building is supported possibly with a Community Library.
- An open area in the District Centre is support for regular markets.
- A clock tower as a centre piece is also supported.
- Consideration could be given to a Hire establishment for bicycles in the District Centre to support Garden Town status.
- The retail offering must be supported by building units that are fit for purpose, i.e. all the retail units with apartments above must be built with correct venting and other

building requirements so that they can be used for shops, cafes, take-aways, dry cleaners, hairdressers.

- West Monkton Parish Council agrees that there should be an open area (with covered provision as well) for seating and chatting, maybe overlooking the bowling green, ref page 18 of the Design Guidance.
- The Parish Council would expect to have sight of the Marketing Strategy for the District Centre and have contact information for the agents at the commencement of the development of the site i.e. simultaneously with the start of the first parcel of houses. This would also need to be in place for the employment sites. This very strong approach is necessary because of the complete failure of the developers to deliver the Local Centre which the Parish Council was led to expect would be in place with the primary school, as a critical element of place making for MH1. Any change of use application of the allocated employment land at Walford Cross must be justified by full explanation of the marketing strategy used and analysis of the need for the change of use.

Employment sites

- The concept plan includes Employment Sites, MH1 also included employment sites which in 9 years to date, with the exception of one building which was delivered by the site owners, no employment units have been built and half of the designated employment land area has been re-designated for housing. The local centre in MH1 has also not been developed. The Parish Council is consequently concerned about any future delivery of employment sites and would ask that there is a delivery schedule and plans integrated with the house schedule, that such a schedule is enforceable and preferably guaranteed by a Bond.
- The Parish Council would like the Concept Plan and Design Guide to include more employment opportunities, for example small office / workshop type buildings, within the development rather than all of the employment site being located to the north of the development. This would enable delivery of employment opportunities during the housing build rather than employment sites being identified but not delivered until the end of the build.
- Employment Land reserve. For the avoidance of doubt, it might be wise to publish the use categories, as well as a description 'Buildings will provide employment in the form of office space, storage and industrial usage'. So please confirm this means B1, B2 and B8 – or is anything else envisaged?

Energy

- West Monkton Parish Council supports District energy centres throughout site – heating, lighting. What will be the likely impact of the Local Electricity Bill going through Parliament at the moment? The use of air and ground source heating systems should be explored.
- If Walford Stream was dammed to make a lake, then could the fall generate a small hydro-electricity scheme?).

- Biomass could be considered.
- The location of the Energy Centre would need to be closer to the employment site so that excess energy could be used by employment site. (Ref Keele University campus heating for further ideas, also hydrogen options).

Water / Flooding

- SUDs must be consented by LLFA use of Building Regulations part G i.e. grey water for toilets, dual flush, water butts in all gardens.
- The SUDs for the entire MH2 site needs to be available with an explanation of how the proposed swales, rain gardens and attenuation ponds interlink, with proper drainage strategy and plans. The development management process should give regard to the design, ownership and maintenance of proposed SUDs schemes, which can be adopted by Water Companies if they comply with the new Design and Construction Guidance for surface water sewers.
- The Parish Council would expect habitat appropriate planting to take place, particularly in swales and rain gardens, in accordance with Somerset Pollinator Policy. The Parish Council would expect all houses to be fitted with rainwater butts.

Building Design

- Buildings to conform the BfL standards (Building for Life). If BfL is used, responses to twelve questions should be made available to the Parish Council before final authorisation is given.
- Building heights and nodal/focal points. Noted that the denser area around the District Centre may reach 4 storeys (see Design Guidance pp18 and 19 for clear explanation). The PC strongly request that 'iconic buildings' should show innovative and/or interesting architectural style, so they are truly iconic:
- Roof gardens and green walls would add interesting features to apartment blocks that would also enhance the environment for residents and local flora and fauna. (Ref development of four multi-storey apartment blocks in Amsterdam with green aerial walk walkways and cycle paths to reach ground floor, apartments surround a central green garden space).
- West Monkton Parish Council notes that it is often the case that Concept Plans produced by Developers include chimneys. Could some of the buildings in the MH2 development be built with functioning chimneys – or even false chimneys? – ref estate in Wellington.
- Noted that proposed housing along ERR will front the ERR with attractive verges, tree planting and other acoustic measures: will the outward facing houses affect the place making within the settlement? Who will conduct the assessment of the impact of the road on air quality and vibration? Will the results be published for the Parish Councils?
- The inclusion of bee bricks, bird bricks, sparrow terraces, in the buildings in MH2 should be encouraged, to minimize disturbance to birds used to nesting in eaves and trees. PV panels on roofs of dwellings not just employment buildings.

- There is an expectation that sufficient storage will be provided to accommodate new recycling initiatives being undertaken by SWP, also in line with Neighbourhood Plan Policy H3 Refuse Bin Storage.
- The expectation is that buildings will conform to new legislation in terms of extra insulation and suitable external materials to increase energy efficiency of buildings getting as close to net emission rate of zero as possible within viability argument.
- Electric charging points are required in all dwellings as well as in the public realm.
- Materials used are to be compliant with the declaration of Climate and Ecological Emergency (SCC, SWTC, WMPC and CFPC). Layout and orientation to maximise solar gain. Apartments should be built with balconies or Juliet balconies as a matter of course, and blocks orientated to allow outdoor seating and community gardens for apartment dwellers.
- The proposed buildings should have net emission rates of zero or be certified '*passivhaus*' buildings.
- The expectation would be the delivery of fibre to the premises (FTP) to enable broadband connectivity in MH2.
- The installation of external lighting on all buildings including domestic and business premises should only be of warm white LED (or current equivalent recognised standard). For example, where lighting is needed but the area is sensitive for bats, red lamps may also be used (Warwickshire, The Netherlands). The light levels from the lighting must not cause disturbance to or prevent the use of habitats or resting places used by bats and other wildlife species.

Gardens / Soil Management

- Sustainable soil management practices (conforming with DEFRA guidelines, Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAEC) to be applied to the site to avoid compaction and contamination of topsoil where materials are stored.
- Safe storage of topsoil should be regarded as an important part of the Landscape and Environment Management Plan.
- Topsoil should be used back on gardens, allotments, and other public open spaces instead of using gardens as a burial ground for builders rubbish and sub-soil.
- It was suggested the proposed route of the ERR through the site could be developed at an early stage as a 'haul road' and storage of materials could be limited to this area.
- Biodegradable mesh should be used for the 'roll-out' turf used for lawns, to avoid plastic contamination, which is a serious pollutant in gardens in MH1.

Persimmon Homes South West

**Monkton Heathfield – Phase 2 Development
Design Guidance**

July 2020

This documents the response to consultation from Persimmon Homes South West (PHSW).

This document is to act as our Representation to the Monkton Heathfield – Phase 2 Development Design Guidance.

The additional design guidance set out in the document is welcomed, as it provides a framework that reflects the ongoing dialogue on this site, and confirms many of the land use principles that have evolved through the joint working and Design Review Panels.

While PHSW consider the document a positive step in aligning the design expectations of the authority and the Consortium, there are a number of elements where further clarity and dialogue is required. As such, and with Persimmon Homes subscribing too much of what is in the document, there are a number of areas of objection expressed below. PHSW is happy to continue to engage in the design agenda for Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 to ensure it is a suitably designed and delivered scheme.

With this in mind PHSW have a number of points where PHSW object due to a lack of clarity or are contrary to conversation we have had previously:

1. The document refers to having material weight in the determination of any application. However, its weight is neither clarified nor qualified and PHSW expresses caution on its use in the development management process outside of it being prepared as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), or a Development Plan Document (DPD) particularly on aspects that go to the heart of development viability
2. On the basis of the above, the language in the document needs to reflect its status as guidance and therefore text and terminology needs to express itself as guidance rather than be definitive.
3. All indicative street scenes, photo montages, block plans need to state they are illustrative as guidance, as they have not been prepared in the context of a wider detailed master planning exercise
4. The proposed Pedestrianisation of A38 between Monkton Heathfield Phase 1 and Phase s is not justified, nor supported by policy
5. The proposals proposing the removal of the noise bund on Phase 1 is not supported or necessary

1. Use of the document as a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications

PHSW acknowledge the requirement in Policy SS1 of the adopted Core Strategy to provide further design guidance on the delivery of Monkton Heathfield, and has been working with the authority on a comprehensive scheme. As such, many aspects of the masterplan and design document are supported, particularly around the disposition of residential and non-residential land uses, alongside the alignment of the Eastern Relief Road. However the Design Guidance goes beyond this on a number of matters of specificity that are beyond policy SS1. PHSW understands the logic and aspiration of some of these aspects and is willing to continue to engage in dialogue on these matters, however, the Design Guidance has no material weight in directing that certain aspects must be delivered. As such PHSW will continue to work with the authority to bring forward as comprehensive scheme on the basis of adopted policy. Where additional aspirational elements are included in the design guidance PHSW will review the opportunity to bring forward these components with the Council but will not be bound by the direction of this guidance where there is no policy basis in place, particularly where it affects development economics. .

2. The language in the document needs to reflect its status as guidance and therefore text and terminology needs to express itself as guidance rather than be definitive.

PHSW acknowledge the requirement in Policy SS1 of the adopted Core Strategy to provide further design guidance however there are a number of pages, specifically the Green necklace section (p15) which has a number of statements that we object to due to the onerous nature of terminology used, specifically any use of the word “will” this is a definitive word when this document should be for guidance only. “Will” in all instances should be replaced by “may” or any such word that is not definitive.

PHSW hope that SWAT can understand that as a piece of guidance the authority should not be outlining what we will be providing, and should be guiding and not directing development.

3. All indicative street scenes, photo montages, block plans need to state they are illustrative and also need to be realistic and deliverable.

There are numerous images and street scenes, including street cross sections (such as Pages 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 26) that are used to illustrate a number of design concepts for the proposal. However, these are isolated and are not part of a wider integrated scheme of design and as such can only be regarded as illustrative aspirational design concepts. PHSW concur that the development needs to be well designed and integrated and many aspects in the imagery / illustrations are welcome but as guidance, the document can only be regarded as an expression of ideas and concepts to consider incorporating into the wider masterplan work, that is already significantly advanced in detail. As such it is noted that the cross sections are identified as possible cross sections

that could be provided rather than being direction on how they must be provided. As such and to reflect their illustrative guidance status, they should be clearly labelled 'for illustrative purposes only'.

Similarly, there are inconsistencies in the document such as images on page 19 which relate to the local centre do not link with the text on page 18 specifically that it states that the district centre "*building would be up to 4 storeys in height would be acceptable*" whereas the imagery only shows a maximum 3 storey buildings that are also not stated as indicative, PHSW would urge SWAT to have 4 storey buildings shown so that there is consistency within the document or ensure that the massing shown is only illustrative.

Furthermore PHSW have not agreed to any of these design principles such as the amount of rear parking courtyards which based on the indicative street scenes appear to be numerous on the ERR, which would be rather considerable in size. PHSW do not believe using parking courts is the most efficient or effective parking strategy across the site as parking courts are very apparent in the street scene and car dominate Areas, it's hard to relate parking spaces to the homes they serve which in turn means an increase of street parked cars close to homes, and empty redundant rear parking courtyards. PHSW design a majority of their homes with on plot parking as it better addresses the issues of rear parking courts and it means that parking is better related to people's homes and that for the elderly and/or disabled there are shorter distances from people's cars to homes, and considering we develop housing for all purchasers it is important to make sure that all people are considered.

In line with our above comments we would recommend that SWAT make sure that all imagery and all design principles are indicative only, this would address our concerns.

4. Pedestrianisation of A38 between MH1 and MH2.

PHSW object to any mention of the removal of the Bund, acoustic fence and the removal, downgrading or diverting the road. The main issues with doing this are:

1. There is no policy basis for this within Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 and without it there is no basis to insist that this is undertaken. There is no proposal in the emerging planning application to remove this route and this has been made clear on multiple occasions.
2. By removing this road all traffic generated from the A3529 after the WRR going towards Bridgwater will be forced based on the SWAT masterplan through the District centre and towards the ERR, potentially creating a rat run through the heart of the development. Which would not be acceptable in a district centre and should be avoided.
3. PHSW believe there is real potential as the guidance stands, for the reasons identified above, for the development to be a private motor vehicle heavy development with increased levels of traffic running through

the heart of the development, it is our opinion that this is direct conflict with SWATs own emerging Garden Town suite of guidance documents, especially the Garden Town Vision “Branching out” section which outlines:

“Taunton’s streets and roads will provide a network of safe, inclusive and comfortable green streets and public spaces”

And

“We will enhance the connectivity, capacity and frequency of Taunton’s rail, bus, cycle and road connections”

By closing this section off you will in effect potentially pushing more vehicles through the district centre which will lead to an increase in traffic around the new through school and shops which may not be Safe and comfortable for all users especially if this area was a quasi-shared public realm. Furthermore by closing this vital link that would not be enhancing the capacity of the local road connections and instead would be pushing it into potentially narrower and more constrained streets.

5. Removal of acoustic Bund and fence.

PHSW object to the removal of the Bund and downgrading or closure of the road that the consortium constructed on our phase 1 application (48/05/0072), as:

1. There is no policy basis for this within Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 and without it there is no basis to insist that this is undertaken. There is no proposal in the emerging planning application to remove this bund, or extend the red line to include this, and this has been made clear on multiple occasions to officers
2. PHSW designed the street pattern around the construction of these bunds hence to open them up would lead to a stark car dominant area to the front of the MHPH1 site, and in all reality would not make the streets more accessible or walkable as the footpath are not designed to be connected here and terminate into parking areas.
3. In terms of place making and design a number of plots have blank gables that face onto this area, and considering this is an element that is not supported in the Districtwide design guide, by opening this up these elements would be prominent and apparent in the street scene as would the car dominated nature of this area hence in terms of design it would be better to keep the bund in place as it keeps those undesirable design elements out of the street scene and obscured.
4. As PHSW object to the downgrading or the removal of the road, and there is no policy reason to downgrade the road, we will not remove the Bund which has been made clear on multiple occasions.

PHSW consider the document as a positive step in aligning the design expectations of the authority and the Consortium, as can be seen above there are a number of elements which we object to and we need further clarity and dialogue on.

PHSW is happy to continue to engage in the design agenda for Monkton Heathfield Phase 2 to ensure it is a suitably designed and delivered scheme.

Yours sincerely,

Joshua Stevenson

Land Buyer

(On Behalf of Persimmon Homes South West LTD)

SHF/KPF/P20-1658

8th July 2020

Mr A Penna
Garden Town Coordinator
Somerset West and Taunton Council
Deane House
Belvedere Road
Taunton
Somerset
TA1 1HE

Dear Andrew

**Monkton Heathfield Garden Community Concept Plan and Design Guide
Representations on behalf of Redrow Homes**

Pegasus Group are instructed by Redrow Homes to make representations in response to the Monkton Heathfield Garden Community Concept Plan and Design Guide Consultation.

Redrow Homes (together with Persimmon Homes) have an option over a large proportion of the land (known as Monkton Heathfield 2 "MH2") to which the Concept Plan and Design Guide relate and have worked collaboratively with the Council and their consultants for some time to assist with the preparation of SPDs/Design Guides and a planning application. A hybrid planning application is currently being prepared for MH2 which will be submitted later this year.

Policy SS1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy identifies the Monkton Heathfield area for a new sustainable neighbourhood. The first phase of Monkton Heathfield (MH1) has delivered around 900 new homes together with new education and community facilities and the first phase of the A38 Eastern Relief Road (ERR). A further 100 homes were built at Aninhills Farm and development is underway at Hartnells Farm which will deliver 320 dwellings.

MH2 will deliver 1,600 of the remaining 2,500 homes allocated in Policy SS1 together with related educational and community infrastructure, employment land, land for a park and ride facility and the remainder of the ERR.

Policy SS1 states that *"the preparation and adoption of SPD will be required to further guide development, incorporating a masterplan and design codes to ensure a coordinated approach to the delivery of this site"*.

Redrow Homes are concerned that the current consultation relates to a Concept Plan and Design Guide that will not comprise an SPD, although is intended to be adopted by the

Page | 1

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre | Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT

T 01285 641717 | **F** 01285 642348 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Peterborough

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales
Registered Office: Pegasus House, Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT

Council for the purposes of determining planning applications (paragraph 2.4 of the consultation Design Guidance).

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides guidance on local design guides stating that:

"Local design guides are prepared by local planning authorities and neighbourhood planning groups to set out the general design principles and standards that development proposals should follow in an area, building on policies in the development plan.... To be given as much weight as possible in the decision-making process, local design guides need to be adopted as supplementary planning documents or appended to a neighbourhood plan"¹ (my emphasis).

With regards to Supplementary Planning Documents the NPPG states that:

"supplementary planning documents (SPDs) should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted local plan. As they do not form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan. They are however a material consideration in decision-making. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development"²

The Council have recently consulted upon a District wide Design Guide which is intended to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and will set out the general design principles and standards development proposals across the whole District (including MH2) should follow in accordance with the NPPG. Redrow Homes also submitted representations to this consultation.

Redrow Homes are concerned that the MH2 Concept Plan and Design Guide seeks to introduce design principles that go beyond those set out in the District wide Design Guide and are overly prescriptive. The NPPG makes it clear that SPDs should build upon policies in adopted Local Plans but that they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan.

Section 11 (District Centre) is an example of where the Design Guide seeks to amend Policy SS1, going beyond the remit of a Design Guide or an SPD. The table at paragraph 11.5 sets out minimum floor areas for the District Centre. Whilst Redrow Homes agree that the amount of 'A' Use Class floor space to be provided should be less than that set out in Policy SS1 this is a matter of Policy and it will be for the applicants to justify the amount of retail floor space proposed as part of the application and based upon an up-to-date evidence base.

A further example of where the Design Guide is considered to be overly prescriptive and go beyond setting out "general design principles and standards" as required by the NPPG is at Section 12 (Eastern Relief Road). Core Strategy Policy SS1 requires a new eastern development spine to the south and parallel to the A38 and improvements to the A38 to

¹ NPPG paragraph 005 Reference ID: 26-005-20191001

² NPPG paragraph 008 Reference ID: 61-008-20190315

transform it into an urban street. Section 12 sets out 18 bullet points that the ERR will be expected to comply with, many of which are overly specific.

The Design Guide also seeks to introduce sustainability and energy standards that go above and beyond current adopted policies. Section 18 (Sustainability/Energy/Climate Change) identifies that the emerging Local Plan, whilst at the very early stages, seeks to deliver carbon neutrality for the District by 2030. Whilst carbon neutrality is an aspiration of the Council any requirements for such compliance must be introduced through the Development Plan system or Building Regulations and not through a Design Guide or an SPD, as made clear in the NPPG. Section 18 seeks to introduce requirements relating to Lifetime Homes, Energy Efficiency and District Heating systems all of which go above and beyond adopted national or local planning policy and Building Regulations standards.

A schedule of detailed comments has been produced and is appended to this letter setting out Redrow Homes' detailed comments on the draft Concept Plan and Design Guide. As acknowledged at paragraph 2.7 of the draft Design Guide the Council and the developer consortium have worked closely to date to bring forward MH2 and as such the comments seek to highlight genuine concerns with a view to ensuring the Design Guide enables a high quality development to be brought forward.

In terms of public participation, the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 set out the Regulations for the preparation of SPDs. There are no such Regulations for the production of Design Guides. The Regulations require a minimum of 4 weeks to be provided for the submission of representations (Regulation 12(b)(ii)) and the preparation of a statement setting out the persons consulted, a summary of the main issues raised by those persons and how those issues have been addressed in the SPD (Regulation 12(a)(i-iii)).

Whilst the Concept Plan and Design Guide are subject of a 4 week consultation period which would comply with the minimum requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 if the Design Guide was an SPD, Redrow Homes are concerned that this is insufficient time for all interested parties to fully respond, particularly given the current Covid-19 pandemic which has seen many developers and consultants on furlough and/or working reduced hours. A 4 week consultation period is also half the amount of time the Council allowed for consultation on the District wide Design Guide earlier this year, the majority of which was undertaken pre Covid-19. There is no justification or explanation for why only 4 weeks is considered necessary in this instance.

Redrow Homes are also concerned that there is no specific allowance for the review and documentation of representations made in response to this consultation. As set out above, production of an SPD, as required by Core Strategy Policy SS1 would require the preparation of a statement summarising the main issues raised and how they have been addressed. This would allow for a transparent process to be followed.

The Concept Plan and Design Guide do not comprise an SPD and are therefore not being prepared in accordance with Core Strategy SS1. There is no justification or explanation for

the Concept Plan and Design Guide not being progressed as an SPD (unlike the District wide Design Guide) and failure to prepare this guidance in the form of an SPD is considered to further reduce the weight that could be attached to the documents in the determination of any planning application.

I trust that the above and attached will be taken into account in the on-going preparation of the Concept Plan and Design Guide and I would be grateful if you can acknowledge receipt of these representations and advise on the process for considering and responding to these (and other) representations.

Yours sincerely

pp.



Sarah Hamilton-Foyn

Senior Director

Sarah.hamilton-foyn@pegasusgroup.co.uk

Monkton Heathfield Garden Community Concept Plan and Design Guide

Consultation Monday 15th June to Friday 10th July 2020

This consultation response has been prepared on behalf of Redrow Homes in response to the consultation for the proposed Monkton Heathfield Garden Community including the following emerging documents submitted by SWT:

1. Draft Framework Plan for the SS1 Monkton Heathfield Policy area;
2. Draft Concept Plan for the Monkton Heathfield 2 development area; and
3. Draft Design Guidance for the Monkton Heathfield 2 development area

The opinions expressed within this representation are those of Redrow Homes only and not necessarily those of the Consortium.

The Consortium have been consulting with the Council over many years regarding the emerging Concept and Framework Plans for the site and recognise that the plans are closely aligned in many respects. There are a number of key differences which have been previously discussed and which are further highlighted within our consultation response below.

Draft SS1 Policy Area Framework Plan – June 2020

Generally, we welcome the changes to this plan following our previous comments (letter dated 13.01.2020) and appreciate the close placemaking and garden town principles aligned with the Consortium's Outline Masterplan. However, there remains some outstanding issues:

- The key refers to the '*Area between MH1 and MH2 to be significantly changed in character by road removal, diversion or downgrading with potential change to the character and appearance of the current road bunds and associated noise barriers*'. This design aspiration would not be deliverable for a number of technical and legal reasons therefore we would wish this note to be removed;
- Any reference to the removal of this highway section between Phase 1 and 2 or to the removal of bunds should be removed from throughout the documents;
- The SWT Framework Plan indicates a 'Possible Access Road to Centre' road leading to the District Centre/Core – the Consortium does not intend to provide a vehicular connection along this route. However, a green infrastructure corridor for pedestrians and cyclists is proposed to extend through MH2 which is considered to be more in-line with the garden town principles;
- The SWT Framework Plan indicates two LEAPs to the east of the site. The Consortiums preferred locations are located on the green corridor between the Through School and the District Centre to create a community hub and focal point between the adjoining land uses. The Consortiums preferred locations for the equipped play areas are integrated into the overall green infrastructure strategy and considered to provide a more even distribution of facilities in relation to Phase 1;
- An additional crossing point should be indicated across the ERR between the main east-west green corridor and the green necklace area to the east;
- We do not consider the provision of two vehicular access points to the land parcel to the north of Monkton Elm Garden Centre and the A3259 to be necessary.
- Proposed Green Wedge to the east of the site between the M5 and Creech Heathfield is not indicated.

We also draw your attention to the representations submitted and issues raised within by Redrow Homes to the consultation on the draft Design Guidance and Masterplan Framework for the Land South of Manor Farm at Langaller (dated 5th June 2020).

MH2 DRAFT Concept Plan – June 2020

Generally, we welcome the changes to this plan following our previous comments (letter dated 13.01.2020) and appreciate the close place making and garden town principles alignment with the consortium Masterplan. However, there remain similar outstanding issues to those noted above as well as the following:

- Proposed 2FE school should be re-labeled as a proposed Through School.
- Only 1 highways access point shown on this plan to the north of Monkton Elm Garden Centre which is preferred.


- 3 no. LEAPs shown on this plan. The Consortium proposes 2 no. NEAPs between within the community hub and on the east/west corridor near the green necklace across the centre of the scheme. The additional LEAP to the north is not considered necessary.
- The Landscape Buffer Zone should also extend to the north of the Through School and to the north of the parcel above Monkton Elm Garden Centre. However, the Landscape Buffer Zone should not include the residential property at Walford Cross.



Draft Design Guidance document for Monkton Heathfield – Phase 2 Development


Section		Comment
2.0	About This Document	
2.4	<i>'This Design Guidance and the accompanying Framework and Concept Plan will, following consultation, be adopted for the purposes of determining applications within the SS1 Policy area. It is a material consideration reflecting policies and guidance which post-dates the adoption of the Core Strategy.'</i>	Refer to cover letter
3.0	Planning Policy	
3.15	<i>'There remains a commitment to identify the strategic reserve of employment land, of up to 10ha, south of Walford Cross, as part of the second phase of the Monkton Heathfield development site.'</i>	Worth clarifying that the current proposals comprise 4.83Ha of employment with an additional 2.55Ha of land for a bus and ride facility.
4.0	Taunton – Garden Town	
4.9,4.10	References to land south of Manor Farm site	Should perhaps refer to MH2 instead?
5.0	Carbon Neutrality and Climate Resilience	
5.6	Ensuring new buildings achieve zero net carbon emissions as soon as possible.	Might be onerous. Perhaps wording along the lines of <i>'Homes designed to the latest building regulations standards, including a fabric first approach.'</i>
7.0	Sustainability Principles	
7.2	<i>'It also addresses issues of passive solar design and gain, so that despite the north-south orientation of the site, at least half of the dwellings will still have a southerly aspect.'</i>	This sentence requires further clarification.
7.4	<i>'...as well as MVHR (mechanical ventilation with heat recovery) on buildings near the motorway.'</i>	This has not been agreed and should be removed.
7.5	<i>'This needs to include the options for a combined local energy source for developments in close proximity and includes local energy centres.'</i>	This has not been agreed and should be removed.
7.7	<i>'...details regarding the proposed landscape proposals have been provided earlier within this document...Full details are submitted separately.'</i>	No details of landscape proposals are found earlier in the document. No separate landscape document found? Clarification required.
7.9	<i>'Further details are provided in this document or other reports accompanying this application.'</i>	Clarification required on documents status as part of an application.

7.10	<i>'Through the use of 'C' rated materials, as defined in the Green Guide to Specification.'</i>	This has not been agreed and should be removed.
Formatting error on page 11, paragraphs 7.1 to 7.9		
7.3 (page 11)	<i>'The <u>green wedge</u>/green necklace to the east and south for recreational use'.</i>	Not the green wedge at this location.
7.3 (page 11)	<i>'The proposed playing fields to the <u>west</u>.'</i>	The proposed playing fields are shared with the Through School subject to agreement and/or within the green necklace to the east. Clarification required.
7.4 (page 11)	<i>'The proposed MH2 development to the north of the site...'</i>	Should this refer to the downgraded A38? It should be clarified through the document that the downgrading of the A38 is not within the MH2 site boundary.
7.6	<i>'...including the Site Waste Management Plan.'</i>	The Council's Validation Checklist does not require submission of a Site Waste Management Plan
8.0	Overall Placemaking Strategy	
8.5	Block Form <i>'Generally perimeter block style...'</i>	Worth a definition of 'perimeter block' here as can mean different things to different people. Suggest changing to: <i>'Generally perimeter block form (where the fronts of buildings face on to streets, private drives and public spaces and the rear gardens of properties are defined by the rear gardens of other properties or parking courts).'</i>
8.9	<i>'Where possible street design should promote rooflines running within 20 degrees of east-west in order to provide south-facing roofs and facades thus promoting the benefits of solar gain.'</i>	This is too restrictive. There are lots of blocks in the masterplan where this would be very difficult to deliver and this objective would compromise good placemaking. I would suggest deleting this to avoid confusion. If not, the wording should be changed to <i>'where possible, practicable and where the principles of good urban design and placemaking are not compromised, street design should allow for rooflines generally running within 30 degrees of east-west in order to provide south-facing roofs and facades thus promoting the benefits of solar gain.'</i>

8.11	<p>The land within MH2 contains existing landscape features that will be retained and used to contribute to the overall character of the development. MH1 will be designed as a garden community with a network of green spaces and corridors linking into the green necklace, MH1 and the northern green edge. This network will consist of: A network of green routes focused around the retention of existing woodland, trees, hedgerows and public rights of way;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The establishment of a central green corridor running from the eastern side of the development through the District Centre and onto MH1 that; • Will be predominantly a car free zone to prioritise movement for pedestrians/cyclists and will be complemented with substantial tree planting to provide shaded areas and offset carbon emissions; 	<p>The highlighted text above should be read as one bullet.</p> <p>As presented, it reads that all green corridors will be car free. Some will but others will have private drives facing the green corridor and some streets will need to cross the green corridors.</p> <p>I don't think the reference to 'car free zones' is needed as it is about promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>We suggest that the text is changed to: <i>'The establishment of a central green corridor running from the eastern side of the development through the District Centre and onto MH1 that will prioritise the movement for pedestrians/cyclists and will be complemented with substantial tree planting to provide shaded areas and offset carbon emissions.'</i></p>
9.0	Green Necklace, Identity Area 1	
Page 15	<p>The Green Necklace will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will provide a noise buffer along the M5 motorway incorporating appropriate noise mitigation measures and must be informed by a detailed noise report. 	SWT to confirm what the level of noise would be acceptable within the green necklace/POS.
Page 15	<p>The Green Necklace should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further speed constraint methods should be explored if required; • This should be via an extension of the green link into MH2 and potentially from cul-de-sac 'opened up' by bund removal or breaks in the bunding. 	It is unclear what is meant by the second bullet point. Further clarification required.
Page 15	Top left image showing a timber boardwalk.	Not sure this image is relevant to this site.
10.0	Integration of MH1 and 2, Identity Area 2	
Page 16	<p>Potential Positive Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be given to potential for part/total pedestrianisation of current road subject to ensuring continued local road access to existing homes and businesses; • Removal of noise bunds and fencing with regard to reduced use and traffic noise on the downgraded road must be considered; • Realignment of road if necessary with regard to removal of existing noise reducing fence must be considered. 	<p>With reference to Pegasus email response dated 03.04.2020 and 24.03.2020, the bunding and fence are not temporary as you will see this is clearly set out in the RM consent.</p> <p>Removal of the bund is not necessary or justified. To remove the bund would cause significant problems and is not considered to be deliverable or feasible; not just in respect of securing a new permission but there are also</p>

		<p>significant concerns about the legal ramifications for Persimmon and Redrow as plot purchasers will have acquired with the comfort of the relevant boundary treatment, which effectively screens the road and offers acoustic protection.</p> <p>The plan accompany Core Strategy Policy SS1 also clearly identifies a road in this location.</p>
Page 17	<p>Section A-A indicating how the realignment of the road and removal of the existing acoustic bund and fence could offer a solution to integrating the MH1 and MH2 communities.</p>	<p>This section shows the bunding and fencing removed – see comment above.</p> <p>The proposed Section A-A shows a footpath circa 1.5m and also vehicle carriageway which is confusing.</p> <p>We would suggest omitting the existing and proposed Section A-A as is not deliverable and potentially misleading.</p>
Page 17		<p>This diagram shows rear parking for housing facing the green space - we would want the flexibility to provide private drives and the drawing should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>There are lots of examples of where rear parking has had negative impact on placemaking, the vitality of streets and spaces as people do not use their front doors. Rear parking is also less convenient and safe.</p>
11.0	District Centre	
Para 11.2	<p>The District Centre will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a mix of uses including community hall, multi-functional space, health facilities, convenience store, retail businesses, café/hot food outlets, pub/restaurant, professional and financial services. 	<p>There should be flexibility for a range of uses to be provided responding to market demand rather than a prescriptive list of uses to be included.</p>
Para 11.5	District Centre mix of uses and floor areas	<p>The mix of uses and floor areas to be provided is a matter of Policy and any changes to Core Strategy Policy SS1 (which Redrow support in principle) should be through a Policy document or a planning application supported by an up-to-date evidence base.</p>

		This diagram shows the school building fronting and framing the green open space adjacent to the district centre, however, it is likely that staff / visitor car parking and drop-off / pick-up area will be located at the front of the building (16.3). The drawing should be amended to allow for this.
12.0	Eastern Relief Road, Idenetity Area 4	
Page 21		This diagram shows rear parking for all the housing facing the Eastern Relief Road – we would want the flexibility to provide private drives and if you agree I think the drawing should be amended to allow for this? There are lots of examples now of where rear parking has had negative platemaking impacts on the vitality of streets and spaces because people don't use their front doors as much. Rear parking is also less convenient and safe.
Page 21	Proposed Section A-A	SUDs attenuation ponds should also be shown within the green necklace.
Page 21	Proposed Section B-B	The Planted Landscape Strip will also need to include a swale between the private drive and foot/cycle.
13.0	Downgrading of the A38	
Para 13.2	The A38 changes along the development boundary...	It should be carried that the downgrading of the A38 does not form part of the application area for MH2.
Page 22	"Access from this route into the new development of MH2 can be delivered but should be restricted to a minimum of two and exclude an access off south of Elm Monkton Garden Centre and Heathfield Gardens development."	Wording not clear. Why should there be a restriction minimum and why no access south of Monkton Elm Garden Centre where current access is proposed? Where is the evidence for this?
Page 22	Proposed Section A-A	Proposed tree planting within high pressure gas pipeline easement should be removed.
15.0	Employment Land Reserve	
15.1	"10ha of land should be released for employment land as set out in the Core Strategy and SS1."	Core Strategy Policy SS1 applies to the wider Monkton Heathfield

		allocation. Not all of the 10ha of employment land will therefore be delivered on MH2.
16.0	School site	
16.1	"The proposed two form entry school."	School to be a Through School
17.0	Landscape and Green Infrastructure Opportunities	
General Imagery	<p>For example, we could replace images like this:</p>  <p>With images like this. We would have one to replace all of the ones they have.</p> 	<p>The document doesn't cover built form character areas or architectural character. The photos are considered to be inappropriate to the site and Redrow's product. The images should be updated to include high quality images and examples of Redrow's products. Images can be supplied.</p>
Page 26	<p>Character of green infrastructure more effectively shown by the following images:</p> 	



18.0	Sustainability/Energy/Climate change	
7.5 (page 30)	"The five overarching principles of Lifetime Homes should be considered and include:"	There is no current policy requirement for Lifetime Homes
7.10 (page 31)	"This will include the production of an Energy Assessment...and a Sustainability Assessment	The Council's Validation Checklist does not require submission of an Energy Assessment or Sustainability Assessment
7.12 (page 31)	"New development should also incorporate renewable energy produced on site. An analysis of feasible technologies will have to be provided in support of planning applications."	There is no current policy requirement to incorporate renewable energy technologies.
7.13 (page 31)	"Options for providing heating and hot water on site will need to be considered and could include a review of a local or district heating scheme in addition to more traditional alternatives."	There is no current policy requirement to consider or incorporate a local or district heating system.

