Linking our objections to the Mendip Plan.

Our objections to the proposed development will have more force if we can link them to the [policies](https://www.mendip.gov.uk/media/29760/Adopted-Local-Plan-Part-II/pdf/Adopted_Local_Plan_Part_II.pdf?m=637758570217000000) set out in the Mendip plan alongside the allocation of the site for housing. If the development does not comply with the policies there is a strong case for refusing planning permission. If, on the other hand, the developers make changes to their proposals to be consistent with these policies then we will have improved the development.

The text set out in black below is a direct quote from Mendip Local Plan Part II: Sites and Policies – Adopted 20th December 2021. The text in red covers suggestions that people have made about how the proposals need to be improved. The list is not exhaustive  
  
Policy WM1: Development Requirements and Design Principles  
1. A minimum of 40 dwellings including affordable housing consistent with relevant policy. We can say what kind of affordable housing we would like to see (bungalows for downsizing, starter homes for young people, shared ownership opportunities). What is the justification for more than 40?  
2. Have particular regard to site layout, building height, and soft landscaping, to minimise the visual impact of the development in this rural location. We might ask for no street lighting, nothing higher than 2 storeys, lots of big trees. Point out the estate will be seen from Broadhay and Deer Leap (both in the AONB), as well as Roughmoor Lane and Stoke Road.  
3. New development should reflect the local materials and style. We need to say what style & materials suit and provide photos of what we like/don’t like.  
4. The site should be designed to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. Suggest wide (8 metre) strip along Roughmoor Lane. Don’t make traffic worse by putting village hall by the playing fields.  
5. Opportunities should be taken to maintain or enhance biodiversity and particular consideration will be needed of the impact on designated sites. 0.13 ha of accessible bat habitat should be provided. Needs a good wide corridor along Roughmoor Lane and also substantial planting alongside the playing field. The bat corridor would be compromised by putting a hall or other facility at the NW end of the plot.  
6. Further investigation will be required of traffic impacts and a safe access onto the A371 will be required. Safe pedestrian links should be provided to enable access on foot to the village core. Putting 120 people and a similar number of cars on the south of the A371 while village facilities (shop, pub, school, and currently village hall) are all on the North makes a dangerous and congested road worse for both motorists and pedestrians. What plans are there for a ‘safe pedestrian link’?   
7. The impact on nearby listed buildings and the Conservation Area will need to be carefully considered. The proposals will increase congestion in the conservation area. An overcrowded development would undermine the appearance of the village.  
8. Up to 0.1ha of land will be made available for the delivery of a community facility. This is insufficient for a facility of useful size plus adequate parking, especially as the Mortar Pits car parking would be lost. Siting the facility at the western end of the site is foolish as it increases traffic and parking problems for no benefit.