

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.	
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>	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.
Eddie Eatwell	My comment relates to the Framework Plan, and specifically to the location of the new bus gate.	If the new bus gate could be moved slightly to the north east, adjacent to Alder King, this could be avoided.

	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.	
Mark Essex	Addressing the Draft SS1 Policy Area Framework Plan (specific comments in answer 2.)	<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.

	<p>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.</p>	
<p>Philip Bisatt - Railfuture</p>	<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>	
<p>Edwin Hughes</p>	<p>Living within the existing development for four years now. Seems that landscaping is very low priority and has still not been completed. The pitches due to go by the A38 have still not been put in. 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>
<p>Sue Wheatley</p>	<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>

<p>Paul Tuff</p>	<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>

	<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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Nigel and Annette Finch</p>	<p>We are concerned about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lack of a Noise Attenuation bund on the Western (Langaller) side of the realigned A38 Our house, and two other houses in Langaller, are Listed Buildings and cannot have double glazing. 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. We argue strongly that the lack of a Noise Attenuation bund on the Western side is discriminatory. 2. The SUDS drainage area next to Langaller Manor Farm has been removed. Why has this been removed? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise Attenuation bund A bund must be also built on the Western (Langaller) side of the realigned A38 Existing residents in Langaller, and especially those in Listed Buildings, should not be impacted by additional noise. 2. Removal of the SUDS area next to Langaller Manor Farm This SUDS area needs to be re-instated. 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>	<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>
<p>Jane Hennell – The Canal and River Trust</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust (the Trust) in respect of the above document. 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>	
<p>Brendan Brighton</p>	<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		
<p>Jayne Whaley</p>	<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 these 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		
<p>Stephanie Essex</p>	<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>

<p>GTH</p>	<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>
------------	--	--

	<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.</p>	
<p>William Thorpe</p>	<p>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>	<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>