

### Martock Parish NP (Pre-Submission Version) Reg.14 Comments and Decisions

	Respondent:	Substance of Comment:	Interpretation and Reaction:	NPSG Decisions 7 <sup>th</sup> October 2019
<b>General</b>				
1	Police Designing Out Crime Officer	I have forwarded your email to my colleague.	Awaiting comments from Yeovil	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
2	Highways England	We are satisfied that the Plan's proposed policies are unlikely to result in development which will adversely impact on the SRN.	Highways England confirms that the NP does not impact negatively on the Strategic Road Network	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
3	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan	NE is satisfied with the current version of the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment
4	SSDC Planning	It is considered the Plan is in general conformity with the development plan for the area.	The LPA has confirmed that the current version of the NP is in general conformity with the development plan. (This is one of the basic conditions required by law.)	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
5	SSDC Planning	The Council is also pleased to note that the format and structure of the Plan is largely in accord with that expected by national legislation and guidance. Furthermore, that the document is both succinct and clear as to what it proposes through its Vision, Aims, and Policies in helping to shape the parish in future.	Complimentary about the NP document.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
6	SSDC Planning	Many other references within the document suggest that it was first drafted in 2018 and updates should therefore be provided where necessary and appropriate.	Dates and other references in the Submission Version of the Plan will need to be up-dated as appropriate.	Ensure all dates and references are reviewed and updated as necessary before Submission Version of the Plan is published.
7	Resident	Excellent detailed plan. I wish to see that our village remains a village and whilst I am sympathetic to small sensitive developments and ones with 'affordable' homes we do not wish to see 'carte blanche' huge developments for which the current infrastructure and services cannot and will not be able to support.	This comment is an endorsement of the scale of growth facilitated by the NP.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
8	Resident	The Martock Neighbourhood Plan is a substantial and complex document.... would it help to include a succinct summary of the major issues?	The Plan is not intended to be read from front to back by the lay person. Its structure and content it is based on what required. SSDC has complimented the NPSG on the document. A summary of the issues and policies could be published for local consumption. As long as it simplifies and clarifies not mystifies. This summary would not become part of the development plan documents.	Consider producing a summary document in advance of the Referendum.
9	Historic England	I can confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.	HE is satisfied with the current version of the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.

10	Resident	<p>The plan would benefit from the inclusion of a succinct summary of the village's main concerns and challenges. I would suggest the following are listed as current concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The chronic and acute shortfalls in the number of GPs</li> <li>2. The level of traffic congestion through both the villages of Martock and Bower Hinton</li> <li>3. The scarcity of off-road parking</li> <li>4. The availability of primary school places to support local children</li> <li>5. The adequacy of drainage and flood prevention measures</li> <li>6. The quantity and quality of local employment opportunities</li> <li>7. The availability of affordable housing to support local needs</li> <li>8. The adequacy of local policing</li> <li>9. Identification of opportunities to meet the SSDC Local Plan requirement for further dwellings.</li> </ol>	<p>The respondent suggests that it would help justify the policies if a list of the village's main concerns and challenges was presented in summary form somewhere in the Plan.</p>	<p>A list of problems and issues is present in the current para. 3.8. No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
11	Gladman Developments	<p>To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. The current Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the MNP and the Development Plan which the MNP will be tested against is the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2015) which sets out the overall vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the district over the period to 2028.</p> <p>South Somerset District Council has commenced work on a Local Plan Review and the Council is currently consulting on its preferred options. The Local Plan Review is still in the early stages of plan preparation and as such, Gladman recommends that the MNP is flexibly worded to reduce any potential conflicts as the Local Plan Review develops and takes shape. This degree of flexibility is required to ensure that the MNP is capable of being effective over the duration of its plan period and not ultimately superseded by s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which states that:</p> <p>'if to any extent, a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approached, or published (as the case may be).'</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the MNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area. Gladman consider that further modifications to the Plan and additional</p>	<p>The respondent urges that the NP and its policies are flexible enough to ensure the NP is not in conflict with the new Local plan when it is adopted.</p>	<p>The Submission Version of the Plan must conform with the adopted Local Plan. Discussions will be held with the LPA to ensure the NP also takes account of the LP Review.</p>

		housing allocations are required to ensure that it allows for sufficient flexibility and so that it is conformity with basic conditions.		
12	Collier for Summerfield	We recommend that the relevant policies should be updated to reflect the need for larger scale housing development to come forward in Martock/ Bower Hinton, which will include sites outside of the Settlement Area Boundary. This is required to ensure that the NP meets the basic conditions in respect of having regard to national policies and national guidance specifically in relation to significantly boosting the supply of housing, contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and being in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.	The respondent says that policies should be updated to take account of the Local Plan Review and its strategic policies.	The Submission Version of the Plan must conform with the adopted Local Plan. Discussions will be held with the LPA to ensure the NP also takes account of the LP Review.
<b>1 Introduction</b>				
13	Resident	Para. 2.1 The junctions of Stoke Road and Foldhill Lane onto A303 are not adequate to support raising these roads to B-Roads. The B-road through Bower Hinton to the junction onto the A303 supports single lane traffic only through the village. Suggest changing text to read “... has reasonable connections to Yeovil ...”	It is suggested that the road links to Yeovil are less than satisfactory and this should be reflected in the phraseology used in para. 2.1. The matter of road capacity is considered to an extent in the introduction to Section 11.	Amend para. 2.1 to better reflect community about the capacity of local roads.
14	Resident	Para. 2.2 Although outside the parish itself, should this also mention that Long Load and the area to the North of the Parish are subject to extensive flooding?	It is suggested that the Plan should refer to flooding being an issue that is wider than just the Parish.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
15	Resident	Para. 2.3 Are the population and out-commuting figures current? I have vague recollections of having heard these as >4700 and 80% respectively.	The figures used in para. 4.3 are questioned.	Up-date figures in accordance with those used by the LPA.
16	Resident	Would it be useful to include a further paragraph identifying the perceived concerns and challenges facing the parish? I would expect these to cover such issues as: GP Provision; availability of school places; congestion on main road through the village; sufficiency of parking spaces; drainage and flood prevention; adequacy of policing; sufficiency and quality of local employment; adequacy of public transport; sufficiency of affordable and/or social housing.	The suggestion here is that the capacity of some of these vital facilities and services is a limiting factor. If it is agreed, and there is clear evidence, that this is the case, then this point is better made in Section 8 and/or section 12.	Point noted but no change necessary in the Introductory part of the NP as a result of this comment.
LC1	Environment Agency	The Environment Agency aim to reduce flood risk, whilst protecting and enhancing the water environment. Together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level.	EA refers the SG to joint advice on neighbourhood planning.	No direct change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>2. Martock Parish Today</b>				
17	SSDC Planning	Para. 3.2 It is considered the Plan pays due regard to national policy as set out in the NPPF 2019. In some instances, it is recognised the Plan has needed to assess and balance competing national policy objectives so that the proposals being advanced are the best available in ensuring	The LPA has confirmed that the current version of the NP is generally in accordance with the NPPF. (This is one of the basic conditions required by law.)	Noted that SSDC has confirmed that the current version of the NP is generally in accordance with the NPPF.

		sustainable development and compliance with the expectations of the local community. With one exception, it is considered this balancing exercise has been concluded successfully.	It suggests that the Plan has one flaw, which the NPSG needs to take heed of.	No direct change necessary as a result of this comment.
18	SSDC Planning	Para. 3.2 .... refers to the 2018 incarnation of the NPPF. This reference should be updated to reflect the latest version of the document (February 2019) and corresponding checks made to any NPPF paragraph references throughout the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure these are still correct.	A slightly revised version of the NPPF was published in February 2019. This requires an amendment to para. 3.2 and all references to the NPPF in the NP need to be checked.	Ensure all references to the NPPF in the Submission Version of the Plan relate to the latest published version.
19	SSDC Planning	Para. 3.3 It is considered the Plan is in general conformity with the development plan for the area which comprises the adopted South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 (adopted March 2015), the Somerset County Minerals Plan up to 2030 (adopted February 2015), and the Somerset Waste Core Strategy up to 2028 (adopted February 2013).	The LPA has confirmed that the current version of the NP is in general conformity with the development plan for the area. (This is one of the basic conditions required by law.)	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
20	SSDC Planning	Para. 3.3 Local Plan Review – Commencement of Preferred Options Consultation References to the adopted South Somerset Local Plan are included as necessary in Section 3.3 and at subsequent locations throughout the document where appropriate. SSDC can confirm that public consultation on the South Somerset Local Plan Review (2016-2036) Preferred Options document is taking place between the 28 June and the 18 September 2019.	The LPA has confirmed that current references in the NP to the Local Plan Review are correct. All such references will need to be checked and corrected as necessary at the time of publishing the submission Version of the NP.	Ensure all dates and references are reviewed and updated as necessary before Submission Version of the Plan is published.
21	SSDC Planning	Para. 3.5 The Neighbourhood Plan recognises progress being made by SSDC in reviewing the Local Plan. The District Council welcomes the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan has endeavoured to ensure general conformity with the new Local Plan and its emerging strategic policies. Also, that parallel plan-making and consultation will likely lead to mutual benefits. The preparation timetable for the Local Plan Review is clearly set out within the Preferred Options document and will aid the Parish Council in setting future consultation milestones. However, the Parish should be mindful of the fact that local plan preparation and review can often be a lengthy process and there may sometimes be unforeseen circumstances which have implications on the content and timing of emerging policy and proposals. If such instances arise, it will be for the Parish to decide whether it would wish to adjust preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan accordingly or whether it would wish to proceed on a potentially quicker route to referendum	The LPA has welcomed the fact that the NP has endeavoured to ensure general conformity with the new Local Plan and its emerging strategic policies. It issues a gentle warning that the on-going LP review could result in changes to the proposed LP that could have implications for the NP.	A meeting with the LPA will be arranged, to discuss the intended policy content of the NP in the light of the Reg. 14 consultation.
22	Resident	Para. 3.6 ... the Martock Sustainable Development Plan was produced in 2013. Elements of this plan need to be updated. In particular, the statement regarding the Martock Surgery at paragraph 4.4.1 <i>“The partners were informed, and they have all agreed that they are more than capable of coping with future demand ...”</i> has turned out to be wildly optimistic.	The respondent suggests that some of the content of the Sustainable Development Plan is out-of-date. Para. 3.6 – 3.8 only identifies the value of the document in highlighting the community’s environmental-awareness credentials and those sustainability	Amend para. 3.6 to recognise that the Sustainable Development Plan is a six-year-old document.

			'issues' that remain important to local people.	
23	Resident	Para. 3.8 Given the abject failure of the Martock and South Petherton Practice to retain and/or recruit sufficient GPs to fulfil the needs of the Martock Surgery, would it be appropriate to include a point within this paragraph relating to both the acute and chronic shortages of GPs serving Martock (over and above the National and Regional shortfalls) .....	The respondent wants the NP to emphasise the lack of capacity at the GP Practice. This would be more appropriate in the Introduction to section 12.	Include a reference, with evidence, in para. 3.6 to the current capacity problems at the local GP Surgery.
<b>3 Purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan</b>				
24	Resident	Para. 4.6 This seeks redefine the English words "out-of-date" in a way designed to EITHER 1) give the false impression that the local community has failed in their duty to maintain this plan OR 2) undermine any confidence not being totally ignored.	This comment relates to para. 4.6. of the Local Plan Review document not the NP.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>The Structure of Our Plan</b>				
25	SSDC Planning	Para. 5.4 Martock continues to be identified as a "Rural Centre" in the Local Plan Preferred Options settlement hierarchy (Policy SS1). This is intended to enable the settlement to grow and expand its identified role by allowing for additional employment growth, the provision of additional retail premises, and modest housing growth, all of which will encourage greater self-containment. There are 5 rural centres identified in the Preferred Options document with a combined proposed growth equating to around 8% of the district's total proposed growth over the plan period. When taken individually, each settlement needs to provide approximately 1.6% of the total proposed growth across the district up to 2036.	The LPA has confirmed that Martock will continue to be viewed and treated in the Local Plan as one of five rural centres in the district.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>4 Vision, Aims and Objectives</b>				
26	Resident	Para. 6.5 For the Aim: "Ensure community infrastructure meets local needs", would it be appropriate to include an objective to limit development within the Parish beyond the level which can be supported by existing healthcare and education provisions: whilst it may be argued that the provision of sufficient doctors and teachers is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, surely it would be a dereliction of duty to permit unrestricted growth of the Parish population in the face of the provision of doctors and school places already failing to meet current demand – we may not be able to fix the problem, but at least we can stop making it worse.	The respondent seeks to amend objectives that have been adopted by the community to further emphasise local concern about the capacity of vital facilities and underpin policies that are intended to be capacity constrained.	Carry out a review of the aims and objectives in the light of changes to the policy content of the Plan.
<b>5 Natural Environment – General and Introduction</b>				
LC2	Environment Agency	National and Local Plan Policy approach is to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. The aim should be to keep development out of medium and high flood risk areas, and other areas affected by flooding. We note that flooding and the risk of flooding is a matter of major concern within the	EA acknowledges the NP takes flood risk seriously and has produced a Flood Risk Guide.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.

		Parish and that a Flood Risk Guide for Planning Applicants has been drafted to accompany this neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Policy Mart1 - Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity</b>				
27	Resident	In July 2019 the government published planning policy guidance on what it termed 'Biodiversity net gain'. I would like to see a reference to this incorporated in Mart 1 backed up by a short explanation of the principle and how we would expect it to be realised either as part of 7.8 or as an additional paragraph. The details should then go in the Environment Manual.	The Respondent wishes to see a stronger reference to 'biodiversity net gain' in the policy and its supporting statement based on the recent changes to the PPG	Environment Task Group to consider how best to refer to 'biodiversity net gain' in the supporting statement to the policy.
28	Gladman Developments	The policy states “development proposals that would result in either loss of or unacceptable harm to an existing area of natural habitat will not be permitted...”. In this regard, the Parish Council is not the decision-making authority and the District Council is solely responsible for the determination of planning applications. As such, Gladman suggest that ‘permitted’ is deleted from the policy wording and is instead replaced with ‘supported’.	The respondent is right in asserting that the District Council is solely responsible for the determination of planning applications and questions the validity of the use of the expression “permitted” in a NP.	Agreed to use the word “supported” to ensure consistency throughout the NP.
LC3	Environment Agency	The NPPF is clear that pursuing sustainable development includes moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature, and that a core principle for planning is that it should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Similarly, the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan (February 2018) has policy for embedding an ‘environmental net gain’ principle for development, including housing and infrastructure. We note that your Neighbourhood Plan policy’s, linking with South Somerset’s Local Plan Policies, are looking to seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity in the wider area. We are supportive of these policies particularly Policy Number Mart 1, Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity, and Policy Number Mart 6, Development in the Countryside. Biodiversity enhancement in and around development should be led by a local understanding of ecological networks.	The respondent acknowledges that the NP seeks opportunities to enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity. EA expresses its support for policy Mart1.	Include a reference to EA’s support for the policy and reasons why in the supporting text.
<b>Policy Mart2 - Landscape and Wildlife Corridors</b>				
29	Gladman Developments	Gladman raise concerns that the policy seeks to protect landscape and wildlife corridors from development other than that required to maintain, enhance or interpret their landscape or wildlife purposes. As currently worded, Gladman consider that the above policy is too onerous and would result in preventing the delivery of any sustainable development opportunities from coming forward. The policy then goes on to state what development proposals should demonstrate to enhance and extend the network of landscape and wildlife corridors. As such, the policy does not provide a clear indication of how a developer is expected to react to a development proposal and is therefore inconsistent with the requirements of paragraph 16(d) of the Framework. Gladman recommend that the first paragraph of the policy is deleted.	The respondent requests the deletion of the first paragraph of the policy as it could be taken to imply a blanket protection on ‘landscape and wildlife corridors’, which is not the purpose of the policy.	Agreed to consider a small amendment to the policy text. Environment Task Group to recommend wording.

Policy Mart3 - Flood Management				
30	Resident	Although outside the scope of the Martock Parish Neighbourhood Plan, would it be appropriate to make some mention of the flood issues to the North of the Parish (i.e. recent flooding of Thorney, Muchelney and Long Load) – presumably developments within Martock could impact on flood prevention measures to the North of the Parish. Could changes to flood prevention measures on the Levels have an impact on Martock?	The respondent suggests that it might help to acknowledge flooding issues outside the parish area and plan to ensure that these are not exacerbated by NP policies.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
LC4	Environment Agency	paragraph 7.15, the Environment Agency would welcome clarification regarding the reference to “critical drainage problems” as this statement could be misleading. The Environment Agency does not have any areas in Wessex that have been formally designated a ‘critical drainage area’.	EA asks for clarification on the phrase “critical drainage problems” as it could be misinterpreted as meaning a ‘critical drainage area’, none of which have been formally designated in the area.	Re-word para. 7.15 to avoid any misinterpretation.
Policy Mart4 - Flood Risk				
LC5	Environment Agency	Para. 7.22, please note, areas that are within close proximity to flood zones 2 and 3 may be for other authorities to provide comment on. The Environment Agency would only be a statutory consultee if the proposed development was actually within the publish flood map for planning (Flood Zone 2 and 3). We would remind you the Local planning authorities’ Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) should be the primary source of flood risk information in considering whether particular neighbourhood planning areas may be appropriate for development.	EA seeks to clarify its involvement and the role of others including the LPA’s SFRA’s	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment. This is dealt with adequately in the Flood Guide.
Policy Mart5 - Public Rights of Way				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
Policy Mart6 - Development in the Countryside				
31	SSDC Planning	Policy Mart6 supports appropriate development in the countryside according to a number of criteria being met. However, it is considered the policy is disjointed and somewhat repetitive and could be simplified to help clarify what types of development will be supported and what types of development will not. A potential simplification might be as follows: <i>“Development in the countryside will be supported where:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, farm diversification or outdoor recreation;</i></li> <li>• <i>It demonstrates a positive contribution to the preservation and enhancement of the countryside, its landscape and its biodiversity;</i></li> <li>• <i>It facilitates responsible use and enjoyment of the countryside by the public;</i></li> <li>• <i>It does not cause harm to publicly accessible open space, footpaths or bridleways;</i></li> <li>• <i>It does not impact negatively on important views and vistas to/from settlements;</i></li> <li>• <i>It does not cause harm to scheduled ancient monuments and other sites of archaeological interest, including ridge and furrow;</i></li> </ul>	The LPA suggests that policy Mart 6 could be made clearer by a revised application of bullet points.	Agreed to accept policy re-wording with “if” instead of “where”.

		<p>• <i>It does not impact negatively on the best and most versatile agricultural land, or the integral character, beauty and tranquillity of the countryside.</i>"</p>		
32	Gladman Developments	<p>The policy states that development proposals in the countryside will usually be supported if they are necessary for the purposes of agriculture, farm diversification or outdoor recreation. Gladman would be opposed to the use of a countryside policy if this were to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities from coming forward on the edge of Martock. Indeed, the approach taken by the above policy mirrors that of previous national planning policy contained in PPS7 which sought to protect the countryside for its own sake. Indeed, Policy No. Mart13 allows for the delivery of residential development either within or adjacent to the built form of the settlement.</p> <p>There is currently uncertainty over the level of future development needed within the District and how the Council will seek to accommodate its housing needs in full. Until such time that the District Council has confirmed its future level of development that will need to be delivered in Martock there can be no assurances that the MNP's policies can positively plan for a suitable level of growth to meet identified needs without ensuring that development proposals that are well related to the existing built form should be supported. Indeed, the criteria listed would prevent any development from coming forward if any 'loss' occurred on views considered to be important, biodiversity or landscape features or best and most versatile agricultural land. In this regard, the Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Furthermore, certain elements of the criteria listed would not be in accordance with the requirements of national policy. For instance, this policy would not support any development on BMV<sup>1</sup> land regardless of its agricultural quality. In light of the above, Gladman consider that the Plan needs to provide a flexible solution to ensure future sustainable growth opportunities are able to come forward within and adjoining the edge of the settlement. The following wording is put forward for the Parish Council's consideration:</p> <p>"When considering development proposals, the Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Applications that accord with the policies of the Development Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide new homes including market and affordable housing; or</li> <li>- Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or</li> </ul>	<p>The respondent suggests that effect of policy Mart6 would be to preclude the delivery of sustainable development on the edge of the built-up area purely because it is regarded as countryside. This, it suggests is in conflict with policy Mart13 by ruling out development that does not meet the criteria of the policy.</p>	<p>Consider minor amendment to supporting text to make clear that there is no overlap between policies.</p>

<sup>1</sup> the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land

		<p>- Infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>Development adjacent to the existing settlement will be permitted provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development.”</p> <p>Indeed, this approach was taken in the examination of the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 4.12 of the Examiner’s Report states: “...Policy GMC1 should be modified to state that “Development ...shall be focused within or adjoining the settlement boundary as identified in the plan.” It should be made clear that any new development should be either infill or of a minor or moderate scale, so that the local distinctiveness of the settlement is not compromised. PM2 should be made to achieve this flexibility and ensure regard is had to the NPPF and the promotion of sustainable development. PM2 is also needed to ensure that the GNP will be in general conformity with the aims for new housing development in the Core Strategy and align with similar aims in the emerging Local Plan.”</p>		
LC6	Environment Agency	<p>The NPPF is clear that pursuing sustainable development includes moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature, and that a core principle for planning is that it should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution.</p> <p>Similarly, the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan (February 2018) has policy for embedding an ‘environmental net gain’ principle for development, including housing and infrastructure. We note that your Neighbourhood Plan policy’s, linking with South Somerset’s Local Plan Policies, are looking to seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity in the wider area. We are supportive of these policies particularly Policy Mart 1 and Policy Mart 6.</p>	EA expresses its support for policy Mart6.	Include reference to EA’s support for the policy and reasons why in the supporting text.
<b>Policy Mart7 - Farm Diversification</b>				
33	SSDC Planning	<p>Whilst the principles of farm diversification are supported by both the NPPF and the Local Plan, SSDC wonders if Mart7 contains a drafting error as the statement runs completely contrary to a variety of national and local policy, standards, advice and guidance designed to maintain / protect character, amenity and safety. Redrafting is necessary to avoid continued conflict.</p>	<p>The LPA is mainly concerned about the phrase “<b>where the benefits of such development outweigh any harm to local character, residential amenity or highway safety, will be supported....</b>”</p>	<p>Re-word policy as follows:  <i>The conversion of existing agricultural buildings for business or business-related purposes will be supported <b>where it is justified in the interests of ensuring the continued viability of the farming business and where the proposal can demonstrate that there would be:</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) no harmful impact upon the surrounding rural landscape;</i></li> <li><i>ii) no unacceptable conflicts with agriculture and other land-based activities;</i></li> </ul>

				<p><i>iii) no harmful impact on the local road network;</i></p> <p><i>iv) no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents or businesses; and</i></p> <p><i>v) no requirement for rebuilding or a disproportionate extension. Converted business space permitted by this policy must remain as its approved use unless it has been actively marketed for two years and it can be demonstrated that no demand exists for its continuation for employment purposes. In such cases, the redundant space should revert to its former use.</i></p>
<b>Policy Mart8 - Views and Vistas</b>				
34	Gladman Developments	As set out in case law, for a view to be identified for protection there should be a demonstrable physical attribute that elevates its importance out of the ordinary, rather than seeking to protect views of the open countryside due its pleasant sense of place. Gladman are concerned that the proposed policy will seek to prejudice the delivery of potential sustainable development opportunities from coming forward. The emphasis of this policy is very much on the 'protection' of the landscape/views identified rather than seeking to integrate new sustainable development opportunities within the existing landscape and character of the local area. Opinions on landscape are highly subjective and without robust evidence to demonstrate why these areas are considered beyond the fact that they are considered valued by local community members will likely lead to conflicting decisions through the development management process contrary to paragraph 16(d) of the Framework. As such, this policy as currently worded is therefore contrary to basic conditions (a) and (d).	The respondent questions the legitimacy of the policy by giving protection to key panoramas, views and vistas that are highly regarded by the local community – in doing so the respondent seems to be questioning the value judgment of local people. It is suggested that the policy places too much emphasis on protection, which could prevent the bringing forward of a sustainable development that would make good use of the views and vistas within the development.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>Built Environment and Heritage - General and Introduction</b>				
35	Wood E&I Solutions on behalf of National Grid	High-pressure gas transmission pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites. There may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites.	The consultant representing the National Grid has confirmed that the NP does not impact on the gas transmission pipeline network. They provide a map to refer to if policy changes are to be considered.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
36	Resident	Noting that the SSDC Local Plan identifies specific sites, which it states " <i>can deliver additional dwellings within the lifetime of the new Plan</i> ", would it be appropriate for the Martock Neighbourhood Plan to discuss issues	The Respondent suggest that the NP includes a discourse on the	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.

		<p>associated with these and other potential sites for major development in and around the village? e.g.  North of Martock: in-fill between Martock and Stapleton; North-west of Martock (i.e. Coat Road/Hills Lane)?  East of Martock (i.e. Foldhill Lane), etc to cover all compass points with potential development areas. Aim would be to show what would need to be done to facilitate any further major developments within the village (potentially arguing that further development in Martock is not feasible).</p>	<p>developability and merits or otherwise of various sites in the parish.</p>	<p>Growth and development policies are under review following comments received.  Any change to development policies will require a presentation of the issues and the reasoning behind the policies.</p>
<b>Policy Mart9 - Heritage Assets</b>				
37	Gladman Developments	<p>As currently worded the policy would apply the same level of weight to all heritage assets within the neighbourhood area regardless of the significance of the heritage asset. Gladman are concerned that this policy does not have full regard to the requirements of national policy. The policy must be reworded to reflect the guidance set out within paragraph 197 of the Framework in respect of the two separate balancing exercises in relation to designated and non-designated assets. It states: "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgment will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset." Policy Mart9 is inconsistent with basic condition (a) in its current form.</p>	<p>The respondent suggests the policy Mart9 does not meet one of the basic conditions (a. having regard to national policies...) by seemingly placing the same level of weight to all heritage assets irrespective of their significance.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend supporting text to better reflect NPPF para. 197.</p>
<b>Policy Mart10 - Local Green Space</b>				
38	SSDC Planning	<p>In relation to Local Green Space, the NPPF is clear that policy should only allow development in exceptional circumstances. Indeed, the NPPF awards parity between policies for the protection of Local Green Space and those for managing Green Belts.  The Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting evidence base is clear that the 13 areas identified through Policy Mart10 as being suitable for this designation have been subject to assessment against NPPF criteria. Given this widespread use of an enhanced level of protection, are there any remaining green areas that might be worthy of protection through a secondary / alternative policy mechanism?</p>	<p>The LPA wonders whether there are non-qualifying areas of green space that may also need protection that are not adequately covered by policies in the development plan. It does not nominate any specific sites/areas.</p>	<p>Point referred to Green Spaces Task Group.</p>
39	Resident	<p>I welcome this policy but would like to see it extended in some manner to give some protection from development to other green areas that are important to the village, but do not necessarily satisfy all the criteria of a formal Local Green Space, in particular with regard to public access.  Examples are:  Coat Hay Common, our only remaining area of common grazing land.  The fields that separate Martock from Stapleton and Martock from Coat.  The field west of the Church which is an important element of the setting of the church (and which contains the remains of the old moated Manor)  The field south of Middle Street, Bower Hinton, which is an important element in the character of the old centre of Bower Hinton.</p>	<p>The respondent identifies areas of green space in the Parish that need to be protected from development</p>	<p>Support noted.  Green areas nominated referred to Green Spaces Task Group.</p>

		Cartgate Nature Area, which is a valuable and diverse natural area. I should like this list to be open-ended, to allow the Parish to add additional areas.		
<b>Policy Mart11 - Local Character and Design</b>				
40	Resident	Would it be appropriate to include something about the character of estates and new developments? High density developments with narrow roads, small gardens, and little in the way of parking provisions do not fit within my concept of a 'rural village'.	The respondent refers to design and layout matters that should be addressed by the Design Statement.	Refer the comment to the Task Group that is preparing the Design Statement.
<b>Policy Mart12 - Infrastructure</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart13 - Accommodating Growth</b>				
41	SSDC Planning	<p>The housing requirement for Martock and Bower Hinton is therefore around 330 dwellings over the plan period (Policy SS2) with a residual requirement of around 210 dwellings after existing commitments and completions are discounted. 3 allocations are made in the Preferred Options (Policies MB1, MB2 &amp; MB3), each with a requirement for 29% affordable housing to be provided.</p> <p>It is suggested the Neighbourhood Plan could better reflect this scenario. Whilst the plan includes a policy to support appropriate housing development, subject to six different criteria, and notes the importance of local plan policy in assessing development proposals in rural settlements, no specific housing allocations are made. Instead, the settlement boundary is more widely drawn than is currently the case with a view to accommodating growth subject to criteria-based assessments in accord with the Local Plan* (Policy SS2 / Local Plan Review Preferred Options Policy SS4) and Neighbourhood Plan Policy Mart16.</p> <p>SSDC suggests that in order to provide a more positive contribution towards meeting acknowledged housing shortages (including affordable housing shortages) and to provide greater certainty for the local community and stakeholders, the Neighbourhood Plan considers making a housing allocation (or allocations) at a suitable location within or adjacent to the settlement boundary. Such an allocation could contribute towards medium or longer-term housing needs and assist in raising funds to help meet the infrastructure requirements of the area whilst providing ancillary benefits to the community in accord with the adopted CIL framework.</p>	<p>The LPA asks that the NP better reflect the housing proposals in the LP Preferred Options, which proposes allocation of sites at:</p> <p>MB1 N. of Coat Road 55  MB2 S. of Coat Road 95  MB3 South Hills Lane 60 (each with 28% affordable)</p> <p>It suggests that the NP would make a more positive contribution and provide greater certainty if it was to allocate sites for future housing development.</p>	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.
42	Resident	Whilst acknowledging that the SSDC Local Plan sets a requirement for Martock of 230 dwellings over the plan period (2006 – 2028), does the parish support this or accept it as feasible? Many of the presentations made to the SSDC opposing the Coat Road development of 120 houses would appear to indicate an increase of 230 dwellings anywhere in the parish would not represent sustainable development (at least until the provision of sufficient GPs, school places, relief roads, local jobs, parking spaces, etc. have been adequately addressed). I would suggest that the	The respondent suggests that the supporting statement for the policy needs to be up-to-date and reflect community representations made regarding the Coat Road development.	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.

		Neighbourhood Plan should caveat its support for the SSDC Local Plan's allocation of additional dwellings to Martock.		
43	Resident	<p>Para 8.44 The Local Plan requires the Parish of Martock to provide for a share of the district's strategic growth in housing and employment land. Regarding new housing, the Local Plan sets a minimum requirement of 230 dwellings over the plan period (2006 - 2028). The Neighbourhood Plan must accommodate this scale of growth as a minimum.</p> <p>I believe that the Neighbourhood plan should state that this requirement to create further new dwellings is an external requirement: it does not originate from within the village; it does not address existing village needs; and it exacerbates existing village concerns and challenges.</p>	The respondent wants it main plain that the strategic target is set by the LP and not the NP. Also, that the target may not be in the best interests of the village of Martock.	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.
44	Gladman Developments	<p>The policy defines the Settlement Area Boundary (SAB) of Bower Hinton and Martock as illustrated on Map 6. Gladman note that small scale development on land adjoining the SAB will be supported provided that it meets the criteria listed.</p> <p>In principle, Gladman welcome the acknowledgment that development proposals can come forward on land adjoining the SAB but would suggest that reference to small-scale development is removed as it is currently uncertain what level of development Martock may be required to accommodate to meet future housing needs. The criteria listed should also include the caveat 'where necessary' in the policy wording as not all of the proposed criteria may be relevant to individual development proposals. In addition, Gladman reiterate our submissions in response to Policy Mart6 and the need for clarity of the approach taken to accommodating growth adjacent to the existing settlement. The policy will also need to recognise that where any potential adverse impacts are identified against the listed criteria then development proposals will be supported provided that appropriate mitigation can be achieved.</p>	<p>Whilst welcoming the policy in principle, the respondent asks for the term "small-scale" to be removed from the policy so as to ensure sufficient development can come forward to meet future targets. The respondent suggests adding "where necessary" to the preamble to the criteria as not all criteria will apply to all development proposals.</p> <p>It also suggests that the policy should be supportive of development if the potential adverse impacts cited in the policy can be appropriately mitigated. It calls too for synergy between this policy and policy Mart6.</p>	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.
45	Collier for Summerfield	<p>Paragraph 8.48 of the NP refers to existing Local Plan Policy SS2 however, this policy is not relevant to Martock/Bower Hinton as the policy applies to Rural Settlements only. Rural Settlements are considered as being in the open countryside which are subject to more stringent policies over the scale of future development and are expected to accommodate less development.</p> <p>The Preferred Options version of the LPR expects Martock/ Bower Hinton to deliver at least 210 dwellings (excluding existing commitments and completions) over the Plan period 2016 – 2036, reflecting its role as a Rural Centre. To meet the basic conditions referred to above, the NP policies must support an appropriate level of development to deliver this housing requirement.</p>	<p>The respondent rightly points out that LP Policy applies to rural settlements not to Martock/Bower Hinton itself.</p> <p>It is suggested that the policy context is updated to reflect the preferred options version of the Local Plan Review.</p>	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.
46	Collier for Summerfield	Part C of draft Policy Mart 13 states small-scale development on land adjoining the Settlement Area Boundary will be supported subject to a number of conditions. Paragraph 8.50 explains that for the purpose of interpreting Policy Mart13, schemes of more than 10 dwellings should not	The respondent points out that policy Mart 13 is in conflict with the site allocations in the Local Plan Review.	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.

		<p>normally be seen as small scale, and a development of more than 10 dwellings will only be acceptable if it provides an appropriate proportion of dwellings that meet a demonstrable local need for affordable housing based on an up-to-date assessment of need and comprises an appropriate mix of dwellings to respond to the need for specific tenures.</p> <p>The sites currently proposed to be allocated for housing in the LPR are for 55, 95 and 65 dwellings respectively. Given that these sites are outside of the proposed Settlement Area Boundary and would not represent small scale development they would conflict with Part C of Policy Mart 13.</p> <p>Paragraph 29 of the NPPF states that Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area or undermine those strategic policies. We therefore consider that this part of the policy does not currently meet the basic conditions.</p>		
47	Collier for Summerfield	<p>We are disappointed to see that the NP Settlement Area Boundary has not been updated to include the land at Ringwell Hill, Bower Hinton following our previous representations which set out the reasons why it should be amended to include the site.</p> <p>As you are aware, South Somerset District Council's Local Plan Review (LPR) is currently being prepared. The LPR proposes to allocate three sites for housing development. We have made representations to the LPR proposing that the site at Ringwell Hill also be allocated for residential development as outlined in our previous representations.</p>	<p>The respondent expresses disappointment that the case it made previously for land at Ringwell Hill to be included in the settlement area boundary was not accepted. The respondent asks once again for the land to be include in the settlement area because of the site's history and pre-application discussions. The previous submission stated: <i>"We have reviewed the criteria used for defining the settlement area and whilst we note that the site does not currently have planning permission, the recent discussions with SSDC and the associated benefits that the development of the site will deliver i.e. the redevelopment of PDL and facilitating the employment development to the north, we cannot see how the exclusion of southern part of the site can be justified. The previous appeal decision is clear that there would be no adverse visual impacts from the development of this site."</i></p>	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.
<b>Policy Mart14 - Renewable Energy</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart15 - Sustainable Design</b>				
LC7	Environment Agency	<p>Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure are needed to support sustainable development. A healthy water environment will also deliver multiple benefits, such as helping to enhance the natural environment generally and adapting to climate change. We would promote that water</p>	<p>EA expresses support for the sustainability and water efficiency aspects of policy Mart15 and the Environment Manual.</p>	<p>Include reference to EA's support for the policy in the supporting text.</p>

		efficiency measures should be incorporated into development as this conserves water for the natural environment and allows cost savings for future housing occupants. We are therefore supportive of Policy number Mart15 Sustainable Design and that you have highlighted that “new development should seek to achieve high standards of sustainable development, and demonstrate in proposals how design, construction and operation will promote water efficiency. We are also supportive of your environmental manual.		
<b>Housing - General and Introduction</b>				
48	SSDC Planning	Attention is drawn to the fact that the affordable housing requirement on qualifying sites* outlined throughout the Preferred Options document is now changed to 29% (rather than 35% as included in the adopted Local Plan). This proposed reduction is considered more realistic and reflects the fact that the current Local Plan target is subject to viability and, more often than not, the affordable housing contribution within developments is reduced following an ‘open book’ viability testing process. *: Qualifying sites are those providing 10 or more dwellings or having a site area of 0.5 ha or more.	LPA makes the point that para 9.2 should reflect the latest position being taken by the LP on affordable housing requirements.	Amend para. 9.2 to ensure it reflects the latest position at the time of publication of the Submission Version of the NP.
<b>Policy Mart16 - Housing Development</b>				
49	Resident	Mart 16 requires that new developments should “ <i>incorporate separate and satisfactory .. parking provision</i> ” but does not define what we mean by satisfactory. I suggest an additional paragraph which indicates an expectation that developments should normally conform to SSC standards unless there is good reason not to.	Respondent thinks it prudent to emphasise that parking provision should normally meet the current standards expected by the LPA.	Add additional text to supporting statement to help define what is meant by satisfactory parking provision.
50	Collier for Summerfield	It is not clear how this policy relates to the Settlement Area Boundary or the allocations which will be made in the LPR to deliver the minimum housing requirement for the settlement. To meet the basic conditions, the NP policies must reflect the LPR aspirations for growth in the Rural Centres such as Martock/Bower Hinton and the policy which sets a residual housing requirement for at least 210 dwellings over the Plan Period to 2036.	The respondent suggests that the policy should relate more directly to the local Plan Review and up-dated targets.	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.
<b>Policy Mart17 - Housing Mix</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart18 - Affordable Housing</b>				
51	Gladman Developments	In principle, Gladman support the general thrust of the above policy which seeks to improve community members access to affordable housing. However, this is not a land use policy and is instead a statement of intent. As such, it should be removed from the main body of the MNP and included as an appendix to the Plan which contained non-land use policies.	The respondent supports the policy in principle but suggests it is, as written, merely a statement of intent rather than a land use policy.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>Policy Mart19 - Community Housing</b>				
52	Gladman Developments	The policy states that community housing schemes may be supported outside the SAB of Martock/Bower Hinton on sites where housing would not otherwise be permitted provided that the development meets the	The uses the example of this policy to highlight what it considers is a lack of	Point referred to Development and Growth Task Group.

		criteria attached to the policy. Gladman reiterate our previous concerns regarding the use of a tightly drawn SAB and would question how the Plan would enable the delivery of sites adjacent to the SAB as outlined in Policy No. Mart13. Gladman recommend that these policies are reconsidered and make clear that all forms of development will be acceptable beyond the settlement boundary in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	clarity about development outside of the settlement area.	
<b>Policy Mart20 - Self-Build Housing</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart21 - Energy Efficiency</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Local Economy - General and Introduction</b>				
53	Braunability	As one of the larger businesses in the area I am not aware of consultations that have happened with businesses. Is there a forum I should be a part of in order to be able to contribute?	This is a matter that should be referred to the Parish Council.	Comment and interest have been referred to the Parish Council.
54	Braunability	The specific issue relates to transport to and from the factory. This has been and continues to be an issue both in the immediate neighbourhood and the sounding feeder roads. There appears to be little in the document that addresses this issue.	The respondent seems to be referring to local road capacity and management, which is generally beyond the scope of the NP.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
55	Braunability	There is also little provision for further business development in the area. This is a concern because with the increase in housing and no additional local work opportunities, the only option is to commute which promotes the use of cars over and above other sustainable transport options. This of course will put a greater load on the road network as it currently is.	The respondent does not seem to agree that policies Mart22 and Mart23 facilitate sufficient business development in the Parish.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>Policy Mart22 - Business Areas</b>				
56	SSDC Planning	It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan is supporting an appropriate scale of business development and expansion at four well-established key sites...This will assist one of the Local Plan's objectives for the area which is to provide further employment opportunities as a means of securing greater self-containment.	The LPA appears to endorse policy Mart22 (and Mart 23)	Include reference to the Local Plan's objectives for the area in support of the policy.
<b>Policy Mart23 - Business Development</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart24 - Communications Infrastructure</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Transport and Travel - General and Introduction</b>				
57	Resident	Despite the B3165 connecting directly to the A303 trunk road it does not make the Village "well connected". The B3165 runs through the centre of Martock village and Bower Hinton village both of which contain numerous pinch points and stretches of road which are effectively single file due to the routine and extensive street parking. The majority of the traffic exiting Martock is via Foldhill Lane, Stoke Road or through the neighbouring parish of Ash. None of these routes provide a B-road standard junction onto the A303.	The respondent questions the use of the term "well-connected" and identifies road network improvements that would be necessary to facilitate major developments.	Amend wording.

		To avoid exacerbating the existing traffic and congestion problems in Martock and Ash, any further major developments within Martock need to be supported by enhancements to the Foldhill Lane and Stoke Road junctions with the A303 or the provision of a relief road to connect Martock to the Cartgate Roundabout on the A303.		
58	Resident	Para 11.4 needs to be more specific and go further. To my knowledge, there is currently only one bus route through Martock and the timing of the first and last buses effectively preclude its use to support commuting to work outside the village. Given the vast majority of the village residents in employment work outside of the village then car ownership and use in the village is a necessity not an option.	The respondent emphasises the need and value of the motor vehicle to local people.	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>Policy Mart25 - Public Transport</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart26 - Off-Road Parking</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart27 - Footpaths and Cycleways</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart28 - Traffic Management</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Policy Mart29 - Disabled Access</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Community Wellbeing - General and Introduction</b>				
59	Sport England	Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important. It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.	This is the standard Sport England response to all NPs. It is a pity it does not comment specifically on policy Mart32 and other relevant policies. It is left to the SG to decide whether the policies are in line with Sport England's aims and priorities. Nb. Reference to NPPF para. 97 is made in relation to policy Mart32.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
60	Resident	Para 12.5 The Neighbourhood plan should make clear that the combined Martock and South Petherton Practice has been unable to recruit sufficient	The respondent wishes to see the NP make clear that there is a lack of	Point noted but no change necessary as a result of this comment.

		GPs to meet its needs. This goes beyond, but is exacerbated by, the national and regional shortage of GPs. The Neighbourhood plan should make clear that the dentist does not take on NHS patients (although this should be checked since the change of ownership).	capacity in the local health service provision.	
<b>Policy Mart30 - Existing Community Facilities</b>				
61	SSDC Planning	SSDC is pleased to note recognition of retail and service functions as significant facets of the local economy. The stance towards maintaining and enhancing community facilities through Policy Mart30 and Policy Mart31 is welcomed and is in accord with Policy EP15 of the adopted Local Plan (now renumbered to Policy TC9 in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options).	The LPA endorses policy Mart30.	Include reference to LPA's comment in support of the policy.
<b>Policy Mart31 - New Community Facilities</b>				
62	SSDC Planning	The stance towards maintaining and enhancing community facilities through Policy Mart30 and Policy Mart31 is welcomed and is in accord with Policy EP15 of the adopted Local Plan (now renumbered to Policy TC9 in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options). The Local Plan aim of increasing the range of comparison goods outlets (which is currently only half the UK town centre average) may also be well served by Mart31.	The LPA endorses policy Mart31.	Include reference to LPA's comment in support of the policy.
<b>Policy Mart32 - Sports and Recreational Facilities</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.
<b>Monitoring the Neighbourhood Plan</b>				
		No Specific Comments Received		No change required.