

North Somerset Council  
**Local Development Framework**

**Sites and Policies Part 2:  
Site Allocations Plan  
2006 -2026**

**Summary of comments made on the March 2016 Consultation Draft  
of the Site Allocations Plan and the Council's Response  
(Consultation Statement)**

**This publication is available in large print,  
Braille or audio formats on request.**

**Help is also available for people who require council  
information in languages other than English.**

**Please contact 01934 426 816**

## **Contents**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
Duty to Co-operate and joint working	6
What happens next	7
<b>2. Summary of responses to the Site Allocations Plan</b>	<b>8</b>
(i) Introduction	9
(ii) Policy Context	12
(iii) Evidence Base	14
<b>3. Detailed Policies</b>	<b>17</b>
(iv) Housing Context /Settlement Boundaries/ Green Belt	17
(v) Housing Allocations (including Schedule 1)	22
(vi) Employment Allocations (including Schedule 2)	51
(vii) Safeguarded Employment Sites (including Schedule 3)	62
(viii) Retention of Economic Uses	66
(viii) Local Green Space (including Schedule 4)	67
(ix) Undesignated Green Space	86
(x) Strategic Gaps	89

(xi) Community Use Allocations (including Schedule 5)	99
(xii) Weston Regeneration Area	107
(xiii) A370 Corridor into Weston-super-Mare	109
(xiv) Safeguarded Park and Ride Site Weston-super-Mare	111
(xv) Sustainability Appraisal	113
(xvi) General Comments on a town or village	123
(xvii) Sites put forward for development	131
 Appendix 1: Site Allocations Plan Poster	 170

## 1. Introduction

This document explains how North Somerset Council has undertaken consultation to date in preparing its Site Allocations Plan. It sets out how North Somerset Council has sought participation from communities and stakeholders during the production of its Site Allocations Plan. It covers:

- Which bodies and persons were invited to make comments;
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make comment;
- A summary of the issues raised; and
- The Council's response to the issues raised

This consultation statement complies with the North Somerset's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The SCI outlines that the Council is committed to effective community engagement, and seeks to use a wide range of methods for involving the community in the plan making process.

North Somerset Council's Statement of Community Involvement was adopted in March 2015. This replaces the former SCI which was adopted in February 2007 and needed updating because of changes in planning legislation and increased use of electronic communication in the planning process. This revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) sets out how the Council will involve the community and stakeholders in the preparation, alteration and review of local planning policy and the consideration of planning applications. The SCI proposed that the consultation methods and those engaged would vary according to the purpose of the consultation and the bodies or persons who the council were keen to involve

The Consultation Draft of the Site Allocations Plan was published for consultation in March 2016. The following people were invited to take part in the consultation:

- North Somerset residents through a Press Release and Advert (see <http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/news/have-your-say-on-meeting-housing-shortfall/>)
- Town and Parish Councils through a workshop held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016
- Agents, landowners and developers who had previously expressed an interest
- Statutory Undertakers
- Adjoining Local Authorities

People were informed about the consultation via:

- E-mail or letters to a Database of participants in previous Local Development Framework documents
- Distribution of Posters to local councils and Libraries and used as an advert in the Local Press ( see Appendix 1)
- Local Press
- Twitter
- Exhibitions

Staffed exhibitions were held at:

- Weston Library, Monday 21 March, 4pm-7pm
- Nailsea Library, Tuesday 22 March, 4pm-7pm
- Churchill Primary School, Wednesday 23 March, 4.30pm-7pm
- Portishead Library, Thursday 24 March, 4pm-7pm
- Clevedon Library, Tuesday 29 March, 4pm-7pm
- Congresbury School Rooms, Wednesday 30 March, 4pm-7pm
- Yatton Library, Thursday 31 March, 4pm-7pm
- Winscombe Community Centre, Monday 4 April, 4pm-7pm.

The consultation ran from Thursday March 10<sup>th</sup> 2016 until Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2016. There were 264 respondents to the consultation who made 785 individual comments

### **Duty to co-operate and joint working**

Planning issues are not constrained to local authority boundaries. The National Planning Policy Framework states that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those that relate to strategic priorities. Councils are required to work collaboratively to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual local plans.

North Somerset Council has a long history of joint working with other local authorities in the West of England. North Somerset is part of the West of England; a functional economic area consisting of the four unitary authorities of Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Bath and North East Somerset and North Somerset. Following the abolition of Avon County Council in 1996 the authorities have continued to work together voluntarily on a range of economic, spatial, transport and infrastructure planning issues. These voluntary arrangements were formalised in 2005 when the West of England Partnership (WEP) was established.

Throughout the preparation of each of the authorities' Core Strategies, the WEP has acted as the focus for cross-boundary working on spatial planning, transport, housing, waste and economic development. It has now been replaced by the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The LEP brings the authorities together with local businesses and education to create a new body that will provide the focus for continued joint working to support sustainable economic growth locally.

The policies contained within the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 are predominantly locally specific to North Somerset and on the whole don't involve any cross-boundary issues or joint working. All adjoining authorities were consulted at each consultation stage in the production of the document and no issues were raised.

### **What Happens Next?**

All representations received (both supporting and objecting to the Site Allocations Plan), have been summarised in this Consultation Report and an assessment taken on representations received and consideration of any amendments required. A revised plan will be prepared. This is the Publication Version and will be the plan that the Council intends to submit to the Secretary of State for examination. This will be consulted upon and all comments received forwarded for consideration at the independent examination. It is anticipated that this consultation will take place in Autumn 2016

The plan then moves into the examination phase. An inspector will undertake the examination and hold hearings as appropriate before submitting recommendations to the Council. The Council will then proceed to adoption.

## 2. Summary of responses to the North Somerset Council Site Allocations Plan (Consultation Draft) March 2016

See [here](#) for the full text of all the 759 responses received on the SAP from 264 respondents. The Site Allocation Plan was subject to public consultation between 10 March 2016 and 28 April 2016. **NB To see individual response it may be necessary to register on the North Somerset Council EConsult web page**

See [here](#) for a plan showing the various sites put forward for development by landowners/ developers

Abbreviations used:

SAP = Site Allocations Plan

JSP = Joint Spatial Plan

NPPF = National Planning Policy Framework

SPD = Supplementary Planning Document

**Where it is intended to change the plan, the text is shown in bold**



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>In total there were 25 comments on this chapter which are summarised below.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>See comments made on Introduction</u></a>	Site Allocation Plan (SAP) should take into account the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and how the planned 85,000 dwellings between 2016 and 2036 will be accommodated.	The Site Allocation Plan is to deliver the Core Strategy requirement to 2026 whilst the Joint Spatial Plan looks ahead to 2036. The Joint Spatial Plan is insufficiently advanced for it to be taken into account at this stage. The SHMA has not been tested and there is no district requirement for North Somerset. The proposed new NSC Local Plan is the vehicle for delivering the new housing requirement once it is established through the JSP.
	Support for retention of the Green Belt.	Noted and welcomed
	SAP is premature pending the outcome of the Inspectors report on the remitted Core Strategy policies. These have been the subject of objection by the development industry and will provide the context for the SAP. Therefore Sept 2016 for the approval of a submitted version is far too early.	Work has progressed in parallel with the Core Strategy examination and reflects the steer of the Core Strategy Inspector. The Secretary of state's letter of September 2015 emphasised the importance of progressing the local plan.
	Many of the proposed sites will require special consideration of drainage related matters at an early stage.	Agreed

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were 25 comments on this chapter which are summarised below.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#">See comments made on Introduction</a></p>	<p>Should not “bow” to pressure from Whitehall and developers and stick to the original Core Strategy housing target of 14,000 dwellings.</p>	<p>The revised target of 20,985 dwellings (Policy CS13) in the Core Strategy was approved by the Secretary of State in September 2015. This decision has the effect of making Policy CS13 part of the development plan. The letter from the Secretary of State concluded with the expectation that the Council will now press on with the completion of the local plan in accordance with the plan-led system:</p> <p><i>“The Government now expects North Somerset Council to move forward with the other elements of its Local Plan to deliver the homes its communities need”.</i></p>
	<p>SAP should not advance until the JSP is well advanced or at least acknowledge that policies may have to change following the JSP and settlement boundaries (including the Green Belt) will need to be amended.</p>	<p>The Site Allocation Plan must deliver the Core Strategy requirement up to 2016. The new NSC LP will be the vehicle to deliver the JSP requirements to 2036 once they are agreed.</p>
	<p>Regard should be had to the effect on others from development.</p>	<p>This would be covered by Policy DM8 of the <a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a> which was adopted on July 19<sup>th</sup> 2016.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>In total there were 25 comments on this chapter which are summarised below.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>See comments made on Introduction</u></a>	Support for employment led strategy in Weston and this should be extended to other areas. Should give priority to a brownfield development and a sequential approach to ensure sustainable development prevails.	Support noted. The strategy to balance jobs and homes applies to the entirety of North Somerset however at Weston-super-Mare, there are specific policy mechanisms in place to help ensure new residential development does not take place without necessary investment and delivery of employment development.  At this stage it is not proposed to implement a similar specific strategy elsewhere.
	Poor consultation arrangements and venues e.g. Nailsea Library.	Comment noted. Venue chosen because of its availability in the evening, good access and convenient location
	Granting planning consents prior to consultation on the SAP is undemocratic.	Comment noted. Due to the lack of a 5 year housing supply and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (Para 49) the Council was not in a position to refuse proposals for residential development that were considered to be sustainable.

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>POLICY CONTEXT</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of responses</u></b></p> <p><b>In total there were 9 comments in this chapter which are summarised below.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>See comments made on Policy Context</u></a></p>	<p>National Policy context is very selective and does not reflect the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) e.g. the presumption in favour of sustainable development is ignored.</p>	<p>There is no need to repeat in detail the requirements of the NPPF. The summary mentions the need to create sustainable communities</p>
	<p>Cumulative impact of proposals are ignored e.g. Nailsea. Development proposed is contrary to the NPPF e.g. on greenfields in unsustainable locations therefore promoting car use and impacting on landscape, wildlife and on high grade agricultural land.</p>	<p>The impact on the highway network will be assessed through individual planning applications which will need to assess the “in combination” impact of all the development proposals at Nailsea. Indications are that there are particular junctions where capacity will need to be increased and this will be assessed through Transport Impact Assessments for each site. Greenfield development is inevitable given the level of development proposed for North Somerset through the Core Strategy. Although the sites at Nailsea are some distance from town centre facilities, the town has a wide range of facilities and Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy supports a scale of development above that for Service Villages. The distance from development sites to facilities is a consequence of green belt and flooding constraints to the north east and south of the town.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>POLICY CONTEXT</b>	<b>In total there were 9 comments in this chapter which are summarised below.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>See comments made on Policy Context</u></a>		
	Where appropriate development contributions should include improvements to the rail infrastructure.	Agreed where this is appropriate.
	Some sites in the Nailsea /Backwell area will require a Coal Mining Assessment.	Noted. <b>This will be added to the specific site requirements for the housing sites as set out in Schedule 1</b>
	Significant residential development proposed in locations with little employment e.g. Nailsea	There are policies that protect existing employment uses from alternative uses and initiatives have been put in place to assist commuting to work e.g. enlarged Nailsea Station Car Park, better cycle links and bus services to Bristol
	Development proposed in locations without the appropriate social, community and road infrastructure.	Development proposals will be required to provide or contribute to the necessary social, community and road infrastructure arising from their development although the Council are unable to insist that they make good existing shortfalls.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EVIDENCE BASE</b>	<b>In total there were 11 comments on this chapter which are summarised below.</b>	
<a href="#">See comments on Evidence Base.</a>	Disappointed that Habitat Regulations Assessment not complete.	The aim is to prepare the Habitats Regulations Assessment by the time the plan is due to be submitted to the Secretary of State.
	A sequential risk based approach will need to be demonstrated. Sites in Flood Zone 2 and 3 will need to pass sequential and exception test and why it is necessary to include in the SAP. Also all sites in Flood Zone 2 and 3 will need a Flood Risk Assessment.	<b>It will be made clear that all sites in Flood Zone 2 and 3 will require a flood risk assessment, sequential and exception test.</b> The sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding are developed in preference to areas at higher risk, where possible. However, wider sustainability benefits to the community can outweigh flood risk. The council is satisfied that there are no alternative sites in areas at lower risk that could meet the local needs identified, including the regeneration of Weston-super-Mare. This is evident in the assessment undertaken of over 200 sites put forward for development. <b>The text in the plan will be amended to make this clear.</b>
<a href="#">See comments on Evidence Base.</a>	No appropriate justification for site selection e.g. no baseline transport assessment showing effect on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and motorway junctions.	Assessments need to be proportionate. Given that many of the site allocations already have planning consent or a Council resolution to approve, then it was considered that the scale of new development proposed did not warrant such an assessment. This approach may have to be

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EVIDENCE BASE</b>	<b>In total there were 11 comments on this chapter which are summarised below.</b>	
		revisited when the new Local Plan looking ahead to 2036 is prepared.
	Ignorance of the wider role that housing can play to deliver other objectives.	There is no ignorance on the part of the Council. It is acknowledged that housing can bring benefits. The test is whether these benefits outweigh the harm that can be caused by additional development
	Need to clarify the heritage evidence that has been applied to inform decisions.	Assessments need to be proportionate. Given that many of the site allocations already have planning consent or a Council resolution to approve then detailed assessments are not necessary. The various heritage constraints affecting proposed site allocations or sites put forward by developers/landowners are highlighted in the plan and Sustainability Appraisal respectively.
	Lack of a robust and up to date evidence base for Sport and Recreation in North Somerset.	<p>The Council's Leisure Services are aware of Sport England's feedback regarding our strategy work.</p> <p>Sport England have been informed that the Council are starting the process to update our evidence base and are hoping to have a consultant start in September 2016 The Council are liaising with Sport England on the update.</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>EVIDENCE BASE</b>	<b>In total there were 11 comments on this chapter which are summarised below.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>See comments on Evidence Base.</u></a>		The Council will still use existing strategies to draw down s106 contributions and there is an evidence base that supports the Development Contributions SPD.
	Significant development at Weston will need to demonstrate that no detrimental impact on the Strategic Road Network or Junction 21.	The draft SAP proposed 12,874 dwellings for Weston in total. As at April 2015, 3120 of these had been built. The majority of the remaining 9724 have planning consent and the impact on Junction 21 has been assessed through planning applications, the Core Strategy and the Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document . Looking beyond this to 2036 the limited capacity of Junction 21 is recognised and may well act as a constraint to development at Weston



### 3. Detailed Policies

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>DETAILED POLICIES</b>	<b>In total there were 11 comments which are summarised below</b>	
<b>Settlement Boundaries</b> <a href="#">Comments on SA1: Settlement Boundaries</a>	Support for Settlement Boundaries, but not the extension of residential curtilages beyond any settlement boundary.	Noted and welcomed
	Under the NPPF it is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead irrespective of the Settlement Boundary.	The general principles relating to settlement strategy and sustainability remain consistent with national policy. The proposed changes to the Core Strategy remitted policies to include additional flexibility provide the context for development taking place adjacent to settlement boundaries (see proposed modifications to remitted Core Strategy policies <a href="#">Modifications to remitted Core Strategy Policies</a> )
	Settlement Boundaries should be extended to include allocated sites. Full settlement Boundary review should be undertaken.	The preferred approach is to retain settlement boundaries – otherwise the practical operation of the new Core Strategy approach will be difficult to deliver if sites are in effect assessed adjacent to allocations and not the existing settlement edge. A further review of settlement boundaries will be undertaken as part of the new Local Plan which looks ahead to 2036.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>DETAILED POLICIES</b>	<b>In total there were 11 comments which are summarised below</b>	
	Detailed policy wording of SA1 should state that development within Settlement Boundaries “will be acceptable” rather than may be acceptable.	<b>Agreed. Policy wording will be changed</b>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on SA1: Settlement Boundaries</u></a>	Interpretation of Policy SA1 should exclude Neighbourhood Development Plans prepared before the preparation of the SAP.	Disagree. Approved Neighbourhood Development Plans form part of the Development Plan for North Somerset and carry weight in the decision making process. This weight will diminish if they are not in accordance with the current strategic spatial policy for North Somerset i.e. the Core Strategy, but this is currently not the case
	Detailed re wording suggested to Policy SA1 “.... Is maintained by restricting the spread of residential development beyond the defined settlement boundaries “	Disagree. Settlement Boundaries restrict other forms of development not just residential development. The Core Strategy remitted policies relaxes the approach to development adjoining settlement boundaries
	Settlement Boundary reviews requested at : (i) Church Rd Dundry (ii) vicinity of Mytle Farm/Thatchers premises Sandford	(i) A comprehensive settlement boundary review will be undertaken as part of the new Local Plan being prepared This request would incorporate some rural buildings which may be suitable for conversion to residential use under Policy DM45 of the <a href="#"><u>Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</u></a>  (ii) this settlement boundary change was introduced at the 2013 stage and was challenged then. <b>Given that a comprehensive settlement</b>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
DETAILED POLICIES	In total there were 11 comments which are summarised below	
		<b>boundary review will be undertaken as part of the new local plan it is agreed that the settlement boundary in this location will revert back to that as shown in the North Somerset Replacement Local Plan</b>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Housing Context (including Table 1)</u></a>	Need to build flexibility into figures. NPPF states that plans "should boost the supply of housing". There are no trajectory or delivery programmes.	The housing requirement is set by adopted Core Strategy Policy CS13. Table 1 in the SAP is clear that it presents the broad distribution of the residual requirement. Table 1 had a base date of April 2015, the latest available at the time of publication of the Consultation Draft. <b>This will be updated in the next version of the Plan</b>
	North Somerset Council have demonstrated a consistent under delivery of housing. No consideration of how sites can contribute to the 5 year supply.	The Core Strategy Inspector for the remitted policies examination was clear that there has not been persistent under delivery within North Somerset. The SAP identifies sufficient sites to deliver the Core Strategy housing requirement over the plan period, and the council's five year land supply work considers the deliverability of each individual site and is published separately.
	Estimates for the capacity of Locking Parklands and possibly Weston Airfield are flawed and assume an unrealistic high density. This overestimate has an impact on the shortfall that needs to be allocated.	The quantum of development at Weston Villages, and delivery of the housing, is monitored in agreement with the landowners and developers.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
DETAILED POLICIES	In total there were 11 comments which are summarised below	
<a href="#">Comments on Housing Context (including Table 1)</a>	No 10% allowance made for non-completion rates. If this was applied then shortfall would increase by 600 units.	It is the council's position to apply an evidenced 9% lapse rate to small sites, and to assess large sites individually rather than apply a flat rate. Table 1 currently has a base date of April 2015, the latest available at the time of publication of the Consultation Draft. <b>This will be updated in the next version of the Plan.</b>
	Too optimistic assumptions on completions and building rates. Shortfall should be in the region of 6000-8000 dwellings.	No assumptions are factored into the completions figures, these are actual totals. Once commitments are accounted and additional sites identified, the Site Allocations Plan identifies sufficient capacity to deliver the plan period requirement in full.
	Too much reliance on the spatial strategy based on the original 14,000 dwelling core strategy target.	This matter was addressed at the remitted Core Strategy hearings in June 2016. Policy SA1 may require amending as a result of modifications to the Core Strategy remitted policies which relaxes the approach to development adjoining settlement boundaries
	Consider developing a new town.	This will be an issue that the new Local Plan which looks ahead to 2036 will address. Currently a "new town" would be in excess of current Core Strategy housing targets and would not deliver sufficient housing to make a contribution to the 5 year housing supply
	Plan should make provision for the allocation of sites between 5-9 dwellings. Reflects Core Strategy	Only sites above 10 dwellings are allocated and identified. This does not prohibit smaller sites

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
DETAILED POLICIES	In total there were 11 comments which are summarised below	
<a href="#">Comments on Housing Context (including Table 1)</a>	approach that service villages should accommodate small scale development.	coming forward. Policy SA1 may require amending as a result of modifications to the Core Strategy remitted policies which relaxes the approach to development adjoining settlement boundaries. This will assist smaller schemes. <a href="#">Modifications to remitted Core Strategy Policies</a>
	Table 1 should be disaggregated more to assist the reader in understanding what is being proposed. Appears to be a discrepancy between proposed site allocations (and windfalls) of 13,090 dwellings and a residual requirement of 13,559 dwellings.	Table 1 is factually and mathematically correct. Table 1 currently has a base date of April 2015, the latest available at the time of publication of the Consultation Draft. <b>This will be updated in the next version of the Plan and consideration will be given to the format, to ensure that the position is clear.</b>
<a href="#">Comments on Green Belt</a>	The SAP should review the Green Belt as this is the location for sustainable development close to Bristol and jobs e.g. Long Ashton.	There is sufficient land identified and flexible policies to provide sufficient housing to meet current Core Strategy housing requirements without amending the Green Belt. A review of the Green Belt may need to be addressed as part of the emerging Joint Spatial Plan which looks ahead to 2036
	Allow more rural exception sites adjacent to villages in the Green Belt.	Policy CS17 of the North Somerset Core Strategy allows exception sites adjacent to villages in the Green Belt if special circumstances can be demonstrated

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on SA2: Housing Allocations</u></a>	More explanation required as to how and why the SAP needs to tackle the Five Year Housing Supply issue.	The council are required to ensure a supply of deliverable sites is available at all times. This is set out in NPPF and as such the council do not need to replicate this within the SAP.
	Last sentence of Policy SA2 is unnecessary as plan policies need to be taken as a whole generally.	<b>Agree. Wording will be amended</b>
	Key consideration in allocating sites should be the views from within and towards the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Agree. Policy DM11 of the <a href="#"><u>Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</u></a> refers to "views into and out of the AONB". No need to repeat this in the Site Allocations Plan
	Allocation of sites appears to be solely a reaction to submission of formal planning applications. Inconsistency in the way that appraisal methodologies have been applied.	Submission of planning applications is an important indication of delivery and achievability and in accordance with the NPPF (para 47) is a proper consideration to be taken into account when allocating land for development.
	More detail required on specific site requirements e.g. what improved transport infrastructure is required?	Assessments need to be proportionate. Given that many of the site allocations already have planning consent or a Council resolution to approve then detailed assessments are not necessary. The few large allocations that do not have planning consent will need to undertake relevant assessments as part of the planning application process. The specific site requirements listed for each site are not exhaustive but provide a clear guide to

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
		<p>developers/landowners what key issues need to be addressed.</p>
	<p>In addition to the comments below there were detailed comments put forward by North Somerset Internal Drainage Board and North Somerset Flood Risk management team which will need to be taken into account in determining any forthcoming planning applications. In particular a Flood Risk Assessment will be required for developments in Flood Zone 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>WESTON-SUPER-MARE</b> <u>Comments on Weston-super-Mare Housing Sites</u></p>		
<p><u>Winterstoke Village</u></p>	<p>The total allocation at Weston-super-Mare is now 12,874, which equates to a delivery rate of 644 dwellings per annum over the plan period. This compares with a completion rate of only 348 in Weston-super-Mare during the period 2006-2015. Whilst clearly Weston Villages only contributed figures in the latter part of that period and its delivery will rise as other parts of the development area begin and the number of outlets expand, the increase from a delivery rate of 348 to a required rate over the remaining 10 years of the plan to 974 (an increase of 179%) is substantial. Whilst increased availability of sites with planning permission and number of outlets</p>	<p>Whilst it is correct that 12,874 dwellings were proposed in total, the plan makes a clear distinction between Weston urban area, and the Weston Villages development.</p> <p>For Weston urban area 6,374 were proposed - of which 2,758 had already been delivered, leaving a residual of 3,616, or 329 per annum, marginally less than the average build rate during the plan period so far. This is considered achievable given the council's regeneration work within the town centre, which is expected to boost supply. The majority of the 3,616 units remaining are already committed.</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
	<p>will lead to an increase in numbers the market for housing in the area will also have an impact and we note that the Council's 5 year housing land supply trajectory for Haywood Village 1 and 2 is less than 140 dwellings per annum (in line with our own expectations) at a time where there is only limited competition from other outlets in Weston-super-Mare.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes Severn Valley are increasing the number of outlets at Haywood Village in order to contribute to an increase in the delivery rate at Weston Villages. However market conditions can change. Therefore we conclude in relation to this issue that the reliance on a flexibility allowance about 1% is unrealistic on the basis that this then requires one submarket area to deliver 9,117 dwellings out of a total requirement of 13,688 over the remainder of the plan period, or nearly 67% of the requirement.</p>	<p>For Weston Villages, 6,500 dwellings were proposed in total, with 372 units completed between 2011 and 2015. The council work closely with all of the landowners and developers from the Weston Villages, through the Joint Delivery Review Board, and the trajectory and build rates have been agreed between all parties.</p> <p>The council will continue to closely monitor construction activity and completions at the Weston Villages, and across the town as a whole, to ensure that delivery remains on track.</p>
	<p>It is important to state that this development is heavily reliant on the existing Rhyne network under the control of the NSLIDB to convey flows away</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter which can be covered at the planning application stage</p>



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
	from the development sites from and to the Strategic Flood Solutions when required.	
<a href="#"><u>Parklands Village</u></a>	It is important to state that this development is heavily reliant on the existing Rhyne network under the control of the NSLIDB to convey flows away from the development sites from and to the Strategic Flood Solutions when required.	This is a detailed matter which can be covered at the planning application stage
<a href="#"><u>Westacres Caravan Park</u></a>	Suggest that the capacity of the site is increased to 130.	<b>Capacity figure will be amended but this will need to be addressed in detail at the planning application stage and should be treated as guidance only.</b>
<a href="#"><u>Walliscote Place</u></a>	The conversion and subsequent conservation of the former Magistrates Court is to be welcomed. However the Plan also proposes that "Landmark high rise buildings would be appropriate". The Local Authority will should provide evidence to help understand the implications for the setting of adjacent heritage assets, the special character and charm of the town and a coherent townscape. Perhaps the word "would" might be substituted with "may"?	<b>Agree. Site specific information to be amended.</b>
<a href="#"><u>Dolphin Square</u></a>	Recommend that the details of the allocation are amended as follows to ensure that Starter Homes could come forward: Allocated for residential and mixed use, with 50% of the homes provided as Starter Homes, subject to	Starter Homes may be appropriate but the exact proportion will need to await a viability exercise and confirmation of government policy

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
	<p>viability. Starter Homes are to be offered to eligible purchasers under 40 years of age at a discount of 20% to open market value. Includes land/buildings fronting Sea Front. Pedestrian link required between Carlton St Car Park and Oxford St.</p>	
<p><u><a href="#">Land west of Winterstoke Rd</a></u></p>	<p>Sport England would expect that the playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development</p>	<p>Agreed. This is stated in the specific site requirements and is covered by Policy DM68 of the <u><a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a></u></p>
	<p>The site specific details specify that the '<i>loss of sports pitch needs to be addressed.</i>' A key factor is the need to consider the particular circumstances of the site. The '<i>sports field</i>' consisted of a single football pitch in a larger area of partly mowed grassland. It had no changing facilities, equipment storage or car parking and was entirely reliant on the adjoining Woodspring Stadium for all these facilities. It therefore could not on its own be used as a formal playing field for organised league fixtures. Teams associated with Weston-super-Mare FC based at the Woodspring Stadium next to the site have used the grass area and the football club are currently in</p>	<p>This is covered by Policy DM68 of the <u><a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a></u> and will need to be addressed in detail as part of any forthcoming planning application.</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
	<p>the process of submitting a proposal for a new 3G facility at the Woodspring Stadium which would replace any use they currently make of the field which is subject to the proposed applications. Persimmon Homes Severn Valley are assisting the football club in this initiative by cooperating in a boundary reconciliation between the two sites to enable the new 3G facility to be provided at the Woodspring Stadium.</p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>Bridge Farm Bristol Rd</u></a></p>	<p>It is proposed that this allocation continues under the provisions of Policy SA 2 and Schedule 1 thereto. The respondents, who own the land, both welcome and support this proposal.</p> <p>The site has already been the subject of pre-application advice from the Council and a scheme will be prepared and duly submitted having regard to such advice and all other relevant material considerations. It is considered that its development will assist in meeting the housing requirement for the district and that it is in all respects deliverable in the context of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>With reference to the 2013 consultation, the representations made under reference Comment id 4601345/1 &amp; /2 are reiterated under this consultation and the subject land, again, should be allocated for</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
	housing and associated development as part of the Bridge Farm scheme.	
<a href="#"><u>Birnbeck Pier</u></a>	Whilst the policy allocation for a mixed-use development is supported, it is neither appropriate nor possible for the Council to identify a realistic capacity figure at this stage We, therefore, recommend that the Council retains the allocation but removes reference to a residential capacity figure. It would be appropriate, instead for the Council to provide additional wording suggesting that the overall quantum of development will be informed by a detailed analysis of the area.	This is an indicative figure and is liable to change following detailed analysis
	Concerned about the proposed allocation at Birnbeck Pier. This site appears to be located on Birnbeck Island, which lies entirely within the Severn Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Severn Estuary is also designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of ecology and in our view development here has the potential to result in significant adverse effects on the qualifying features.	Agree This will be taken into account in any forthcoming planning application
	The evidence base should demonstrate that great weight has been afforded to the conservation of affected heritage assets including their setting where this contributes to the asset's significance. At	Agree This will be taken into account in any forthcoming planning application

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
	<p>present evidence is unavailable/not apparent and as such the implications of development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent heritage assets is unclear. Also need to indicate how development relates to, and ideally restoration of pier.</p>	
<p><u><a href="#">South of Herluin Way</a></u></p>	<p>Welcomes the inclusion of the Weston Links site in the Site Allocations Plan and would support the extension of the proposed allocation to include Hutton Moor.</p> <p>The HCA propose that both sites should be allocated in combination for residential and mixed use in order to mitigate the higher remediation costs associated with the former landfill site.</p> <p>As part of these proposals, the existing playing fields adjacent to Hutton Moor Leisure Centre would be relocated onto the Weston Links site.</p>	<p>Policy DM 68 of the <u><a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a></u> does allow for the development of playing fields provided <i>“alternative provision of at least equivalent community benefit is made available in the same vicinity”</i></p> <p>Any subsequent proposal can be judged against this policy and until further work/justification is undertaken the allocation will remain the same.</p>
	<p>This is a past landfill site which accepted industrial, commercial and household waste and may therefore be producing landfill gas. Waste Management Paper 27 advises that “domestic housing should not therefore be built on landfills which are gassing”.</p> <p>“Whenever development is proposed on or adjacent to a landfill site, a comprehensive investigation of the site, the development, and the possible effect of the development on the landfill is essential.</p>	<p>This will be assessed as part of any subsequent planning application and the need for remediation work to eliminate risk of contamination is already highlighted in the site specific details in Schedule 1</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>Former Bournville School Site , Selworthy Rd</u></b></p>	<p>Sport England would expect that the playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development.</p>	<p>Agreed. This is covered by Policy DM68 of the <a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a></p>
<p><b><u>Fomer Sweat FA Site , Winterstoke Rd</u></b></p>	<p>The land has an extant consent for retail development (App ref 12/P/2055/F) that has been implemented. At present the approved scheme for a retail building, is not being taken forward to completion. However, occupiers for this approved building are currently being sought and alternative options for the redevelopment of the site are being considered. One of the alternatives for the redevelopment of the land is for residential development. However, it is currently not clear if such a use is viable.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b><u>Station Approach</u></b></p>	<p>Question whether Station Approach is the right location for a new primary school. The site is dissected by a large dual carriageway and the railway line forms a distinct boundary to the south of Locking Road Car Park. Additionally, it is considered that the shape of the site does not lend itself to providing the required facilities to meet modern</p>	<p>A new Primary School site is required in the Town Centre and work is progressing to define the exact needs and location. It is anticipated that the site will be either in or very close to this area.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
	primary school standards. Therefore, we believe that the provision of a primary school on the site should be reviewed.	
<a href="#"><u>Bridgwater Rd</u></a>	Support for site allocation but suggest the following re- wording to site specific considerations: (i) hedge and trees to be retained where possible (ii) highway access to be delivered south of the site leading onto Bleadon Hill	<b>Agreed. Site specifications to be amended</b>
<b>CLEVEDON</b> <a href="#"><u>Comments on Clevedon Housing Sites</u></a>		
<a href="#"><u>North of Churchill Avenue</u></a>	<p>Clevedon Town Council request that the land north of Churchill Avenue be included under Policy SA 7 Schedule 4 Local Green Space not under Policy SA 2 Housing Allocation Site.</p> <p>The reason Clevedon Town Council feel so strongly that this is an issue is that on 2nd June 1930 the Urban District Council of Clevedon (a forerunner of Clevedon Town Council) purchased this land for the sum of £275 to hold this land for the purposes of a recreational ground under the powers of the Public Health Acts 1875 and 1925 Section 69. Therefore this is a commitment on all successive owners of the land.</p>	<p>The council's Property and Asset Management's department have supplied information suggesting that, notwithstanding the 1930 acquisition, this council has no legal/title restrictions preventing development of the site, although other potential constraints such as the need for planning permission etc. would need to be addressed.</p> <p>The site is a proposed housing allocation, and it is proposed that part of the site is to be given over to improved play/public open space facilities. The site is well contained and would provide both housing and improved public open space opportunities in a sustainable location within the urban area of Clevedon, with little</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
	<p>NSC is reminded that this purchase in 1930 was assisted by the public contributions and even penny donations from local children towards the purchase of this land. Hence the local name Penny Fields has been attached to this land ever since.</p> <p>In summary the Town Council has further reasons for claiming this area as a Local Green Space;</p> <p>1) recreational value for the residents of this community both those living adjacent and further away from this field;</p> <p>2) richness of wildlife – the River Land Yeo flows through the site and provides a very special wildlife habitat;</p> <p>3) historic significance in view of the history of how this site was originally purchased.</p> <p>All of these three points are extremely important to the town and the people of Clevedon.</p>	<p>landscape impact. The site is within 400m walking distance by footway of the designated Clevedon Town Centre. The site is needed for housing in terms of 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance states that “plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making” (paragraph 007 of the section on Local Green Space).</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Millcross</u></a></p>	<p>Clevedon Town Council request that the Millcross site is retained for a possible replacement hospital until the site's future is decided by the NHS, and not presently allocated for future housing development</p>	<p>The National Health Service Property Services have advised that they own the Millcross site but the North Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group (NSCCG) directs the use of the site, and this will continue until such time as NSCCG declares the site surplus to their requirements. Currently NSCCG have not declared the site surplus, and the site is not for sale. The site was acquired for a potential new hospital but has remained vacant for approximately seven years</p>



<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<p>and a previous planning consent for a hospital has lapsed. NSCCG are still investigating and considering a new hospital but this is subject to NHS funding.</p> <p>NHS Property Services continues to hold the site for NSCCG's future plans and assists them in their project planning. To protect the value of the site, for the wider benefit of the NHS, NHS Property Services wishes to maintain the promotion of the site through the planning system for alternative uses, and would like to keep the option of residential development open. They continue to work with NSCCG in respect of their aspirations to see a new hospital on the site, but state that there is a possibility that any new health development on the site would not fully use the whole site. If this is the case a residential option for the remaining land should be considered, particularly, if this involves a complimentary health/residential use.</p> <p>NHS Property Services feel that, to protect the long-term use of the land, the promotion of the site for residential use is most in keeping for the neighbourhood and follows government policy on re-development of brownfield sites. However they acknowledge that if and when a decision is made to develop a new health facility/hospital on site, a planning application will be made to change the use of the land.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites (</b> <b>Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<p>The council has considered this information from NHS Property Services and considers that continuation of the residential allocation for the site is appropriate. That residential allocation would not prevent the site being developed for a hospital if and when the NSCCG decides to go ahead with that option. Indeed, the advice from the NHS Property Services seems to be that they favour continuation of the residential allocation but would not be prepared to seek residential development on the site until the NSCCG have decided on the future of the site and declared it to be surplus to their requirements, in whole or part.</p>
<b>NAILSEA <u>Comments on Nailsea Housing Sites</u></b>		
<u>Trendlewood Way</u>	<p>24 objections to this site because of suggested high density, poor road network, town centre parking issues, impact on wildlife and site was bequeathed to benefit the elderly and should be used for this purpose.</p> <p>One letter of support.</p>	<p>There are no identified planning constraints to developing this site and the issues raised by the objectors will be examined and addressed if a planning application is submitted. The net developable area of the site i.e. excluding the woodland which will be retained, is 1.135 hectares. A capacity of 30 dwellings is therefore considered an appropriate density and similar to surrounding development. It is also in accordance with Policy DM35 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
		Policies which aims to secure a suitable housing mix to meet the needs of Nailsea
<a href="#"><u>Nailsea Police Station</u></a>	Support for redevelopment although one respondent concerned about the proposed height of four storeys.	Noted
<a href="#"><u>Land at West End</u></a>	<p>The proposed site at the west end of Nailsea will, by its very geography, create infrastructure dangers for the whole town. There is no main thoroughfare for the increase in the town's additional population to use for their inevitable need to travel into Bristol, which is to the east of the town.</p> <p>Surface water from the proposed site could add to the current flooding problems already present in the West End of Nailsea, especially on the narrow approach to Nailsea Wall Lane; this area has a near perpetual flood over the Tarmac. This presently causes traffic problems. Surface water has to move somewhere and would naturally flow from the land used for building in Engine Lane across into the west end dip adding to existing road flooding.</p>	<p>The impacts of development will be tested by the developers through a Transport Assessment to demonstrate the impacts such as increased queue lengths and journey times at critical junctions/pinchpoints and increased volumes where there are safety concerns. It then comes down to a judgement about what level of increased queue/delay is acceptable and what mitigation works are necessary to overcome any objections. The Council will be seeking a cumulative approach through joint Transport Assessments which will facilitate the delivery of more effective mitigation schemes than a piecemeal approach.</p> <p>Particular areas which the Transport Assessments will need to examine in detail are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backwell Crossroads</li> <li>• Queens Road/Station Road.</li> <li>• Surrounding country lanes</li> <li>• Brockley Coombe Traffic Lights</li> </ul>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites (</b> <b>Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Causeway</li> <li>• Stone edge Batch</li> <li>• B3130/ Pound Lane junction</li> <li>• Clevedon roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>Comments from the North Somerset Levels Internal Drainage Board and North Somerset Flood Risk Management Team ( see below) do not indicate that drainage issues are insurmountable</p> <p>“This site lie on the periphery of the existing developed zone some distance from existing maintained watercourses. It is likely that both new surface water sewers and local ditch improvements will be needed to convey surface water to existing maintained watercourses”. (NSLIDB)</p> <p>“The site could be drained by sustainable drainage, however there are constraints and these need to be considered in the design” (NSFRMT )</p>
<a href="#"><u>West of Engine Lane</u></a>	24 objections based on poor access to the town centre, lack of services, green field site loss of open	The impacts of development will be tested by the developers through a Transport Assessment to

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
	<p>spaces , minimal employment opportunities, poor road network, landscape impact, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of biodiversity and flood risk.</p>	<p>demonstrate the impacts such as increased queue lengths and journey times at critical junctions/pinchpoints and increased volumes where there are safety concerns. It then comes down to a judgement about what level of increased queue/delay is acceptable and what mitigation works are necessary to overcome any objections. The Council will be seeking a cumulative approach through joint Transport Assessments which will facilitate the delivery of more effective mitigation schemes than a piecemeal approach.</p> <p>Particular areas which the Transport Assessments will need to examine in detail are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backwell Crossroads</li> <li>• Queens Road/Station Road.</li> <li>• Surrounding country lanes</li> <li>• Brockley Coombe Traffic Lights</li> <li>• The Causeway</li> <li>• Stone edge Batch</li> <li>• B3130/ Pound Lane junction</li> <li>• Clevedon roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>Greenfield development is inevitable given the level of development proposed for North</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
		<p>Somerset through the Core Strategy The Council have unsuccessfully tried to limit residential growth to protect the countryside but the imposed housing target in the Core Strategy approved by the Secretary of State in September 2015 has made this difficult to achieve. Although this site is some distance from town centre facilities, the town has a wide range of facilities and Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy supports a scale of development above that for Service Villages. The choice of development sites to the west of Nailsea is a consequence of green belt and flooding constraints to the north east and south of the town.</p> <p>There is no substantial tracts of lower grade agricultural land around Nailsea that are not constrained by either green belt , flooding or landscape reasons</p> <p>An ecology assessment will be required as part of any planning application. However there are no designated Nature Conservation sites within the proposed development area</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
		<p>1.5 hectares of employment land is being allocated at North West Nailsea in addition to a policy that protects existing employment sites. Initiatives to help commuters to access jobs in Bristol area also being implemented e.g. extension to railway car park, cycleway improvements links</p>
<p><b><u>South of The Uplands</u></b></p>	<p>28 objections due to the land being designated as Public Open Space, inadequate highway access, poor surrounding road network, impact on wildlife, landscape impact, lack of employment opportunities in Nailsea and outside the mains drainage area.</p>	<p>The impacts of development will be tested by the developers through a Transport Assessment to demonstrate the impacts such as increased queue lengths and journey times at critical junctions/pinchpoints and increased volumes where there are safety concerns. It then comes down to a judgement about what level of increased queue/delay is acceptable and what mitigation works are necessary to overcome any objections. The Council will be seeking a cumulative approach through joint Transport Assessments which will facilitate the delivery of more effective mitigation schemes than a piecemeal approach.</p> <p>Particular areas which the Transport Assessments will need to examine in detail are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backwell Crossroads</li> </ul>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queens Road/Station Road.</li> <li>• Surrounding country lanes</li> <li>• Brockley Coombe Traffic Lights</li> <li>• The Causeway</li> <li>• Stone edge Batch</li> <li>• B3130/ Pound Lane junction</li> <li>• Clevedon roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>It may be necessary to acquire additional land in order to gain satisfactory access to the site and this is being investigated as part of the pre-application process.</p> <p>An ecology assessment will be required as part of any planning application. However there are no designated Nature Conservation sites within the proposed development area.</p> <p>Comments from the North Somerset Levels Internal Drainage Board and North Somerset Flood Risk Management Team (see below) do not indicate that drainage issues are insurmountable.</p> <p>“This site lie on the periphery of the existing developed zone some distance from existing</p>



<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<p>maintained watercourses. It is likely that both new surface water sewers and local ditch improvements will be needed to convey surface water to existing maintained watercourses". (NSLIDB)</p> <p>"Easily drained and sustainable drainage could be implemented easily" (NSFRMT )</p> <p>The site has strong hedge boundaries and is well screened from views from the south. <b>The capacity of the site is being reduced to 50 dwellings in order to reflect the character of the surrounding area and the covenant and Tree Preservation Order which restricts development in the north eastern corner of the site.</b></p> <p>1.5 hectares of employment land is being allocated at North West Nailsea in addition to a policy that protects existing employment sites. Initiatives to help commuters to access jobs in Bristol area also being implemented e.g. extension to railway car park, cycleway improvements links.</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><u>Station Rd</u></p>	<p>8 objections. Oppose removal of protective designation (previously Amenity Area). Site has value as woodland edge habitat and landscape. Request reconsideration as Local Green Space or a substantial reduction in units agreed.</p> <p>Building density proposed is inappropriate for area and will adversely affect nearby properties and character of area. Previous proposals on the site for small scale development have been dismissed at appeal by an independent inspector.</p>	<p>Agreed that 15 dwellings would be an inappropriate density given the constraints of the site. A development of less than 10 dwellings would be more appropriate and this would take it below the threshold of sites to be shown. <b>Site to be deleted and any forthcoming application treated in accordance with current planning policies.</b></p>
<p><u>North West Nailsea</u></p>	<p>11 objections relating to traffic generation along the Causeway and in Nailsea generally, encroachment onto the flood plain, landscape impact, damage to SSSI, impact on wildlife, uncertainty over delivery due to power lines.</p>	<p>The impacts of development will be tested by the developers through a Transport Assessment to demonstrate the impacts such as increased queue lengths and journey times at critical junctions/pinch points and increased volumes where there are safety concerns. It then comes down to a judgement about what level of increased queue/delay is acceptable and what mitigation works are necessary to overcome any objections. The Council will be seeking a cumulative approach through joint Transport Assessments which will facilitate the delivery of more effective mitigation schemes than a piecemeal approach.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<p>Particular areas which the Transport Assessments will need to examine in detail are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backwell Crossroads</li> <li>• Queens Road/Station Road.</li> <li>• Surrounding country lanes</li> <li>• Brockley Coombe Traffic Lights</li> <li>• The Causeway</li> <li>• Stone edge Batch</li> <li>• B3130/ Pound Lane junction</li> <li>• Clevedon roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>The site is not within any landscape designation area and the impact can be mitigated by retention of the hedge boundaries and structural landscaping</p> <p>Only a very small part of the site is within the flood plain.</p> <p>Development of the site can proceed in advance of pylon removal</p> <p>The site does not encroach onto the SSSI but does lie adjacent to it .Policy DM8 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
		Policies will ensure that the impact on the SSSI will be fully addressed and mitigation measures introduced if necessary
	Support for the allocation of the site from developer.	Noted
<b>PORTISHEAD <a href="#">Comments on Portishead Housing Sites</a></b>		
<a href="#">South West of Severn Paper Mill</a>	Support for inclusion of land south of Severn Paper Mill, Portishead as a residential allocation	Noted
<a href="#">Old Mill Rd</a>	<p>The availability of the retail park site, in combination with the Old Mill Road site as allocated, provides an enhanced opportunity for significant town centre regeneration that will deliver Core Strategy objectives, including securing a greater market share through the provision of new and additional town centre uses and new residential development, as well as improving the overall cohesion of the town centre and its relationship to neighbouring sites.</p> <p>The basis for requiring the provision of all the uses set out within Schedule 1 is unclear and does not appear to be supported by clear evidence. Given the proposed town centre location we also consider that the range of uses identified in the allocation should encompass all town centre uses, with specific reference to retail, leisure and residential. However it should be clear that it is not a</p>	<b>Site details to be amended to include the provision of an additional residential units. Site boundaries to be widened to incorporate additional land which may be required for a better comprehensive redevelopment in the longer term.</b>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
	requirement to provide all of the stated uses. This will provide flexibility to bring forward a scheme that can adapt to market demand at the time.	
<b>BACKWELL</b>		
<a href="#"><u>Moor Lane</u></a>	Water voles – protected species may be present on site.	This will be addressed at the application stage by applying Policy DM8 of the <a href="#"><u>Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</u></a>
<b>CONGRESBURY</b>		
<a href="#"><u>Cobthorn Way</u></a>	Amend allocation from 54 to 38. Amend description as the field east of the public footpath will have no pond or swales. Consider designating fields east and south of area allocated for development as a Local Green Space.	<b>Agreed. Allocation to be scaled down to 38 dwellings which reflects current planning consent which has been granted subject to a legal agreement. Description will also be amended</b>
<a href="#"><u>Venus St</u></a>	The site allocated in Venus Street should be removed due to the fact that a call in has been requested.  This site was only added due to the fact that Councillors voted to not defend this site proposal at appeal. Until such time as this is approved nationally it should be removed from the consultation process.  NSC should already have this allocation in place. If they had acted in a timely manner this site would not	This site was not called in by the Secretary of State and has now been granted planning consent ( 16/P/0147/F )

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
	<p>have been included due to the fact that officers considered it to be unsustainable.</p> <p>This site has no public support and furthermore is not supported by the CPC. There is no local need for this site to be developed and is heavily opposed by the community.</p> <p>Support from developer</p>	
<b>YATTON</b>		
<a href="#"><u>Land to the east and west of Wemberham Lane</u></a>	<p>This is one of a number of relatively small sites Persimmon Homes Severn Valley control with other partners. The problem with such sites is that they are too small to be split and shared by both parties and therefore either need one partner to transfer their interest to the other or for both to dispose of their interest to a third party, which will generally be a smaller house builder or contractor. Persimmon Homes Severn Valley have a programme in place for with dealing with such sites.</p> <p>Whilst this site is one of the previous Local Plan allocations, which have so far not come forward in view of the above issues it is our intention that it will</p>	<p>Noted. Site will remain as allocated</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	
	be brought forward as part of that programme and will therefore definitely be developed either by ourselves, our partners or a third party. As a small site it potentially offers something different to other larger allocations in Yatton.	
	Land to the east and west of Wemberham Lane: We would like to see an industrial estate for small enterprises or office units on the east side as businesses would easily access public transport. The west side would be more appropriate for housing development.	The site is in a predominantly residential area. Although this suggestion has merit it is considered that the cost of making the site suitable for development will preclude employment use
<a href="#"><u>Yatton Station</u></a>	Agree with improving the capacity of the existing railway car park but the junction with the High Street is very problematic.	Although the junction with the High Street is not ideal it does not preclude an increase in car parking and housing development
	Part of the land identified for residential development at Yatton Station was previously designated as a buffer zone to the Strawberry Line LNR. Is this still not the case?	The site has no planning constraints and does not adjoin the Strawberry Line Local Nature Reserve
<a href="#"><u>Land at Northend Yatton</u></a>	Hallam Land Management supports the allocation of Land at North End, Yatton within the Site Allocations Plan. Development is not reliant on the delivery of a comprehensive surface water strategy and therefore any reference to this element should at least be qualified such that any contributions should be proportionate, reasonable and directly related to the	<p>The Council have resolved to grant this site planning consent for residential development (14/P/2017/O )</p> <p>It was acknowledged whilst determining this application that the proposed development of the site is likely to give rise to additional surface</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
	<p>development, or might indeed on reflection, not be included in the Plan</p>	<p>water run-off into an area prone to problems of high water table and possible flooding. The North Somerset Levels Internal Drainage Board will require further details to be submitted as part of a reserved matters planning application submission to ensure that their concerns are fully addressed before the commencement of development. These are considered technical issues which are capable of being dealt with through the submission of the appropriate design detailing and subsequent implementation.</p> <p>The conditions recommended by the North Somerset Levels Internal Drainage Board together with those of the conditions recommended by the Environment Agency and the Council's Flood Risk Management Team will satisfy the relevant national, local and emerging local plan drainage Policies.</p> <p>Further assessment is proposed to explore whether advantage could be taken through the synergy between the development sites in the vicinity to ensure coordinated flood risk measures.</p>



<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
	<p>Partly within Tidal Flood Zone 3. Area should be surveyed at an appropriate time, prior to work beginning, for water voles, by a qualified ecologist. If evidence is found, advice on how to proceed must be sought from the ecologist. Deciduous woodland – dormice: breeding season for dormice is May - late Oct. These sites are adjacent to the Axe and Somerset Streams SSSI. Natural England must be consulted if the streams will be affected.</p>	<p>These matters have been covered in the current planning consent subject to legal agreement (14/P/2017/O)</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Arnolds Way Phase 1</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Arnolds Way Phase 2</u></a></p>	<p>The cumulative environmental and drainage impact of the proposed developments at Northend has not been adequately assessed. The village infrastructure is not sustainable and there are no facilities at all in North end, which will disadvantage residents with mobility and access issues.</p>	<p>The Council has taken great care to ensure that the analysis and the studies submitted by developers have identified and attempted to predict, impacts on the physical environment, as well as social, cultural, and health impacts. The potential implications of these applications both on an individual and cumulative level has been the subject of considerable attention throughout.</p> <p>Consideration has not been limited to North End or single topics but has attempted to draw out the interrelationships across topic areas and the responsibilities of different service providers. Decisions have also taken account of other developments already approved, including not just residential but commercial applications in the area and applications beyond the village.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
		<p>Attention has been given to a series of issues including traffic implications, the village character, sustainability, the landscape, capacity of schools, community development, safety in the High Street, drainage and flood risk, capacity and quality of recreational, leisure and library facilities, ecology, heritage, public transport, and health facilities.</p> <p>This is reflected through the proposed s106 Agreement and the recommended planning conditions that have been applied. A working group of councillors, officers and various representative groups within the village has also been formed in order to assist with the process of place-making and ensuring the s106 agreement is implemented to reflect local needs.</p> <p>It is almost inevitable that there will be impacts that may not be popular with local residents, but that is a direct outcome of the position that the Council has found itself in once the residential numbers were confirmed by the Secretary of State in September 2015 .</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>In total there were a considerable number of comments on Policy SA2 and Housing Sites ( Schedule 1) which are summarised below</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><u>Moor Rd</u></p>	<p>13 objections/observations regarding this site covering the following issues :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Water voles which are a protected species may be present on the site</li> <li>(ii) Funding required to cover strategic improvements to the rhyne network</li> <li>(iii) potential impact on Grange Farm a Grade II listed building</li> <li>(iv) Orchard is ecologically sensitive – rare fungus</li> <li>(v) Orchard and Grange Farm frequented by bats</li> <li>(vi) Loss of rugby pitches (although were never granted planning consent). Pitches to be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development</li> <li>(vii) landscape impact – site is a gateway into the village</li> <li>(viii) increased traffic onto already congested highway network</li> <li>(ix) Site should be designated as Local Green Space</li> </ul>	<p>These detailed issues will be addressed at the planning application stage. It is considered that as long as replacement pitches can be provided then there are no objections in principle to the development of this site.</p> <p>The site will make a valuable contribution to the housing supply in North Somerset and is in a sustainable location being walking distance from the railway station and the High Street</p> <p><b>At the Executive Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016, the Committee in approving the Publication Version of the Sites Allocation Plan resolved that the orchard part of this allocation ( southern half ) be kept free from development apart from the required access road to the remainder of the site . The capacity of the site is therefore reduced to 60</b></p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>Background</b> <a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a>	<p>Regret the continued loss of employment land in Portishead.</p>	<p>Point noted. At the planning application stage under Policy SA6 of the Site Allocations Plan a developer will need to demonstrate that the loss of an existing or proposed business site would not harm the range or quality of land available for business,</p>
	<p>The lack of any new employment designation in or around Nailsea fails to recognise the growth anticipated for the town. The Council has failed to acknowledge how land near to the Backwell and Nailsea station could assist in reducing the need to commute and the self-contained nature of the settlement could be enhanced.</p> <p>There is promoted land next to the railway station which would be an excellent location for new commercial uses that would be sustainable in every aspect and enable the continued sustainable growth of Nailsea.</p>	<p>Points noted. 1.5 ha of employment land has been allocated at North West Nailsea</p> <p>The Council's economic development Section have previously indicated that there has been a lack of interest in the Moor lane site in Backwell (close to the railway station) from the business community. Moreover an application for new employment at Coles Quarry, Backwell (planning ref: 14/P/0304/F) was approved on 15 February 2015.</p> <p>This includes the erection of 15 industrial units for use class B1a, B1b, B1c, or B8. This would provide significant employment provision in Backwell and based on the lack of interest in developing the Moor Lane site is considered to provide a more realistic prospect of enabling employment provision</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>EMPLOYMENT</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a></p>	<p>For plan-making purposes, it is important to ensure the allocations set out in the Site Allocations Plan will deliver the Core Strategy (CS) requirements and assess how this will be achieved. There is no assessment of whether these sites will, if delivered, meet the CS20 requirement. CS20 seeks to provide 114 hectares for B1, B2 and B8 uses, whereas schedule 2 identifies 86.21 hectares. Unlike for residential development completions are not identified, so it is impossible to assess whether the overall quantum of employment land identified in CS20 will be delivered by the additional 86.21 hectares identified in schedule 2.</p>	<p>The 114 hectares were remaining employment allocations as set out in the Replacement Local Plan and not specifically linked to the delivery of 10,100 jobs. The Core Strategy set out a requirement to review the remaining allocations to ascertain whether or not they should be rolled forward. In addition much of the allocation at WSM such as at RAF Locking was no longer fit for purpose taking into account the Weston Villages proposals.</p> <p>It is recognised that many of the 10,100 jobs will not be B Class and won't have a land requirement. Therefore only a proportion of the 10,100 jobs will translate to a land requirement and it is considered that there is sufficient land set aside to facilitate the delivery of jobs as proposed.</p> <p>Recent work on the Joint Spatial Plan carried out a review of forecast employment against land supply and identified that from a numeric point of view, North Somerset has sufficient land allocated.</p>
	<p>The CS20 requirement was based on meeting the self-containment strategy in relation to 14,000 dwellings. Now that has been increased to 20,985, it suggests the employment requirement should be</p>	<p>The Core Strategy jobs figure is a minimum, and there are mechanisms in policy to ensure increased dwelling provision at WSM is brought forward in line with increased jobs.</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a>	reassessed, but there is no evidence that this has been done.	
	Sites should not encroach further into the countryside except in exceptional circumstances. The restrictions on residential development to protect the countryside are equally applicable to future development for employment purposes.	<p>Many of the sites proposed for employment development are located within settlements. There are some such as west of Kenn Road, Clevedon that are located in the countryside and in some cases such allocations can offer a suitable opportunity for employment provision particularly employment that could benefit from a non-urban location e.g. distribution/storage.</p> <p>Certain business sites may also lead to amenity issues and again more peripheral sites can offer suitable opportunities progressed through the plan-led process.</p> <p>Agreed however that through the development management process, the provision of new employment development in the countryside should be carefully controlled. In this regard the Development Management Policies: Part 1 Plan policies DM53 and DM54 set out the framework for assessing such proposals.</p>
<b>Policy SA4: Proposed Employment Sites</b>	Object to this policy approach as it unnecessarily restricts potential development opportunities, including in particular the development of supporting uses commonly found at business parks such as	The policy seeks to allow for such supporting uses whilst maintaining the focus as a traditional B Class land use. There is also a route to justify

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>EMPLOYMENT</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a></p>	<p>Hotels, public houses, small scale convenience and snack/sandwich and hot drink establishments.</p> <p>These all deliver employment which whilst not B1, deliver significant employment and also contribute significantly to the attractiveness, diversity of business parks to potential B class users.</p>	<p>loss of the B Class land similar in principle to Policy E/5 of the Replacement Local Plan.</p> <p>The benefits that can be achieved through the focussed delivery of B Class land in certain locations are important including providing certainty to businesses and investors about where such uses will be supported.</p> <p>There is a risk of actually adversely impacting on the feasibility of these planned uses if non B uses are able to be developed.</p> <p>It is beneficial for the Council to maintain a minimum stock/requirement for B Class. This is often where higher value job potential is located and where there is potentially the most jobs density. These locations can be critical to achieving the required employment growth in an area.</p> <p>In addition B Class land is under pressure/being lost elsewhere across North Somerset diminishing the stock of land and premises available to business.</p>
	<p>The policy should be rephrased to provide appositive obligation, by deleting the word 'only'.</p>	<p>The deletion of the word 'only' is not considered to fundamentally change the spirit of the policy</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a>	This is necessary to provide the applicant with the ability to justify their approach.	nor its potential outcomes. <b>The criteria still apply so this deletion is acceptable.</b>
	The second bullet point requires proposals for non B use classes to be small scale, which is stated to be no more than 15% of the site area overall. There is no evidence to support the 15% figure, which therefore must be considered to be arbitrary. It also requires the application of a rigid figure when a more flexible approach might lead to more successful solutions where shared use of parts of the site are considered (for example parking).	Although it is acknowledged that the 15% is arbitrary , any relaxation in this figure or approach will weaken the Council's ability to retain a stock of employment land for B employment use
	The application of the second part of the policy and the last two bullet points needs to be clarified. It is not clear whether proposals need to satisfy one or both of the criteria. In our view the exceptions should apply on an either/or basis.	Agreed. If the first point is satisfactorily justified and therefore the site is unsuitable for its intended use, then as a consequence, the second point would be as the range or quality would not be impacted because the site is not suitable to start with. <b>The policy will be amended so that the exceptions will apply on an either/or basis.</b>
	There is a need to ensure consistency in the wording of the different criteria in Policies SA4 and SA5.e.g. in the interpretation of small scale in Policy SA4 where a specific numerical definition is provided and SA5 where there is none.  As set out in response to Policy SA4 we consider small scale should be interpreted flexibly to allow for	There is a clear distinction between SA4 and SA5. SA4 allocates new employment sites whilst SA5 protects existing sites Using the same approach with regard to non B uses would be inappropriate as some of the existing sites may already be populated with non B uses



<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a>	specific circumstances on site to be taken into account and therefore the SA5 wording is to be preferred.	
	We are broadly supportive of this Policy provided that the factors set out in the bullet points on pages 22 and 23 are clearly and directly linked to the Policy. Therefore, the Policy wording should be revised accordingly to ensure that there can be no doubt about the need to assess each site's suitability.	<p>In order to justify allocation of a site the points listed on pages 22 and 23 have been considered in order to help ensure that sites being proposed are suitable and have a reasonable prospect of being delivered over the plan period.</p> <p>However once allocated the principle of employment development is accepted and the assessment of a planning application will then generally focus on matters of detail rather than principle. It is therefore not considered necessary to include the points into the policy text.</p>
<b>Schedule 2: Proposed Employment Sites</b>	<b>There were 30 comments relating to this schedule.</b>	
<b>General</b>	Three sites are included on both schedule 2 and schedule 3. These are Europark, Weston-super-Mare, Marine View/Portishead Quays and Estune Business Park, Long Ashton. The schedules need to be reconciled to avoid double counting.	Double counting is not considered to be an issue in this context. Some sites have been identified for redevelopment for business purposes but are in existing business use e.g. due to the current condition of the business units. Other sites have elements of existing use but smaller parts remaining as allocation.
<b>Weston-super-Mare</b> <a href="#"><u>Comments on Weston-super-Mare Employment Sites</u></a>		

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<b>West Wick Business Park</b> <a href="#">Comments on Employment</a>	Land adjacent to west of M5 employment allocations document identifies site as 'priority employment location' with enquiry in first quarter of 2016 yet allocation as proposed sees loss of some 2 ha from position in RLP 2007. Lost area has a diminished chance of achieving residential and should remain fully committed to commercial delivery.	Comments noted. The smaller allocation reflects the loss of part of the site to residential use, and the constraint provided by the large pond to the north of the site south of the retail warehouse.
<b>Weston Airfield</b>	Haywood Village Business Quarter Sites to be removed from proposed employment sites, but not added to safeguarded i.e. the Hive.	Don't agree. This site is central to meeting the employment aspirations at the airfield and for the Developer to meet their employment obligations in relation to the housing at Haywood Village.
<b>Weston gateway South of A370</b>	Object to this site being included as a B class site in the Plan. Since the original planning permission in 2012 this site has been subject to the same marketing process as the northern site Accordingly, an obvious option is to consider the site's development for residential use. The site adjoins Bloor Home's recent development and is located in a general residential area. It is sustainably located within the existing urban area of Weston-super-Mare. The site will provide circa 50 homes including affordable housing and meets with the NPPF requirements in respect to sustainable development (paragraph 7), presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) and significantly boosting the supply of housing (paragraph 47).	Site has an outline consent for B Use Class related to the adjacent residential development. Site provides an opportunity for smaller businesses.
<b>Clevedon</b> <a href="#">Comments on Clevedon Employment Sites</a>		

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<b>Clevedon 5/20</b> <a href="#">Comments on Employment</a>	<p>The council has not provided any justification for the removal of Portbury House from this allocation although the Employment Allocation Review (March 2016) suggests that this may be due to the listed building and curtilage.</p> <p>Representations have been made elsewhere in the plan (under Mixed Use Allocations) that the site should, properly, be included in a new mixed residential/commercial allocation which would enable the area to be planned in an appropriate manner taking account of the listed building. That said, the curtilage of the listed building does not extend to the modern agricultural buildings situated on the eastern portion of the land and, thus, there is no justifiable reason for removing the allocation on that part.</p>	The Listed Building status of the site is considered sufficient to remove the allocation from this part of the site.
<b>West of Kenn Rd</b>	Propose a mixed use approach to unlocking the Kenn Road site which will deliver the required major residential site that Clevedon desperately requires in order to meet the identified housing numbers and in turn delivering an appropriate level of employment floor space that otherwise would not be viable.	Given its location to the south of the Blind Yeo, the site is not considered to offer a suitable residential location. Officers would be keen to explore the viability of employment only on this site and to understand any barriers to bringing the site forward.
<b>Portishead</b> <a href="#">Comments on Portishead Employment Sites</a>		
<b>Gordano Gate</b>	Land at Gordano Gate is retained as an allocation under draft Policy SA4 within Schedule 2. However, as noted, the employment allocation is now only	It is considered important to retain a balance of uses in Portishead including land set aside for B Use Classes. There has been a cumulative

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a>	<p>relevant to the remaining 1.6ha of undeveloped land, rather than the previous 6.8ha.</p> <p>Of the 5.2ha of the built out allocation, only a small proportion has actually been delivered as employment (B1, B2 and B8). The majority of the site is given for non-B use classes, notably A1 (retail), C1 (hotel) and D1 (nursery). There is therefore a question about whether the site is desirable or suitable as a traditional employment site.</p> <p>The land has been demarcated for traditional employment land for over 10 years, and as highlighted above, has only had limited interest in respect to these uses. The continued allocation of the site for traditional employment is not supported, and we would request that the allocation is reviewed on the basis that there is no reasonable prospect of the site delivering B-use classes in the future.</p> <p>We therefore either suggest the amended wording in respect to draft Policy SA 4 to allow for other employment generating uses on the site, or would request that the site is de-allocated as employment land should the Council wish to continue with their strict approach to suitable employment uses.</p>	<p>erosion of such land and it is considered important to retain these sites.</p> <p>The suitability of any proposed employment use in future on the site would be addressed at the planning application stage taking into account neighbouring land uses and the demand for employment premises.</p>
<b>Wrigton</b>	It is difficult to see how any extension to the existing built development at the Havyatt Business Park	The proposed allocation is carried forward from the previous allocation in the Replacement Local

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>There were 12 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Employment</u></a>	could be justified, bearing in mind the impact on the flood plain and the increased flood risk created directly or by displacement from additional development on this site.	Plan. In relation to flood risk, mapping shows the edge of the site to be in flood zone 2, a lower risk location where employment development is permissible. There is fluvial flood zone 3b shown just outside the allocation linked to the Congresbury Yeo. At planning application stage it is likely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess any flooding implications associated with development.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>SAFEGUARDED EMPLOYMENT SITES</b>	<b>There were 4 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<b>Policy SA5</b> <a href="#"><u>Comments on Safeguarded Employment Sites</u></a>	<p>Consideration should be given to combining Policy SA5, either with Policy SA4 to deal with the use of non B class uses on safeguarded and proposed employment sites, or with SA6 to deal with replacement of safeguarded employment and retention of economic uses</p>	<p>The policies draw a distinction between employment sites that are proposed and safeguarded for B Class- traditional employment uses (SA4 and SA5), and sites that are in an existing economic use (SA6) which covers a much broader range of employment generating land uses.</p> <p>Options:  SA4 could be merged with SA5 to create a policy similar to E5 of the RLP. This could remove the safeguarded sites and instead assume that all existing B Class sites should be safeguarded.</p> <p>SA4 and SA5 could be merged maintaining separate schedules for proposed allocations and safeguarded sites. One of the main reasons for separating the policies was to avoid confusion.</p> <p>SA5 and SA6 are merged with separate criteria as currently set out in SA5 shown as a separate subset within the policy.</p>
	<p>There is a need to ensure consistency in the wording of the different criteria in Policies SA4 and SA5.e.g. in the interpretation of small scale in Policy SA4 where a specific numerical definition is provided and SA5 where there is none. As set out in response to Policy SA4 we consider small scale</p>	<p>There is a clear distinction between SA4 and SA5. SA4 allocates new employment sites whilst SA5 protects existing sites Using the same approach with regard to non B uses would be inappropriate as some of the existing sites may already be populated with non B uses</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>SAFEGUARDED EMPLOYMENT SITES</b>	<b>There were 4 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Safeguarded Employment Sites</u></a>	should be interpreted flexibly to allow for specific circumstances on site to be taken into account and therefore the SA5 wording is to be preferred.	
	Banwell Parish Council agrees that existing employment sites should be safeguarded and retained in employment use and notes the inclusion of Knightcott Industrial Estate in Schedule 3 but considers that this protection should apply to all such sites not just those that have good access, are purpose built, modern and compatible with surrounding uses.	Disagree . This would give protection to sites that are poorly located and appropriate for an alternative use
<b>Schedule 3: Safeguarded employment Sites</b>	<b>There were 11 comments relating to this schedule.</b> <a href="#"><u>Comments on Schedule 3</u></a>	
<b>Abbots Leigh</b>	This is a highly restrictive policy and as such it should only be applied to the correct sites. Otherwise there is the potential for the vitality and viability of sites to be adversely impacted upon, against a key objective of national planning policy objectives, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012). This is especially true of sites that include important heritage assets. Concerned that the designation of Leigh Court as a safeguarded employment site will limit the scope of this objective in relation to the site. The conservation of significant and landmark heritage assets can require creative development approaches to	Comments noted.  On the grounds that this may restrict uses that would benefit this heritage asset (Leigh Court) then the safeguarded status will be deleted.  Any proposals that involve the loss of employment use will still need to demonstrate appropriate marketing in accordance with Policy SA6

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>SAFEGUARDED EMPLOYMENT SITES</b>	<b>There were 4 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Safeguarded Employment Sites</u></a>	maximise conservation value and ensure long term protection. This allocation will negatively impact upon the ability to focus on the conservation and management of Leigh Court.	
<b>Nailsea</b>	Whilst there is clearly a need for employment sites and jobs within Nailsea, some of these sites such as Coates would be more suitable as housing sites than many of the sites proposed in this plan	<p>Noted. There is a need to ensure there are sufficient employment sites available for local employment opportunities and business activities.</p> <p>There is potentially an opportunity through the new Local Plan to review at a strategic level the distribution of employment land in Nailsea linked to any further strategic growth identified through the Joint Spatial Plan.</p>
	The sites in Nailsea are underused and access to them is very bad particularly on Southfield Road where HGVs come down the Willows and turn into the estate. This whole site could be used for suitable low density housing and the few businesses that trade there relocated either onto the West end estate or onto the site of the former Rowntrees Garden centre.	Comments noted as above.
<b>Portishead</b>	The remaining undeveloped areas of Gordano Gate employment site should not be safeguarded for employment	It is considered important to retain a balance of uses in Portishead including land set aside for B Use Classes. There has been a cumulative erosion of such land and it is considered important to retain these sites.



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>SAFEGUARDED EMPLOYMENT SITES</b>	<b>There were 4 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Safeguarded Employment Sites</u></a>		The suitability of any proposed employment use in future on the site would be addressed at the planning application stage taking into account neighbouring land uses and current demand for employment premises.
<b>Congresbury</b>	<p>The Elliot Medway site in Congresbury should not be allocated as an employment site as this is not a viable use for the land and will not be developed in the near future. The land has been marketed for this use for over 2 years, which has resulted in no interest occupies of the proposed offices or land purchasers.</p> <p>The site is also bounded by residential uses and would not be suitable for employment due to its location. Alternative uses should be considered.</p>	<p>An employment use was safeguarded for the site through the recent consent and development of housing on the site.</p> <p>There is a route through Policy SA4 of the plan to develop the site for alternative uses if it can be demonstrated that the planned B Class use is not suitable and that there is no realistic prospect of the site coming forward for its planned use; and if the range and quality of land available to meet future business needs is not adversely impacted.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Response</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>RETENTION OF ECONOMIC USES</b>	<b>There were 6 comments relating to this chapter.</b>	
<b>Policy SA6</b> <a href="#"><u>Comments on Retention of Economic Uses</u></a>	Policy SA6 includes a negative obligation ' <i>will not be permitted</i> ' which should be replaced. The policy should be rephrased to contain positive obligations to provide the applicant with the ability to justify their approach. In addition National Guidance is that planning policies should avoid negatively worded requirements for the following reasons:	Agreed. <b>Propose change as, <i>Land in existing economic use <u>will be permitted to change use where it can be demonstrated that...</u></i></b>
	This policy is not clear as to what it is trying to achieve. It has an employment led policy and the first paragraph of the 'Background' reinforces this but the policy refers to the loss of the site rather than the loss of jobs or job potential. It is unclear how removing certain Permitted Development rights would avoid future loss	The fundamental aim of the policy is to ensure a range of economic land uses are maintained for all of the benefits to business and the economy this creates, and to avoid unsustainable changes of use that in many cases are likely to be driven by commercial reasons including to gain a higher value use for the site.  Removing PD rights in certain circumstances may prevent such changes of use that would be to the detriment of a sustainable balance of land uses in an area.
<b>Aisecome Way Weston-super-Mare</b>	Land at the end of Aisecombe Way is within the settlement boundary, is used for commercial uses, and is well located to existing commercial and retail uses and offers the potential for redevelopment for wider B class uses. It is requested that the potential of the site is noted as part of ongoing considerations in connection with Plan preparation	The site is adjacent to the main railway line and provided sufficient space remains for double tracking of the railway line (10 m from boundary) then the commercial development of this site is appropriate. It is too small to be allocated and any planning application will need to be in accordance with current planning policies

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Response</u></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><b>Background</b>  <a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>Where an area is used for a formal surface water attenuation pond or a dry pond would these count as areas that need protection? Many attenuation ponds are within public open spaces but occasionally these are outside of those areas and therefore could be vulnerable to development.</p>	<p>The council's updated Background Paper on Local Green Space, paragraph 3.1, states that "lakes, ponds and water features may be found within LGS sites". The suitability of a site for LGS designation largely depends on whether the designation criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are met.</p> <p>The above Background Paper paragraph 2.19 states that <i>"as they are green spaces of particular local significance the council would normally expect LGS to be at least 0.2 ha in size, but this does not rule out smaller spaces where they are clearly shown to have particularly strong justification, normally requiring them to be out of the ordinary"</i>.</p>
	<p>The plan should make it clear that the test for the designation of land for Local Green Spaces is that it should be exceptional.</p>	<p>The supporting text to policy SA7 appropriately refers to the NPPF paragraph 77 which states that the LGS designation <i>"will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space"</i>. The supporting text also refers to the designation criteria set out in that paragraph.</p>
<p><b>Policy SA7</b></p>	<p>The HBF would query whether circa 1,500 acres of green spaces in North Somerset are demonstrably special to a local community and of particular local significance to warrant designation.</p>	<p>The NPPF paragraph 77 indicates that the green areas for LGS designation should hold a particular local significance for example because of their beauty, historical significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Response</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>		<p>wildlife. The sites considered have been appropriately assessed against these criteria. In preparing the Plan a large number of sites were considered for possible LGS designation. Many were suggested for consideration by town or parish councils, but some were suggested by individuals. In response to the 2013 version of the Plan, few sites were requested for deletion by Town and Parish Councils. Rather they suggested a large number of further sites for consideration.</p> <p>The sites that were proposed in the 2013 Plan, and the new sites that were requested for consideration were considered in preparing the March 2016 Site Allocations Plan.</p>
	<p>We support the designation of Local Green Spaces and would add 'landscape' to the characteristics. It is not clear what qualifies as 'very special circumstances' and we recommend that 'except in very special circumstances' be removed.</p>	<p>The designation criteria for LGS is set in the NPPF and cannot be changed. However "beauty" is one of the criteria and the council has interpreted this as relating to "<i>the visual attractiveness of the site, and its contribution to townscape, landscape, and/or character of the settlement</i>". (Paragraph 2.4 of the council's updated Background Paper on Local Green Space).</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Response</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>		It would not be appropriate to remove the reference to “very special circumstances” from policy SA7, which is consistent with paragraph 76 of the NPPF, which states that “by designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances”.
	Policy SA7 needs rewording. NPPG 37-005 says Local Green Space is a way to provide special protection against <u>development</u> . Therefore reference in the policy should be to ‘ <i>development</i> ’ not to ‘ <i>planning permission</i> ’. We therefore suggest the following revisions to the policy: <i>‘Development that would harm the openness or special character of a Local Green Space or its significance in value to a local community will be permitted where there are very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Local Green Space.’</i>	The suggested change is not necessary and inappropriate. Policy SA7 already refers to “development”.  The policy appropriately refers to the characteristics underpinning LGS designation such as beauty, historic importance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife, consistent with the criteria set out in the NPPF.
<b>Schedule 4 Proposed Sites for Local Green Space</b>	<b>There were 30 comments for this schedule.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Backwell</u></a>		
Backwell Lake	Designation of Backwell Lake supported	Noted.
Farleigh Fields	Support for the designation of the two fields forming a “T” shape as shown on the plan. Two main	Noted. The fundamental aspect underpinning the proposed designation of this site relates to

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Response</u></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>reasons are given for such designation. BRA considers these are inadequate and should also include "recreational value."</p>	<p>the Beauty criterion in paragraph 77 of the NPPF. While there are public footpaths across the site, paragraph 2.11 of the council's updated Background Paper on LGS states that <i>"the existence of a right of way across farmland would not in itself be likely to merit designation on grounds of recreational value"</i>.</p>
	<p>Firstly, whilst the total area comprises six fields, the land is effectively managed as a single parcel for agricultural purposes by a tenant farmer and forms a single planning unit. Therefore in view of the Neighbourhood Plan Examiners view that the whole area fails to meet NPPF guidance by virtue of being extensive it is then disingenuous to attempt to overcome this by dividing the area into individual field parcels.</p> <p>Secondly, the current position is that there is an unresolved planning application on the site. That application retains a larger area than the currently proposed Local Green Space in open uses. Our view is that open land can be better protected in perpetuity by planning conditions or through a Section 106 Agreement than by designating the land as Local Green Space. If planning permission is granted for development on other parts of the site, the open land will be gifted to the local community,</p>	<p>The council is not being disingenuous. We proposed the same two fields for LGS in the February 2013 Site Allocation Plan, long before the Examination was held for the Backwell Neighbourhood Plan (September 2014).</p> <p>The two fields are appropriate for LGS designation. The justification is set out in the council's updated Background Paper on LGS. The Background Paper, paragraph 2.21, states that LGS areas would normally have clearly defined edges and the proposed boundaries of the LGS appropriately follow the field boundaries.</p> <p>The LGS designation would appropriately be taken into account in determining planning applications. If land is not proposed as LGS it is more vulnerable to being developed, since there would be no guarantee that a section 106</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Response</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>or North Somerset Council, or be managed by a Management Company (whichever route is preferred) for whatever purposes or uses the community/Council's would wish without the need to be designated as Local Green Space. However, if the land is allocated as Local Green Space it will be retained in private ownership and actively managed for agricultural purposes, in which case there would be no additional public access other than the public footpaths, no additional ecological, landscape or recreational improvements and no community involvement in its management.</p> <p>Therefore we consider it is unnecessary to allocate any of the land at Farleigh Fields as Local Green Space and in the event of planning permission being granted it will be more beneficial for community purposes if it were not.</p> <p>For all the above reasons we consider the proposed Local Green Space designation at Farleigh Fields should be deleted.</p>	<p>agreement would be entered into, or that conditions could be imposed which would protect the land.</p> <p>LGS designation does not prevent use of section 106 agreements, nor the establishment of a management agreement for the benefit of the community.</p>
	<p>Additional land to the west of Backwell Village should be designated as Local Green Space</p>	<p>The council notes that fields identified by people working on the Backwell Neighbourhood Plan (fields 12,13,18 and a small part of 14) are being suggested for LGS designation. However, this would not be appropriate. They are agricultural</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Response</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>		land which do not clearly meet the designation criteria. Paragraph 3.4 of the council's updated Background Paper on Local Green Space indicates that designation would not be appropriate.
<a href="#"><u>Banwell</u></a>		
	Support for land designated as Local Green Space in Banwell	Noted.
<a href="#"><u>Clevedon</u></a>		
	Clevedon Town Council propose the following sites for Local Green Space designation.	The council's detailed assessments of these sites is documented in the council's updated Background Paper on Local Green Space. The summarised results of those assessments are given below (as " <b>yes</b> " or "no" for whether the site warrants proposal for LGS designation or not)
	<b>East Ward</b> Brookfield Walk - Open Space adjacent to Millennium Orchard	<b>Yes.</b> Grass area used for informal recreation
	Land east of Moor Lane allotments	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites



<u>Chapter</u> <b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<u>Summary of Response</u> <b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>		
	Play area on Walton Road	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	All Saints Church and School Playing Field – Glebe Field	No. School playing field, not normally appropriate for LGS designation.
	Clevedon Court Hill	No. Extensive area of land not appropriate for LGS designation
	Land at Teignmouth Road/Beaconsfield Road junction, with play area	<b>Yes.</b> Grass area with trees and play area, for informal recreation
	Cherry Avenue play area	<b>Yes.</b> Grass open space for informal recreation.
	Land by Land Yeo River at Somerset Road / Kingston Avenue	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites

<u>Chapter</u> <b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<u>Summary of Response</u> <b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>	Bowling Green – Princes Road	No. Bowling green, standing alone within urban area. Not part of a wider area suitable for LGS designation.
	Walton Road in front of Conygar Close	<b>Yes.</b> Attractive grass area with trees, for informal recreation.
	<b>West Ward</b> Westbourne housing estate open spaces	<b>Yes.</b> Grass areas with trees amidst housing. Visual amenity and informal recreation.
	Clevedon Tennis Club, Princes Road	No. Standalone artificial surface tennis courts in the urban area, not part of a wider area suitable for LGS designation.
	Promenade Bowling Green – Elton Road	Yes, already proposed for LGS designation.
	Land behind houses on Coleridge Vale Rd	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Wordsworth Road/ Coleridge Vale Rd South junction/ site entrance	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Churchill Avenue – land to the north	No. Proposed housing allocation in the March 2016 Consultation Draft Plan. A proposal for LGS designation would be contrary to paragraph 007 of the section on Local Green Space in the national Planning Practice Guidance.
	Clevedon South playing fields, south west of Churchill Avenue.	No. Formal playing fields, not considered appropriate for LGS designation

<u>Chapter</u> <b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<u>Summary of Response</u> <b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>	Green area and gardens – Jesmond Road	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Junction of Victoria Road with Old Church Road (Jesmond Road side)	Yes. Attractive area including ornamental garden, with grass and treed areas as part of walk.
	<b>South Ward</b> Kenn Moor Drive/ Hazell Close Football Field and Play Area	<b>Yes in part only.</b> The play area is already proposed for LGS designation, together with adjoining land alongside the River Blind Yeo. The “football field” comprises formal playing fields, not considered appropriate for LGS designation
	Newlands Green green area	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Tutton Way green area	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Land at Elgar Close (next to no. 6)	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Hillview Avenue grass patch by ring path	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	<b>Walton Ward</b> Clevedon Cricket Field and play area – Esmond Grove	No. Formal playing field, not considered appropriate for LGS designation. Play area is under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the

<u>Chapter</u> <b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<u>Summary of Response</u> <b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>		particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Land at Walton Castle and Clevedon Golf Course – Castle Road	No. Extensive area of land, contrary to NPPF paragraph 77. Also golf courses outside settlement limits are not normally appropriate for LGS designation.
	Old Park Road – Wooded areas adjacent to; 1) Thackeray Road; 2) Esmond Grove	<b>Yes, already proposed for LGS designation.</b>
	Marine Hill/ Marine Parade west of horse trough on Marine Hill	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	<b>Yeo Ward</b> Land off Southern Way between Strode Sports Centre and Ashton Close/Westerleigh Road	No. This is part of an area used for formal playing fields, not considered appropriate for LGS designation.
	Ruddymead green space	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Butterfield Park green space	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Chipping Cross green space	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Response</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>	Cobley Croft/Cannons Gate green space	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
	Netherways green space	No. Under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites
Highdale Hill	<p>Privately owned properties situated between Highdale and Chapel Hill in Clevedon are already subject to sufficient planning regulations and should not be designated as Local Green Space. Land has a clear boundary fence with no public access - it is not crossed by a public footpath and the justifications for Local Green Space designation put forward in the latest proposals are incorrect and would not meet the NPPF requirements.</p> <p>There is <b>no</b> evidence to demonstrate that the land area covered is deemed special to the local community. There is no public access to the site, the site is not historically significant and there is no evidence of ecological potential.</p>	Clevedon Town Council have confirmed that the areas in private ownership proposed for a Local Green Space at "Highdale Hill" Clevedon are not demonstrably special. <b>It is therefore now proposed that those areas be deleted from the proposed LGS area.</b>
<a href="#"><u>Congresbury</u></a>		
	The smaller part of the Millennium Green, Congresbury, south of the river Yeo, which includes the community orchard, needs to be included in the list of Local Green Spaces.	<b>Agreed. Attractive grass area with community orchard. Comprises the southern part of the Millennium Green. Part of the site fringing the river is within the Wildlife Site associated with that.</b>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Response</u></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>King George V playing field Congresbury is subject to a referendum in September for a Community Right to Build Order for a Community Hall. The Local Green Space Schedule may need to be reconsidered in view of these proposals and the referendum scheduled for September 2016</p>	<p><b>Noted. The referendum relating to this has occurred, (September 2016) and the result was that the majority of people voted yes to the question of whether the proposed new village hall/community building should have planning permission.</b></p> <p><b>In view of this it is considered that the area which was proposed for Local Green Space (LGS) in the March 2016 Plan, east of the playing field, should be amended to exclude the area proposed for the new village hall/community building in the Community Right to Build Order.</b></p> <p><b>However that still leaves the majority of the area that was proposed as LGS, including the play area, as continuing to be proposed as LGS, amounting to about 0.45ha.</b></p>
	<p>Fields east and south of Cobthorn Way development site should be Local Green Space.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The fields are agricultural land, not considered appropriate for LGS designation. The council's updated Background Paper on LGS, (paragraph 3.4) indicates that LGS would not normally include agricultural land.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Long Ashton</u></a></p>	<p>The large area proposed for Local Green Space called "Land north east of Long Ashton" includes Tarmac's Durnford Quarry operational extraction area as shown on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>The large area of Local Green Space, which includes the quarry, has been established through the Long Ashton Neighbourhood Plan, which was "made" (finally adopted) in November</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Response</u></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><u><a href="#">Comments on Local Green Space</a></u></p>	<p>This area is subject to limestone extraction and infilling for at least the next 15 years and is not accessible by the general public.</p> <p>The quarry area must be removed from the Proposals map and this may result in the site area of the Local Green Space (298.01 hectares) being recalculated.</p> <p>Following restoration of the site there is the potential to incorporate the land in the Local Green Space designation</p>	<p>2015. Therefore no adjustment of this area of Local Green Space is possible.</p> <p>However the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that the quarry is still expected to continue working for some time. The Long Ashton Neighbourhood Plan (policy LC4) also designates Durnford Quarry as a "site of open space value" to "come into effect" when its "current use has been discontinued and remediation is complete". The supporting text states: "The planning permission for Durnford Quarry also requires remediation. Although this will not be complete for many years it is envisaged that the land will be returned to the Ashton Court Estate and thus fully open for public access".</p>
<p><u><a href="#">Nailsea</a></u></p>	<p>Nailsea Environment &amp; Wildlife Trust purchased 6 acres of land in 2009 at Moorend Spout with financial assistance from the Landfill Community Trust. The site has become an amenity for the community, providing access to the countryside within easy walking distance of Tickenham and Nailsea. Details of our nature reserve can be seen on our website <a href="http://www.newt.btck.co.uk">www.newt.btck.co.uk</a>. This area deserves the designation of Local Green Space.</p>	<p><b>Agreed, the site meets relevant designation criteria. It is partly a designated Wildlife Site and comprises a nature reserve owned by Nailsea Environment and Wildlife Trust, with access to the public. It is managed for the benefit of wildlife and as a public amenity. It is attractive, and includes some carr woodland and a pond. Low lying, adjacent to an area of rhynes.</b></p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Response</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p>Nowhere Lane <a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>There is no evidence to support or demonstrate that the area of land in question is demonstrably special to meet the terms of the NPPF.</p> <p>In summary, the land at Nowhere Lane does not justify designation as Local Green Space. It is too small and insignificant and the public interest has been overplayed to prevent inappropriate development. The wildlife and the trees are effectively protected by existing legislation. There is extensive green space nearby already, Trendlewood Park for example.</p> <p>The allocation does not meet the Local Green Space requirements as set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF and will be resisted for these reasons.</p>	<p>The site is considered to warrant LGS designation, particularly with regard to two criteria: beauty and historic significance. It includes a former coal tip ("tump") of historic interest, well treed. The site is important for the setting of and views towards this feature. In addition the whole site is an attractive green area providing relief from the urban fabric of the town. On the council's Historic Environment Record (HER) the site is shown to include an archaeological site relating to the coal tip: site of East End Pit, Trendlewood Way, post medieval coal mine.</p> <p>Nailsea Town Council have reiterated their support for this LGS proposal.</p>
<p>Netcott's Meadow</p>	<p>I own the above property currently managed by the Avon Wildlife Trust and am very upset:- 1. That you did not inform me of the proposed land designation change when it is clear in land registry records that I own the property. You have been negligent not informing me in a timely manner. 2. I totally object to my property being designated a green space unless the council pays me the full current market value</p>	<p>The council is sorry that you are upset, and your objection is noted. However the land at Netcott's Meadow is considered to warrant LGS designation having regard to the designation criteria.</p> <p>Nailsea Town Council have reiterated their support for this LGS proposal.</p>
<p>Land north of Greenfield Crescent</p>	<p>Marked on the site allocations map as Local Green Space but not referred to in the Consultation Draft. The Town Council objects to this allocation. It questions why this has been allocated in isolation</p>	<p>LGS is not proposed north of Greenfield Crescent, Nailsea. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) proposes land in that area for strategic open space; (a carry- over of a North Somerset</p>



<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Response</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>and considers that the use of this area should be addressed as part of a comprehensive green belt review.</p>	<p>Replacement Local Plan proposal which refers to provision of “outdoor playing space incorporating playing pitches and children’s play area”. )</p>
<p>Land to the rear of 60 Station Road</p>	<p>Request reconsideration as Local Green Space</p>	<p>This land has been reconsidered and is still not considered to be appropriate for LGS designation. The land is the garden to a residential property and the council’s updated Background Paper on LGS, (paragraph 3.2) indicates that such land is normally excluded from LGS.</p>
<p>Land South of The Uplands</p>	<p>This site should be designated as Local Green Space – fits the criteria listed in the Background Paper on LGS.</p>	<p>Land south of The Uplands is proposed for housing development in the SAP. The council’s updated Background Paper on LGS, (paragraph 3.8) indicates that land allocated for development in emerging or adopted local plans will not normally be appropriate for LGS designation.</p> <p>Paragraph 007 of the relevant section of national Planning Practice Guidance on LGS, states that “designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs, and the LGS designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making”.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Response</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>		
<a href="#"><u>Portishead</u></a>		
	Welcomes the decision to put the green coastal strip (which incorporates the Golf Course, Kilkenny Fields, Battery Point and Eastwood) into Local Green Site (LGS) status, protecting it from future inappropriate land use.	Noted.
<b>Tickenham</b>		
	The village recreation area, by Tickenham village hall should be included as Local Green Space.	<b>Yes, this site meets the criterion on recreational value. It is a recreation area including a grass area and area with play equipment to north.</b>
<a href="#"><u>Winscombe</u></a>		
Land to rear of Winscombe Fire Station	<p>We do not feel that designating the Community Centre and the adjacent field as a "Local Green Space" is appropriate, and we do not support the proposal.</p> <p>As Trustees, our role is to ensure the buildings are maintained, and if possible improved, in order to guarantee the Centre is available for future generations. We feel that any designation that inhibits our freedom to sustain, and possibly expand or develop the buildings, would threaten the future of the organisation.</p>	<b>It is noted that the Winscombe and Sandford Parish Council also object to this LGS proposal. In view of this, and the points being made, we agree that this LGS proposal is not appropriate. It will be deleted.</b>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Response</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	
Fountain Lane (Belgian Avenue field) <a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>	The Parish Council object to the inclusion of the Fountain Lane (Belgian Avenue field) as an open green space. The avenue of trees is of historic interest, but these are already protected with a preservation order. Designation of the whole field could stop the school developing in the future in a way that is sympathetic to the surrounding area and this is contrary to PPG that states the LGS designation should not be used in a way that undermines the aim of plan making.	<b>It is noted that the Winscombe and Sandford Parish Council object to this LGS proposal. In view of this, and the points being made, we do not consider that this LGS proposal is appropriate. It will be deleted.</b>
<b>Wrington</b>		
The Mike Bush Paddock, Wrington Hill	Suggest that this site be designated for LGS. It is a grass space surrounded by hedging, trees and fields, providing extensive views over Wrington Vale to the south and south-west. This is well used as a picnic area, for general recreational purposes and as a stop-off for people walking up and down Wrington Hill.	No. This site is under 0.2 ha and not considered to have the particularly strong justification required for such sites (see paragraph 2.19 of the council's updated Background Paper on LGS).
Land to the west of Garstons Orchard, Wrington	Suggest that this site be designated for LGS. It is a grassed area immediately to the west of the open stream where it flows out from the village. Within the Conservation Area but outside the settlement boundary. Fits with the character of the village and has public amenity value. Significant ecological value related to the stream, the trees and hedging both along its banks and elsewhere on the field	No. Agricultural land not considered to warrant LGS designation. (see paragraph 3.4 of the council's updated Background Paper on LGS).

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Response</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 10 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<b><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></b>	boundary. Surveys have demonstrated that the field and trees are used by foraging bats. 1.74Ha.	
Land at the junction of Alburys with West Hay Road, Wroughton	Suggest that this site be designated for LGS. It is a small plot planted with trees and crossed by a public footpath. The land is within the Conservation Area and provides an open but valued green approach to the settlement. 0.25ha.	Yes, attractive area of grass with trees.
<b><u>Yatton</u></b>		
Moor Rd	Site in particular the Orchard should not be allocated for development but should be given a Local Green Space designation.	Land at Moor Road, Yatton is proposed for housing development in the SAP. The council's updated Background Paper on LGS, (paragraph 3.8) indicates that land allocated for development in emerging or adopted local plans will not normally be appropriate for LGS designation. Paragraph 007 of the relevant section of national Planning Practice Guidance on LGS, states that "designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs, and the LGS designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making".
	The following further sites have been suggested for LGS designation:	The council's detailed assessments of these sites is documented in the council's updated Background paper on Local Green Space. The summarised results of those assessments are

<u>Chapter</u>  LOCAL GREEN SPACE	<u>Summary of Response</u>  There were 10 comments on this chapter.	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Local Green Space</u></a>		given below (as “yes” or “no” for whether the site warrants proposal for LGS designation or not)
	Cadbury Hill LNR	No. Extensive area of land not appropriate for LGS designation
	Rock Road playing field/play area.	No. Formal playing fields, not considered appropriate for LGS designation
	Hangstones playing field.	No. Formal playing fields, not considered appropriate for LGS designation
	Field east of Hangstones playing field (for extension to Hangstones for playing pitch).	No. Agricultural land not considered to warrant LGS designation.
	Village green off Church Rd	<b>Yes.</b> Comprises attractive grass areas subdivided by paths, with trees and ornamental planted borders.
	St Mary's church yard, Yatton	<b>Yes.</b> While cemeteries are not normally appropriate for LGS designation, the historic importance of the site, with listed monuments, together with its importance to the setting of the church, is considered to warrant an exception.
	Claverham cricket ground.	No. Formal playing field, not considered appropriate for LGS designation
	Play space at Broadcroft, Claverham	<b>Yes, already proposed for LGS designation</b>
	Site POP21, proposed for strategic open space, Claverham.	No. Agricultural land not considered to warrant LGS designation.
	Area adjacent to Claverham village hall used for May Day celebrations	Yes. Grass area with area of trees to west. Used for May Day celebrations and other events.

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>UNDESIGNATED GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 8 comments made on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><b>Policy SA8</b></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Comments on undesignated Green Space</u></a></p>	<p>The background text to Policy SA8 uses NPPF paragraph 77 as the policy justification for the identification in a policy of areas of undesignated open space. That is fundamentally wrong, because NPPF 77 deals with Local Green Space, i.e. areas of green space that meet the criteria set out in the paragraph which should be specifically designated. It is inappropriate to identify a two tier protection approach to areas of Local Green Space. If there are areas of land that satisfy the criteria in NPPF 77 then they should be specifically identified as Local Green Space. However, given the extensive list of Local Green Spaces identified in schedule 4 we doubt that any additional areas would pass the NPPF tests.</p>	<p>The protection of undesignated areas of green space through policy SA8 is appropriate. It is consistent with paragraph 7 of the NPPF, which refers to contributing to and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.</p> <p><b>The reference to paragraph 77 of the NPPF is erroneous; the reference should be to paragraph 7.</b></p>
	<p>The policy as it is written applies a simple blanket ban on development that is deemed to unacceptably affect the value of undesignated green space which is clearly contrary to the planning balance exercise and paragraphs 77 and 109 of the Framework. This Policy should therefore be deleted.</p>	<p>There is no “simple blanket ban on development”. The policy only restricts development where, at the time of determining a planning application affecting an undesignated green space, it is determined that the green space makes a worthwhile contribution to the townscape, character, setting and visual attractiveness of the settlement, and the development is considered to unacceptably affect the value of that green space.</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>UNDESIGNATED GREEN SPACE</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 8 comments made on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on undesignated Green Space</u></a></p>		<p>The reference to paragraph 77 of the NPPF is erroneous and should actually refer to paragraph 7 of the NPPF, which refers to contributing to and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.</p>
	<p>The plan does not actually identify any areas on the proposals map. Therefore, use of the term '<i>planning permission will not be granted for development</i>' in the policy demonstrates this is a policy which will be applied in response to planning applications for development in general terms, without any specific guidance on how it will be interpreted,. The effect is to apply a policy reason for refusal where none existed in advance.</p> <p>This retrospective approach to planning is contrary to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, specifically section 38 and to the NPPF. For example, paragraph 154 of the framework says '<i>only policies that provide a clear indication of a how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan</i>'. The policy clearly does not do that and is therefore contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF 14) and the Core Planning Principles (NPPF 17) in relation to both plan-making (e.g. the need to plan positively, NPPF 157) and decision-taking (e.g. the approach to decision-taking</p>	<p>The policy is not general and gives clear guidance as to the circumstances in which it would be applied; (that is where it is determined that the green space makes a worthwhile contribution to the townscape, character, setting and visual attractiveness of the settlement, and the development is considered to unacceptably affect the value of that green space.)</p> <p>The reference to paragraph 77 of the NPPF is erroneous and should actually refer to paragraph 7 of the NPPF, which refers to contributing to and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.</p> <p>The policy is in line with the NPPF paragraph 7 with regard to the environmental strand of sustainable development.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>UNDESIGNATED GREEN SPACE</b>	<b>There were 8 comments made on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on undesignated Green Space</u></a>	in a positive way, NPPF 186). For all the above reasons the policy should be deleted	
	Suggest that it would provide a more positive community and public amenity benefit if amended to read 'Within and immediately adjacent to defined settlements.	<p>The policy is appropriate to apply within settlements because the main pressure for development, at least regarding windfall planning applications, is on land within settlements.</p> <p>The pressure for development outside settlements is appropriately handled through the plan-led system which considers sites for possible land allocations.</p>
	We support this policy but would propose that the wording is amended such that planning permission would also not be granted if the development were to unacceptably affect the amenity value of the green space.	<p>Agree that reference to amenity is appropriate, since it covers aspects such as the usability/value/pleasantness of the space for doing things (such as passive recreation), rather than how it looks.</p> <p><b>The policy should be amended to refer to “a worthwhile contribution to <u>amenity and/or</u> the townscape, character, setting and visual attractiveness of the settlement.”</b></p>
	The wording of this policy clause would be improved by clarifying “value” as “amenity value” and including wildlife habitat as worthwhile.	The value of the site is appropriately intended to refer to its value in terms of elements referred to in the policy, (contribution to townscape, character, setting and visual attractiveness of the



<u>Chapter</u>  UNDESIGNATED GREEN SPACE	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  There were 8 comments made on this chapter.	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#">Comments on undesignated Green Space</a>		settlement.) It is now proposed to add amenity to those elements.

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><b>Policy SA9</b></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a></p>	<p>The document merely lists five strategic gaps by name and identifies specific areas on the proposals map. We do not believe the evidence supporting each strategic gap is convincing. The background document is largely descriptive and does not consist of a comprehensive assessment which would be needed to justify designation of land as Green Belt and which we consider is needed for the identification of strategic gaps, which as the plan accepts have broadly similar functions to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The council has had regard to comments received and reviewed their approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria, and where appropriate, changes to the boundaries of strategic gaps have now been proposed. The Review document is to be placed on the council's web site. The original Background Paper's references to comparison with Green Belt help explain why the strategic gaps have been drawn to not overlap with Green Belt.</p>
	<p>Policy CS19 is yet to be re-examined by the Planning Inspector looking at the remitted policies on the Core Strategy. This approach is premature in relation to this process. Especially if the land is suitable for sustainable development in the longer term. This is particularly relevant where a council is in the process of updating its Core Strategy as is the case here with North Somerset being one of four authorities working together to prepare a strategic plan which will manage growth and development across the area until 2036.</p>	<p>The housing requirement to 2026 can be met without the need to affect strategic gaps.</p> <p>Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy simply states that the council will protect strategic gaps to help retain the separate identity, character and/or landscape setting of settlements and distinct parts of settlements. The policy itself does not identify the location of the strategic gaps nor their extent. This is appropriately left to the Site Allocations Plan.</p> <p>The Inspector held hearings relating to the remitted policies in June 2016, but considered</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b>	<b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>		that no change is required to policy CS19, and that strategic gaps is an issue to be considered through the Site Allocations Plan.
	Core Strategy Policy CS19 establishes the need for strategic gaps and the value they bring but the wording in Policy SA9 appears to contradict by identifying what is permitted.	There is no contradiction. Policy SA9 appropriately supports policy CS19 by referring to the same criteria, such as the separate identity and character of settlements and their landscape setting. It is appropriate for the policy to set out the requirements in relation to the criteria.  <b>Please note that it is proposed to change the policy wording by insertion of the word “only” between “will” and “be permitted”.</b>
	Unlikely that any ‘Strategic Gap’ policy will meet NPPF tests. NPPF sets out that the planning system should contribute to and enhance valued landscapes. Inspectors have dismissed similar Strategic Gap policies as being inconsistent with the Framework in Appeals	The policy is in line with the NPPF paragraph 7 with regard to the environmental strand of sustainable development contributing to and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.
<b>Land between Locking and Weston-super-Mare</b>	With regard to the land owned by Oaktree Parks we consider that this does not meet the criteria set out in paragraph 6.1 of the Evidence Paper, nor those set out in paragraph 85 of the NPPF for the following reasons:  □ the land does not form an important part of the landscape, being flat and relatively featureless, nor	The council have reviewed its approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria.  The land referred to by the objector, directly east of Oaktree Park, is an important part of the

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
STRATEGIC GAPS	There were 16 comments made for this chapter.	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>	<p>are there views across the land from any nearby public viewpoints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ the creation of a strategic gap in this location would, actually, divide the existing community on the basis that residents of Oaktree Park regard themselves as residents of Locking, and look to the village for local services and amenities. In fact, if approved, this would create a strategic gap between two parts of the same village which, we would suggest, is not something which was contemplated in policy CS19.</li> <li>□ the land does not give a sense of place and its exclusion from the strategic gap would not give rise to a perception that settlements would coalesce – in fact there would remain a large area of separation between Weston-super-Mare and Locking even if this area was to be excluded from the strategic gap.</li> <li>□ the land is considered to be in a highly sustainable location which may be required to meet future requirements for development. In that regard it is noted that the council is currently considering a planning application (ref: 15/P/1205/O) for residential development on land lying immediately to the south of the land owned by Oaktree Parks which, if approved, would have the effect of closing</li> </ul>	<p>strategic gap. It separates the Oaktree Park residential site from Locking village, and its loss to development would mean that Locking village would virtually be linked to Haywood Village by development (including the helicopter museum and Weston Business Park) except for two very narrow gaps (of about 100m each). Thus the land owned by Oaktree Parks is an important element in maintaining the separate identity of Locking.</p> <p>Oaktree Park is already physically separated from Locking village by the land, and this does not stop the Oaktree Park residents from looking to the village for local services and amenities. The proposed strategic gap does not alter that.</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a></p>	<p>the gap between the village and Oaktree Park/West End Farm Caravan Park. Also, while not determinative of the position of the boundary of the strategic gap it would, if approved, provide further strong support for the contention that this is a highly sustainable location to which future development should be guided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> there is no need to keep this land permanently open.</p>	
	<p>Concerned that there is no flexibility applied to the Strategic Gap to enable the housing requirement to be achieved. We would question the assumption that the Weston-super-Mare, Hutton, Locking and Parklands Village Strategic Gap does not require review and amendment.</p> <p>Fundamentally we question the rationale and role for the strategic gap on the basis that the 'Weston Villages' area has always been implied as an urban extension to Weston. We would question why such a designation is required over and above other areas of land that fall outside of defined settlement boundaries. We would note for example that the requirement to maintain a strategic gap between the Parklands Village and Locking Village appears to be irrelevant given the existence of the</p>	<p>The council have reviewed its approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. The review points to a need to extend rather than reduce the proposed strategic gap between Weston super Mare and Hutton.</p> <p>The housing requirement for the district can be met without the need to reduce strategic gaps. Having regard to levels of development permitted, the Council are on track to meet the planned number of dwellings for Weston Villages without any need to reduce the strategic gap referred to.</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a></p>	<p>A371 and the fields to the south of the A371 before Locking Village. Such a large blanket designation does not contribute towards seeking to integrate Parklands Village and Winterstoke Village or Weston beyond.</p> <p>Request that further assessment of the Strategic Gap between Parklands Village and Locking is carried out to ensure that the housing requirement for Weston Villages can be met.</p>	<p>The policy is seeking to retain the separate identity and character of the settlements, and to protect their landscape setting, rather than to integrate the settlements.</p> <p>Strategic gaps are needed because while other existing countryside policies exist, they allow a large range of developments in the countryside as exceptions, as set out in the council's Background Paper on Strategic Gaps.</p>
<p><b>Land between Weston-super-Mare and Locking Village</b></p>	<p>It is neither necessary nor appropriate to designate all of the land between the A371/A370 and the existing boundaries of Parklands Village since this would, potentially, prevent sustainable land from coming forward to meet the longer term development needs of the district.</p> <p>We submit that part of this area should be removed from the proposed strategic gaps designation and, if necessary, identified as 'safeguarded land' capable of coming forward for development as and when required.</p> <p>We do not consider that the council has demonstrated that these areas will not be required for development in the future and the effect of designating such areas as part of this plan will be to</p>	<p>The council has reviewed their approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. The review does not point to a need to amend the proposed strategic gap between Weston super Mare and Parklands Village.</p> <p>The housing requirement to 2026 for the district can be met without the need to reduce strategic gaps. Having regard to levels of development permitted, the Council are on track to meet the planned number of dwellings for Weston Villages without any need to reduce the strategic gap.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b>	<b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>	put pressure on other, less sustainable, locations once the longer terms needs (to be set out in the Joint Spatial Plan in due course) of the area are known.	It is likely that strategic gaps would be further reviewed when the next Local Plan, which goes forward to 2036, is prepared.
<b>Land between Oldmixon and Hutton</b>	It is considered that the proposed boundary for the Weston-super-Mare, Hutton, Locking and Parklands Village Strategic Gap should be amended to remove land to the north and south of Oldmixon Road. This land would continue to be outside of the defined settlement boundaries for Weston-super-Mare and Hutton and protected from inappropriate development by the Council's policies which relate to development in the countryside.	<p>The strategic gap is needed to protect the separate identity, character and landscape setting of the settlements. The council have reviewed their approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. <b>The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. In the light of this it is now proposed that the strategic gap between Weston super Mare and Hutton be extended, rather than reduced.</b> The Review document will be placed on the council's web site alongside the original Background Paper on strategic gaps.</p> <p>While other countryside policies exist, they allow a large range of developments in the countryside as exceptions, as set out in the Council's original Background Paper on Strategic Gaps.</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b>	<b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>		
	Support the strategic gap between Weston-super-Mare and Hutton as proposed. Would withdraw support if boundary altered to accommodate development	Noted.
<b>Land between Nailsea and Backwell</b>	Nailsea/ Backwell Strategic Gap is proposed without justification and there is no robust evidence that supports such a designation in a scenario where the LPA has failed to deliver sustainable levels of housing for years	The council has reviewed its approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. The review does not point to a need for a change in the proposed strategic gap between Nailsea and Backwell. The Review document will be placed on the council's web site alongside the original Background Paper on strategic gaps.
	That any change to the settlement boundary at Nailsea can only be considered if the area described below is incorporated into the green belt, or at a minimum this area is incorporated into the Strategic Gap: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to the north, Bucklands End, the southern side of The Perrings, the Bridleway from the junction of The</li> </ul>	<p>The Core Strategy does not require change to the Green Belt. The housing requirement to 2026 can be met without affecting the Green Belt or strategic gaps.</p> <p>The council has reviewed its approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been</p>



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b>	<b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>	<p>Perrings and Youngwood Lane and across Morgan's Hill (footpath N4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the railway line to the south.</li> <li>○ Station Road to the east (the current western boundary of the green belt).</li> <li>○ Netherton Wood Lane/Chelvey Lane to the west.</li> </ul>	reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. The review does not point to a need for a change in the proposed strategic gap between Nailsea and Backwell. The Review document will be placed on the council's web site alongside the original Background Paper on strategic gaps.
<b>Land between Yatton and Congresbury</b>	Yatton and Congresbury Wildlife Action Group (YACWAG) considers the strategic gap between Yatton and Congresbury is important for many reasons and especially significant for protected species such as the Greater Horseshoe bat. It also forms an important buffer zone to the Biddle Street SSSI. The boundaries to the strategic gap between Yatton and Congresbury should not be reduced or adjusted prior to a Habitats Regulations Assessment and completion of emergent planning guidance in relation to the North Somerset and Mendips Bats SAC.	<p>Noted. The council considers that the housing requirement to 2026 can be met without the need to reduce strategic gaps. The aim is to produce a HRA report by the time that the Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>The council has reviewed its approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. The review does not point to a need for a change in the proposed strategic gap between Yatton and Congresbury. The Review document will be placed on the council's web site alongside the original Background Paper on strategic gaps.</p>
	In the light of the expectation that the council will need to provide for a significantly higher housing requirements in settlements such as Yatton in the period to 2036, we do not consider that it has balanced the importance of meeting this	The housing requirement relevant to the Site Allocations Plan, which goes forward to 2026, can be met without the need to reduce strategic gaps. It is likely that strategic gaps would be

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b>	<b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>	<p>requirements for sustainable development against the purposes of strategic gaps. We submit that, if the criteria are correctly applied, it is inappropriate to designate land at Frost Hill as strategic gap.</p>	<p>reviewed when the next Local Plan, which goes forward to 2036, is prepared.</p> <p>Strategic gaps contribute to the environmental strand of sustainable development referred to in paragraph 7 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The council has reviewed its approach to definition of strategic gaps, including the criteria to be used. The strategic gaps proposed in the 2016 Consultation Draft Plan have been reviewed with regard to the revised criteria. The review does not point to a need for a change in the proposed strategic gap between Yatton and Congresbury. The Review document will be placed on the council's web site alongside the original Background Paper on strategic gaps.</p> <p>Land south of Frost Hill (which the objector identifies in red) is a very important part of the proposed strategic gap, comprising attractive sloping countryside adjoining and clearly visible from Smallway (the B3133).</p> <p>Loss of that land to development would mean that the perceived gap between development at Yatton and development on both sides of</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>STRATEGIC GAPS</b>	<b>There were 16 comments made for this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Strategic Gaps</u></a>		Smallway (perceived to be part of Congresbury) would be greatly reduced.
<b>Land between Weston-super-Mare and Uphill</b>	Support for the strategic gap boundary as proposed between Weston-super-Mare and Uphill.	Noted.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<b>Policy SA10</b> <a href="#">Comments on Community Use Allocations</a>	It is unfortunate that policy relating to provision of community use is divided between two separate plans. NPPF 153 advises that ' <i>each Local Planning Authority should produce a Local Plan for its area</i> '. Recognising that has not been possible in North Somerset, it would have be helpful to include the text of policy DM68 at the very least as an appendix to the Sites Allocation Plan or as part of the background text	It is the intention of the Council to produce one Local Plan and work is already underway on this .Until then the practice of referencing policies in other documents rather than quoting them will continue.
	The policy should ensure that should there be proposals for alternative use of sites there should be no net loss of facilities for the local community	Agree This is covered in Policy DM68 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies
<a href="#">Primary Schools</a>		
Kewstoke	Due to provision of primary school places elsewhere it is understood that a new Primary School at Kewstoke is unlikely to be required. Whilst the allocation has been carried over from the Replacement Local Plan there is no evidence that a primary school is required in this location. Whilst the identification of the site for development is welcomed the land should be considered for alternative uses. As the revised housing requirement for NSC is likely to result in the need for existing settlements to accommodate further housing growth the site should be considered for a small scale housing development which could provide local market and affordable housing, deliver appropriate community facilities to serve	<p>The current Kewstoke school site is undersized and inappropriate. If there were to be any new homes in Kewstoke in the future, the pupils would need to attend local provision and it is planned that the current Kewstoke school would need to be relocated and expanded to meet this need.</p> <p>Unless an alternative location for future provision is found, this land should remain as a secured school site to meet future need. If we cannot meet local demand, the Council has to pay its revenue to transport pupils to alternative locations. This has high year-on year revenue cost implications that are statutorily the Councils for which we receive no external funding</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Community Use Allocations</u></a>	Kewstoke and contribute towards primary school provision in existing education facilities nearby	
Bleadon	A new school would be required if development in the vicinity which are subject to planning appeals were to be allowed	The Site Allocation Plan does not allocate any significant development in the Bleadon area. If this changes or developments are granted on appeal then this will need to be reviewed. <b>The only suitable site would be the site allocated for Strategic Open Space (West of Bridge Rd ) and a note to this effect will be added to Schedule 5</b>
Clevedon	Churchill Avenue would be a good location for a new Special School required due to overcrowding in the three other special schools	This site is required for housing to meet the 5 year housing supply. The need for a new Special School needs to be fully justified and funding secured before the allocation is changed
Long Ashton	If significant development proposed then a new Primary School would be required	Long Ashton is constrained by the Green Belt and no significant development proposed. A need for a new school will need to be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan preparation
Nailsea	There are four primary schools in Nailsea: Kingshill (Church of England), Golden Valley, St Francis (Catholic) and the Grove and Hannah More Federation. All were built (respectively circa 1963, 1980, 1980 and 1964) at the time when the population was responding to a massive increase in housing in the town. Kingshill is significantly undersubscribed and the only primary school in the town to be so, but its	If the development proposed for Nailsea goes ahead then a new primary school at North West Nailsea will be required to accommodate demand. <b>The SAP will be amended with this additional Primary School site added to Schedule 5</b>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Community Use Allocations</u></a>	capacity is only half that of either Golden Valley or that of the Federation. St Francis is not quite full, but has significantly more first preference choices for September 2016 than it has room for, but its 'catchment' as a Catholic school extends well beyond the town of Nailsea and the school is only half the size of Golden Valley and of the Federation. Golden Valley and the Federation have a few places available. If the proposed site allocations by Engine Lane and The Uplands are developed, even without taking account of the, as yet, unallocated site by Youngwood Lane, the nearest school, the Federation, would be significantly over subscribed and pupils would be directed to Kingshill. If the Causeway View site is developed as well, then Kingshill would be significantly oversubscribed too.	
	New Primary School (2.2 ha) required as part of North West Nailsea development site	<b>The SAP will be amended with this additional Primary School site added to Schedule 5</b>
Locking Parklands	The proposed allocations for schools to the west of Banwell in the W-s-M area, particularly in the Parklands area, are supported	Noted
Portishead	If development at Marine View goes ahead a new Primary School in Portishead would be required. Suggested location is to the east of the town close to Sheepway	This area is in the Green Belt and a school would be considered "inappropriate development ". Inappropriate development in the Green Belt cannot be proposed in a Local Plan and therefore the best way forward would be through a planning application which seeks to

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Community Use Allocations</u></a>		demonstrate exceptional circumstances and investigates all other possible sites outside of the green belt
Weston-super- Mare	New Primary School site (2.2ha) required in the northern part of the town	As the need is not immediate a new site will be identified as part of the new Local Plan being prepared
<a href="#"><u>Secondary Schools and Higher Education</u></a>		
Nailsea	Concerned that a number of schools in the town are undersubscribed, the secondary school significantly so. The need to increase the roll there is immediate, i.e in September 2016, well before any building will have taken place on the proposed sites and certainly very well before any occupants arrive (probably no earlier than for the September 2018 intake at the very earliest). Furthermore, to restore the fortunes of the undersubscribed secondary school would take a massive housing development, far beyond the aspirations of the Town or unitary authority council or the nationally set targets.	Noted. The potential increase in the school roll for Nailsea Secondary School arising from the development is not in itself a reason for allocating residential sites in the town
<a href="#"><u>Allotments</u></a>		
Banwell	Proposed allotments in Banwell are supported	<b>Subsequent to this comment the Parish Council have confirmed that there are vacant allotment plots further north along Wolvershill Rd which has a lease expiring in 2024 and therefore no additional allotments are required at present. The allocation will therefore be deleted</b>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	
<u>Cemeteries</u>		
Yatton <a href="#"><u>Comments on Community Use Allocations</u></a>	Yatton PC would certainly wish to designate this land as a burial ground as a matter of urgency as we currently only have six plots left and once used, there would be nowhere in the village to bury the deceased.	Noted
<u>Strategic Open Space</u>		
Clevedon Brookfield Walk	This is a wholly speculative allocation that has no evidential justification and no realistic chance of being delivered other than via assertive Compulsory Purchase or in association with other commercially viable and deliverable development. Even in these scenarios the Officer preference, albeit expressed informally, is more likely to be for off-site enhancement of existing playing fields within Clevedon rather than the somewhat isolated and potentially unsustainable redevelopment of this land as formal playing field open space. Request that it is deleted from the Proposal Map and from Schedule 5.	Playing pitch provision is to be re-examined by the Council's Leisure Services in Autumn 2016. If this concludes that playing pitch provision in Nailsea is adequate then the allocation of this site will need to be deleted. Until this exercise is undertaken it is prudent at this stage to retain the allocation.
Nailsea North of Greenfield Crescent	Land to the North of Nailsea is also identified for Strategic Open Space (North of Greenfield Crescent and Woodland Road) but no justification for this provision is provided other than by reference to it being carried over from the Replacement Local Plan (2007). The proposed Strategic Open Space in this location should therefore be deleted. Opportunities for open	Playing pitch provision is to be re-examined by the Council's Leisure Services in Autumn 2016. If this concludes that playing pitch provision in Nailsea is adequate then the allocation of this site will need to be deleted. Until this exercise is undertaken it is prudent at this stage to retain the allocation



<u>Chapter</u>  <b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Community Use Allocations</u></a>	<p>space provision can however be provided to support the identification of the site as a strategic mixed use allocation.</p>	
<p>Yatton The Batch, west of Mendip Road, Yatton.</p>	<p>The subject land comprises a field located on the western fringe of Yatton, close to the former Titan Ladder Factory site. It lies outside but immediately adjoining the current settlement boundary. It is currently a safeguarded site for proposed strategic open space and to the south it adjoins a safeguarded site for a proposed primary school.</p> <p>The land has been included in the Council's HELAA under reference no HE 1488.</p> <p>Under Policy SA 10 and Schedule 5 thereto the land is again proposed to be a safeguarded site for proposed strategic open space. In isolation it is considered that there is no reasoned justification for the continuance of the previous policy requirements. It is questionable as to whether the adjoining safeguarded primary school site is now required given that the recently approved Bloor scheme at Arnolds Way has specifically reserved a site for a primary school. The land itself does not possess any inherent characteristics that mark it out as particularly suited or located for such purposes.</p> <p>Given the apparent lack of funding available to the Council to enable it to acquire the land and its lack of</p>	<p>Playing pitch provision is to be re-examined by the Council's Leisure Services in Autumn 2016. If this concludes that playing pitch provision in Yatton is adequate then the allocation of this site will need to be deleted. Until this exercise is undertaken it is prudent at this stage to retain the allocation</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#">Comments on Community Use Allocations</a>	<p>priority to do so over the many years the designation has been in place, it is considered inappropriate to continue to blight the land so. This proposed safeguarded allocation should now be deleted.</p>	
<p>Failand</p>	<p>Our client supports the inclusion of community facilities within the Site Allocations document and the reference to the importance of sport and recreation within the community. It is considered however that the document does not go far enough in terms of actual allocations for formal sports facilities. In particular Bristol City FC's training requirements at Failand need to be recognised and positively allocated.</p> <p>There is a recognised sports need (which has been acknowledged by the Council) for a permanent training facility at this site for the benefit of both BCFC and the wider community and as such land needs to be identified for this purpose within the plan. It is requested that the site is allocated under Policy SA 10 for formal sports provision and included on the list provided at Schedule 5.</p>	<p>The site is in the Green Belt. The provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation are considered to be appropriate development in the green belt provided that "it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it" ( Para 89 of NPPF) . Policy DM12 of the <a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a> allows such a proposal subject to certain criteria that protect the green belt. Allocating the site would in effect pre determine the impact on the Green Belt without detailed knowledge of what is being proposed. Given this, it is considered prudent to judge this proposal by way of a planning application rather than an allocation</p>
<p>Wrington</p>	<p>Noted that the site south of Rickyard Road, Wrington, is proposed for designation as a 'Strategic Open Space'. The land concerned was designated in the Replacement Local Plan under 'Safeguarded sites for cultural and community facilities'. More precisely, it was described as an 'Outdoor playing space</p>	<p><b>The description of what is proposed south of Rickyard Rd will be amended</b></p> <p>The other facilities listed ( a, b and c ) are existing and are protected by Policy DM68 of the <a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development</a></p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>COMMUNITY USE ALLOCATIONS</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 4 comments on this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Community Use Allocations</u></a></p>	<p>incorporating playing pitches and children's play areas to meet under provision in Wrrington'. The point is that the land was to be safeguarded for future use, possibly as a grass or all-weather pitch or playing field and not as an undefined open space. This needs to be made clear.</p> <p>Otherwise, we recommend that following sites are also designated:</p> <p>a. Allotment site, Half Yard, Wrrington. This is located on the east side of Half Yard, the road linking Wrrington with Langford, and provides allotment facilities to parish and other local residents. 1.01Ha.</p> <p>b. The Recreation Field, Silver Street, Wrrington This large site includes a football pitch, cricket pitch, croquet facility, tennis courts skate park and children's play area. 2.23Ha.</p> <p>c. Land at the rear of Redhill Village Hall, Church Road, Redhill This is a grassed area used for recreation, sports and general community use linked with the Hall and Redhill Club. It has an attached play area for children. 0.53Ha</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Management Policies</u></a> There is no need for them to be allocated.</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>WESTON REGENERATION AREA</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 6 comments made for this chapter.</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><b>Policy SA11</b></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Comments on Weston Regeneration Area</u></a></p>	<p>To achieve your objective for Weston's historic environment, interventions and development will need to be suitably informed. Evidence will need to be gathered that identifies what is significant about the town's heritage. This is not just that which is 'best' but that which typifies the town's special character and charm (see Policy SA 11) and should be maintained and invested in, as well as setting out where and how potential for positive change may lie</p>	<p>This will be covered in the forthcoming Weston Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document</p>
	<p>Housing allocations are in a town that has struggled to deliver new housing growth in the past because of commercial viability and may not deliver units as quickly as the Council have suggested going forward because of issues of market saturation, particularly with easier to develop greenfield sites making a considerable contribution to the housing supply in the town. They require large scale regeneration and the demolition and conversion of buildings within the Town Centre, as well as the potential relocation of some uses and remediation work to address potential contamination. These types of schemes are complex and difficult to deliver for a whole number of reasons including potential viability issues and should be treated cautiously by the Council when considering delivery trajectories associated with the sites.</p>	<p>This is acknowledged and it is not assumed that all of the sites within the Town Centre will be developed in their entirety during the next 5 years. The Council is working with the Homes and Communities Agency to deliver houses as fast as possible</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>WESTON REGENERATION AREA</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 6 comments made for this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Weston Regeneration Area</u></a>	<p>Generally support the provisions of Policy SA11 and the policy aim to regenerate and revitalise the Town Centre, which will complement the investments Persimmon Homes Severn Valley are making on the regeneration and redevelopment of the airfield. We also recognise the role new residential development has to play in the Town Centre regeneration area. However we note that the policy includes a priority for 900 new homes but that schedule 1 identifies a total of 673 as specific allocations. The plan needs to be clear about delivery of the remaining 227 homes. In addition the wording of the first bullet point in the policy needs to be changed to be consistent with the definition of Core Strategy Policies and it should refer to the provision of '<i>at least 900 new homes</i>' rather than '<i>approximately 900 new homes</i>'</p>	<p><b>The wording of the policy will be reduced to will provide the justification and boundary of the Weston Town Centre Regeneration Area</b></p>
	<p>We support the town centre regeneration although we have concerns as to how this will support the current local population and their very specific needs including health and community services.</p>	<p>The growth in residential development will help to support an improvement in such services</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>A370 CORRIDOR INTO WESTON- SUPER-MARE</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 6 comments made for this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>Policy SA12</b>  <a href="#"><u>Comments on A370 Corridor into Weston-super- Mare</u></a>	<p>Suggest that the SA12 policy approach should be extended to cover the length of the A370 from Weston to Congresbury, which should provide a positive enhancement and a timely control on development alongside the A370.</p>	<p>This a Weston based policy aimed at improving the entrance into the town. It is not appropriate to extend it to east of the M5 which is governed by stricter countryside policies</p>
	<p>The wording at present is very generic but could be interpreted to prevent development which otherwise in the absence of the policy would be acceptable in design terms. Indeed, the policy apart from relating specifically to the A370 corridor adds little to the general design policies which are within the Core Strategy or indeed the National Planning Policy Framework. It therefore appears superfluous.</p>	<p>The aim of the policy is not to prevent development but to achieve a high standard of design and landscaping on what is the main approach to the town</p>
	<p>The policy wording is too vague for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Which development proposals does the policy refer to?</li> <li>2. Are development proposals expected to contribute physically or through financial contributions?</li> <li>3. What is meant by '<i>other opportunities</i>'?</li> <li>4. How will '<i>visible from</i>' be interpreted?</li> <li>5. Is a development brief to be prepared to provide specific guidance?</li> </ol>	<p>The policy is intended to cover all developments</p> <p>Developments should contribute through high quality of design and landscaping. It is not envisaged they will contribute financially</p> <p><b>“Other opportunities” will be deleted</b></p> <p>If the development is visible and located adjacent to the A370 it is considered to be covered by this policy</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>A370 CORRIDOR INTO WESTON-SUPER-MARE</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 6 comments made for this chapter.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on A370 Corridor into Weston-super-Mare</u></a></p>	<p>In its current form the policy lacks clarity and guidance. If development is <u>required</u> to contribute (ie the policy wording is '<i>must contribute</i>') the wording needs to be much clearer and more specific guidance provided.</p>	<p>At this moment in time a specific brief is not intended to be prepared, although in the Weston Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document further guidance may be available</p>
	<p>The draft policy requires any proposals to contribute to a "continuous, co-ordinated, high quality visual approach". However, how any particular site or development can contribute to this must be assessed in the context of the site and it should not be used as a tool to impose a particular style, nor to require landscape treatments which will result in proposals being unviable. Sites which have a long frontage to the A370 could be sterilised. Reworded policy suggested.</p>	<p>Any viability issues will need to be addressed at the planning application stage</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>SAFEGUARDED PARK AND RIDE SITE WESTON- SUPER-MARE</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 5 comments made for this chapter.</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<b>Policy SA13</b>  <a href="#"><u>Comments on Safeguarded Park and Ride Site</u></a>	<p>In the absence of a Parking and Movement Strategy for the entire town, whether the proposed site is both in the right place and is of the right size to perform all its potential functions. In rolling forward the allocation it would be appropriate for the Site Allocation Plan to provide the necessary evidence in order to review these issues.</p>	<p><b>The proposed site is in the optimum location to intercept traffic on the A371 and the A370 .Until an alternative site is identified it is considered prudent to continue with this allocation The site is already allocated in the Sites and Policies Part 1: Development Management Policies ( DM20) and this allocation does not need to be repeated . Policy to be deleted.</b></p>
	<p>Given its proximity to Junction 21 of the M5 further consideration of the implications of locating the site here will be necessary, particularly given the need for future improvement of the junction as recognised by Core Strategy Policy CS10</p>	<p><b>The proposed site is in the optimum location to intercept traffic on the A371 and the A370 .Until an alternative site is identified it is considered prudent to continue with this allocation The site is already allocated in the Sites and Policies Part 1: Development Management Policies ( DM20) and this allocation does not need to be repeated . Policy to be deleted.</b></p>
	<p>Have concerns that 800 spaces will lead to significant loss of employment generating land wholly in the control of NSC. The removal, without replacement, of 5ha minimum from employment use in this location is likely to act detrimentally on NSC ambition to attract larger scale inward investment opportunities where its significant sole land ownership leverages further</p>	<p><b>The proposed site is in the optimum location to intercept traffic on the A371 and the A370 .Until an alternative site is identified it is considered prudent to continue with this allocation The site is already allocated in the Sites and Policies Part 1: Development Management Policies ( DM20) and this</b></p>



<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
SAFEGUARDED PARK AND RIDE SITE WESTON- SUPER-MARE	There were 5 comments made for this chapter.	
	public and private investment thus creates significant job creation in a sustainable location.	<b>allocation does not need to be repeated . Policy to be deleted.</b>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on Safeguarded Park and Ride Site</u></a>	It is clear this a sensitive site and that mitigation will be necessary. There will also be a need to address the impact on the bat population and we recommend this should be detailed within the policy to allow for the appropriate protection, mitigation and effective implementation.	Comments noted. Core Strategy Policy CS4 <i>Nature Conservation</i> provides as overarching policy for the protection of biodiversity that would apply to this site. Bat species are known to utilise much of North Somerset and are not therefore specific to this site. Appropriate surveys and assessment would have to accompany a planning application and any mitigation/protection required should be designed accordingly with measures set out in Conditions/S106 to guide their implementation.

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>	<p>SA alternatives of keeping the existing Local Plan allocations or not having any allocations are not considered to be genuine suitable alternatives. All reasonable alternatives have not been assessed. Objective to 'Promote development that contributes to a suitable mix of high quality housing types etc' should not have been removed. Object to some statements in para 3.9 e.g. NPPF just encourages brownfield (no priority to it).</p>	<p>1) As stated in para 4.6 of the SA, the reasonable alternative assessed for residential sites are to allocate the 'call for sites' proposals outside of the green belt and flood zone 3b. This alternative is fully assessed through the comprehensive residential site assessment, which allows identification of preferred sites.</p> <p>2) The reason why the sub-objective relating to promoting development contributing to suitable mix of high quality homes and tenures was removed was that this could not be assessed through the SA process. This is an objective specific to planning applications.</p> <p>3) Misinterpretation of the NPPF – paras 17 &amp; 111 state that development should <i>encourage the effective use of land</i> by reusing land that has been previously developed, not <i>encourage the use of PDL</i>.</p>
	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal in its current format is not fit for purpose and would be unsound for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) the A3 spreadsheet assessments of the sustainability of each site assessed in each village uses different headings;</p>	<p>(i) The headings have been amended.</p> <p>(ii) Green belt is not considered as this would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6.</p> <p>(iii) The hierarchy provides an indication of which settlements contain the most sustainable characteristics. This does not necessarily mean that suitable development sites will be located within these settlements.</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>	<p>(ii) Green Belt is treated as an absolute constraint, whereas there may be sustainable sites within Green Belt on the edges of towns;</p> <p>(iii) no correlation between the sustainability hierarchy and the actual allocations.eg Backwell</p> <p>(iv) having ranked the villages in sustainability terms there is no attempt to use this to make allocations according to the local facilities in each village. Neither is there any assessment of the quality of the facilities.</p>	<p>(iv) Information gained from the sustainability assessment has been used to assess potential residential sites. Objectives assessed include 1.4 access to healthcare facilities, 2.5 access to town centre services and facilities. Additional objectives have been added to provide a better assessment of local facilities. This includes 1.2 which assesses access to playing pitches, 1.3 access to public leisure centre, 5.1 frequency of bus services, 5.2 proximity to bus stops' 5.3 pedestrian and cycle links and 5.4 proximity to railway station.</p>
	<p>Distance and accessibility to the primary settlement of WSM should be given due consideration in assessing a settlement's overall sustainability</p>	<p>The facilities schedule does provide an assessment of the proximity to the nearest key facilities. This acknowledges that where key facilities are not located within an individual settlement, they may be within proximity to allow access via cycling or a short car journey. In the case of Bleadon, this acknowledges that whilst there are no schools, a GP or medium supermarket in the village, these are provided within 5km. However, other healthcare, a large supermarket and leisure centre are more than 5km from the village.</p> <p>A sustainability site assessment is carried out for individual applications, which would also</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b>	<b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b>	
<a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a>		acknowledge proximity to nearest services/ facilities.
	There are flaws in the SA methodology and also in concluding which sites are most suitable for residential development and allocated. We have re-run the appraisal re our client's site at Ladymead Lane Churchill. We advocate a 1.1ha parcel of land there for residential development.	Ladymead Lane (HE1429) is not selected for allocation because the site is greenfield and has a high probability of being the best and most versatile land. Pedestrian and cycle links from the site are also poor.
	Concerns over accuracy of assessment in relation to land adjoining settlement boundaries at service villages.	Sites are not allocated purely due to which type of settlement they are most closely related to. Sustainability credentials of each site are taken into consideration as are other factors outlined in the SA report.
	Proposes additional site at land west of Garstons Orchard, Wrington (40 dwellings). Appendix 1 to the SA identifies this site as unsuitable for housing because of narrow roads and effect on rural setting but this is challenged as site is enclosed on three sides. Concerns over accuracy of assessment in relation to sustainable transport.	This comment relates to site NSC0120. Although surrounded on three sides by development this site does help to retain the rural setting and character of the village. It also lies within the Conservation Area. The assessment has additional criteria to measure sustainable transport options from each site. This includes: 5.2 which is a measure of proximity to bus stops, 5.3 which assesses pedestrian and cycle links, 5.4 proximity to rail stations.

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>	<p>Consultation on the sustainability appraisal scoping report was limited to a small number of statutory consultees. It lists a number of criteria but the list of criteria omits some issues that it is important to consider.</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal main report clearly describes a sensible process for selection of sites to be included in the Sites and Policies document. The process described omits consideration of some important issues.</p> <p>Sustainability Assessment Appendix 1 includes a "Result of the Assessment" column that gives a judgement as to which residential sites should be included in the Plan. Nailsea Action Group was unable to reconcile many of those judgements with the process described in the SA main report and sent a Freedom of Information request for information that would help reconcile the results with the process. Some additional information was received in the response to the FOI request. The additional information filled in some of the gaps but it was insufficient to enable the Result of the Assessment to be reconciled with the process.</p>	<p>The SA Directive requires the Local Planning Authority to consult with the 3 statutory bodies alone on the scope and detail of the environmental information to be included within the SA main report.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of sites has been expanded to clarify and also include additional criteria.</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>	<p>Further enquiries revealed that the additional information provided was not part of the site selection process. We are concerned that the process is not sufficiently clear. Insufficient clarity will make it more difficult for the Council to defend appeals against refusal of planning applications.</p>	
	<p>Yatton Parish Council do not feel that a rigorous SA has been undertaken that takes local circumstances into account and the cumulative impact of such large scale housing developments on the village infrastructure. Highways, sustainable transport ,rail transport and drainage have not been examined thoroughly</p>	<p>The Council has taken great care to ensure that the analysis and the studies submitted by developers have identified and attempted to predict, impacts on the physical environment, as well as social, cultural, and health impacts. The potential implications of these applications both on an individual and cumulative level has been the subject of considerable attention throughout.</p> <p>Consideration has not been limited to North End or single topics but has attempted to draw out the interrelationships across topic areas and the responsibilities of different service providers. Decisions have also taken account of other developments already approved, including not just residential but commercial applications in the area and applications beyond the village.</p>

<p><u>Chapter</u></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><u>Council's Response</u></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>		<p>Attention has been given to a series of issues including traffic implications, the village character, sustainability, the landscape, capacity of schools, community development, safety in the High Street, drainage and flood risk, capacity and quality of recreational, leisure and library facilities, ecology, heritage, public transport, and health facilities.</p> <p>This is reflected thorough the proposed s106 Agreement and the recommended planning conditions that have been applied. A working group of councillors, officers and various representative groups within the village has also been formed in order to assist with the process of place-making and ensuring the s106 agreement is implemented to reflect local needs.</p> <p>It is almost inevitable that there will be impacts that may not be popular with local residents, but that is a direct outcome of the position that the Council has found itself in once the residential numbers were confirmed by the Secretary of State in September 2015 .</p>
	<p>Detailed comments on Water management issues : (i) SA should refer to the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS)</p>	<p>(i)The scoping report now refers to the LFRMS. (ii) The contribution of SuDS will be acknowledged</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>	<p>(ii) well designed sustainable drainage schemes should manage surface water runoff and improve water quality</p> <p>(iii) Flood risk from surface water and ordinary watercourses is dealt with by the LLFA (North Somerset Council Flood Risk Management Team) through the planning process since April 2015 on major sites, as well as the EA on sites in the flood map.</p> <p>(iv) Although green spaces will help to mitigate flooding. There may be areas which require strategic solutions due to the concentrations of new development in a single river or surface water catchment</p> <p>(v) New development in villages vulnerable to flooding from ordinary watercourse / surface water flooding problems (see LFRMS) needs to consider flood prevention measures. Where several new developments in a river catchment / low lying area strategic flood solutions / improved conveyance / flood volume storage maybe required.</p>	<p>(iii)The EA surface flood water risk management map will be used to assess sites for surface flood risk</p> <p>(iv) It is acknowledged that strategic solutions may be required</p> <p>(v) the Plan will be amended to make it clear that a flood risk assessment will required for all developments within flood zones 2 and 3.</p>
	<p>Role of the sustainability assessment in setting the settlement hierarchy</p>	<p>The recently published document 'Reviewing the sustainability and settlement hierarchy of settlements in North Somerset' provides an updated evidence base to the settlement hierarchy detailed within the Core Strategy.</p>



<u>Chapter</u>  <b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>  <b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a>		
	<p>Understand that you consider sustainability of each application on its own merits, but do not consider the sustainability of the overall effect of the sites on the village of Yatton, is this correct?</p>	<p>The Council has taken great care to ensure that the analysis and the studies submitted by developers have identified and attempted to predict, impacts on the physical environment, as well as social, cultural, and health impacts. The potential implications of these applications both on an individual and cumulative level has been the subject of considerable attention throughout. Consideration has not been limited to North End or single topics but has attempted to draw out the interrelationships across topic areas and the responsibilities of different service providers. Decisions have also taken account of other developments already approved, including not just residential but commercial applications in the area and applications beyond the village.</p> <p>Attention has been given to a series of issues including traffic implications, the village character, sustainability, the landscape, capacity of schools, community development, safety in the High Street, drainage and flood risk, capacity and quality of</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p> <p><b>There were 14 comments made on the sustainability appraisal which are summarised below:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal</u></a></p>		<p>recreational, leisure and library facilities, ecology, heritage, public transport, and health facilities.</p> <p>This is reflected thorough the proposed s106 Agreement and the recommended planning conditions that have been applied. A working group of councillors, officers and various representative groups within the village has also been formed in order to assist with the process of place-making and ensuring the s106 agreement is implemented to reflect local needs.</p> <p>It is almost inevitable that there will be impacts that may not be popular with local residents, but that is a direct outcome of the position that the Council has found itself in once the residential numbers were confirmed by the Secretary of State in September 2015 .</p>
	<p>A more detailed assessment will be needed to demonstrate that including land at Birnbeck Pier in the SAP is justified and sound.</p>	<p>The Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) will address this issue</p>
	<p>Inaccuracies in Appendix C Facilities Schedule</p>	<p>These have been amended.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Barrow Gurney  <a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a>	Support for retention of the green Belt around Barrow Gurney	Noted and welcomed
Churchill	3 comments opposed to further development at Churchill due to lack of employment, poor surrounding road network and congestion In addition ALL the identified sustainable infrastructure of, School places, Local Work opportunity, Medical care, Public transport, Roads, and social activities, are all inadequate,	Noted. Further residential development at Churchill beyond that with planning consent or proposed in the Site Allocation Plan will be resisted
Congresbury	There is no consistency with the level of allocations made at a number of service villages. Congresbury, is a highly sustainable location for additional residential development with a wide range of services and facilities. It could easily accommodate additional growth over and above that currently allocated without any detrimental impact to the character, appearance and function of the settlement.	Noted. Two residential allocations at Congresbury outside of the existing settlement boundary have recently been granted consent (Cobthorn Way and Venus Street). It is considered that further large scale development would have a detrimental impact on the rural setting of the village and sites to the south of the village are remote from facilities
Clevedon	1 comment stating that the identification of additional housing land in Clevedon would not only support the growth of the town. It would also relieve smaller centres such as Yatton from current development	Clevedon is largely constrained by the green belt to the north, the M5 to the east and flood zone/nature conservation interests to the south. By a process of elimination further development

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a></p>	<p>pressures in terms of proposed allocations and applications which appear to be disproportionate to their size and role in comparison to Clevedon.</p>	<p>would therefore have to be limited to land south of the Blind Yeo towards Kenn. It is considered this location is somewhat divorced from the main settlement of Clevedon and inappropriate for residential development</p>
<p><a href="#">Nailsea</a></p>	<p>There was general opposition (51 comments ) to any significant development in Nailsea the reasons being :</p> <p>(i) lack of employment opportunities in the town and out commuting will increase</p> <p>(ii) primary schools would be over subscribed</p> <p>(iii) lack of social infrastructure e.g health facilities,</p> <p>(iv) poor road infrastructure that has not been improved since the 1960's</p> <p>(v) poor public transport links e.g. rail station is some distance from main existing and proposed residential areas , station car park is operating to capacity , trains are too small, bus links to areas other than Bristol are poor</p> <p>(vi ) Distance of proposed housing sites are too remote from town centre</p>	<p>(i)The Plan allocates 1.5 hectares of employment at North west Nailsea .There are policies contained in the plan to protect and retain employment land in the town. Initiatives have also been introduced to assisting travel to work to Bristol</p> <p>(ii) A new Primary School; is planned as part of the north west Nailsea development</p> <p>(iii) this will need to be addressed by the appropriate authorities</p> <p>(iv) The impacts of development will be tested by the developers through a Transport Assessment to demonstrate the impacts such as increased queue lengths and journey times at critical junctions/pinchpoints and increased volumes where there are safety concerns. It then comes down to a judgement about what level of increased queue/delay is acceptable and what mitigation works are necessary to overcome any objections. The Council will be seeking a cumulative approach through joint Transport</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a></p>	<p>(vii) development involves loss of good grade agricultural land</p> <p>(viii) development involves loss of open space</p> <p>(ix) development will impact on biodiversity</p> <p>(x) development is beyond natural boundaries and will have an adverse impact on the landscape and rural setting</p> <p>(xi) Development involves loss of greenfield</p> <p>(xii) town centre has inadequate car parking to accommodate an increase in population</p> <p>In addition to the above there were 2 comments suggesting that Nailsea was a very sustainable location for development and could accommodate additional development to that proposed in the SAP</p>	<p>Assessments which will facilitate the delivery of more effective mitigation schemes than a piecemeal approach.</p> <p>Particular areas which the Transport Assessments will need to examine in detail are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backwell Crossroads</li> <li>• Queens Road/Station Road.</li> <li>• Surrounding country lanes</li> <li>• Brockley Coombe Traffic Lights</li> <li>• The Causeway</li> <li>• Stone edge Batch</li> <li>• B3130/ Pound Lane junction</li> <li>• Clevedon roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>(v) this will be assessed as part of the transport assessments;</p> <p>(vi) Although the sites in the vicinity of Engine Lane are some distance from town centre facilities, the town has a wide range of facilities and Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy supports a scale of development above that for Service Villages. The choice of development sites to the west of Nailsea is a consequence of green belt and flooding</p>

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>General comments on individual towns/parishes</u></a></p>		<p>constraints to the north east and south of the town;</p> <p>(vii) The majority of the land surrounding Nailsea has a high probability of being the best and most versatile. Lower grade agricultural land is either in the Green Belt or is very prominent in the landscape;</p> <p>(viii) Only the playing fields at Fryth Way are affected by development and these will be replaced as part of the development proposals;</p> <p>(ix) None of the allocated sites directly affect any designated sites and an ecology assessment will need to accompany any planning applications</p> <p>(x) none of the allocated sites are in any landscape designation and the more sloping and exposed land to the south of the town has been avoided</p> <p>(xi) Greenfield development is inevitable given the level of development proposed for North Somerset through the Core Strategy The Council have unsuccessfully tried to limit residential growth to</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
<b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b>		
<a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a>		<p>protect the countryside but the imposed housing target in the Core Strategy approved by the Secretary of State in September 2015 has made this difficult to achieve.</p> <p>(xii) This is not considered sufficient justification for resisting development;</p> <p>Noted. This will be a matter for the new Local Plan which will look ahead to 2036</p>
<b>Weston-super-Mare</b>	Transport and social infrastructure needs, including health and education requirements need to be prioritised in front of housing development. Weston is already taking the largest share of the new housing development for the district which could be eased by the larger villages accepting more housing development. The greenbelt needs reviewing to allow housing between the current urban boundary and the new road. Wish to see both high quality development and adequate levels of parking	Agreed. Policy DM71 of the <a href="#">Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</a> ensures that planning agreements will be necessary to mitigate against the impacts of development proposals
<a href="#">Wroughton</a>	There were 17 comments supporting the restrictive planning policies in Wroughton and in particular in the vicinity of Cox's Green for the following reasons : (i) Development would be Greenfield (ii) Poor employment opportunities in the area would result in additional out commuting	Noted .Wroughton has been assessed as one of the least sustainable service villages and the development of this site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village and is remote from the limited village facilities

<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a></p>	<p>(iii) Poor access to the village through country lanes            (iv) Surface water flooding issues            (v) Wroughton has lost a number of key facilities and is an unsustainable location for development            (vi) Cox's Green area is some distance from village centre            (vii) poor public transport links to and from village            (viii) local primary school is close to capacity            (ix) loss of good grade agricultural land            (x) impact on biodiversity            (xi) overall impact on rural setting of village</p>	
<p><a href="#">Yatton</a></p>	<p>A number of objections were raised to the development proposed at Yatton and related to :</p> <p>(i) Most of the proposed sites have planning consent so consultation is futile</p> <p>(ii) Yatton lacks the necessary social and community infrastructure e.g doctor's surgery</p> <p>(iii) No guarantee of new Primary school being delivered</p> <p>(iv) The High Street is already congested and dangerous and cannot accommodate additional traffic</p>	<p>(i) It was necessary to grant planning consent for some of the sites in the Northend area due to the Council being unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply.</p> <p>(ii) plans are being drawn up to provide an improved health centre for the village</p> <p>(iii) The local authority aspires to provide local schools for local children and is working to secure a new primary school site at North End in Yatton. The Council will look to secure new school places on this site once resources are identified to deliver the necessary buildings and other infrastructures required.</p>



<p><b><u>Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b></p>	<p><b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Council's Response</u></b></p>
<p><a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a></p>	<p>(v) cumulative impact of developments have not been adequately addressed</p> <p>(vi) the impact on the rural setting of Yatton</p> <p>(vii) loss of conveniently located sports pitches</p> <p>(viii) Yatton may have a railway station but trains are running to capacity and overcrowded</p> <p>(ix) sites allocated for development are prone to flooding</p>	<p>(iv) Attention has been given to a series of issues including traffic implications .This is reflected through the proposed s106 Agreement and the recommended planning conditions that have been applied. A working group of councillors, officers and various representative groups within the village has also been formed in order to assist with the process of place-making and ensuring the s106 agreement is implemented to reflect local needs.</p> <p>It is almost inevitable that there will be impacts that may not be popular with local residents, but that is a direct outcome of the position that the Council has found itself in once the residential numbers were confirmed by the Secretary of State in September 2015 .</p> <p>(v) The Council has taken great care to ensure that the analysis and the studies submitted by developers have identified and attempted to predict, impacts on the physical environment, as well as social, cultural, and health impacts. The potential implications of these applications both on an individual and cumulative level has been the subject of considerable attention throughout.</p>

<u>Chapter</u>  <b>General comments on an individual town or parish</b>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
<a href="#">General comments on individual towns/parishes</a>		<p>(vi) None of the allocated development sites are located in areas designated for their landscape value;</p> <p>(vii) any sports pitches lost through development will need to be replaced;</p> <p>(viii) Noted. Larger trains are planned as part of the electrification upgrade on the network but timing is unknown at present;</p> <p>(ix) this has been assessed through the planning application process and other sites allocated are outside of the flood plain.</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
Backwell  <a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Five sites on the edge of Backwell</a> Plan ref: 8711: Land north of Backwell Hill Road = 0.15ha Plan ref: 8003: Land south of Backwell Hill Road = 0.5ha Plan ref: 6495: Land south of Uncombe Close = 1.4ha Plan ref: 5446: Land off Church Lane south of Farleigh Combe Manor = 2.6ha Plan ref: 5023: Land off Church Lane opposite Court Close = 3.1ha	All of these sites are within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
	<a href="#">Land at Church Lane Backwell</a> Size: 1.64ha	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (part of site NS0011) It was considered that the development of the site would be contrary to the recent Backwell Neighbourhood Development Plan and would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<p>Land at Moor Lane Backwell</p> <p>(i) <a href="#">Rear of Summervale</a> 0.43 hectares</p> <p>(ii) <a href="#">Rear of Natal</a> 0.53 hectares</p> <p>(iii) <a href="#">Land off Moor Lane</a> 4.2 hectares</p> <p>(iv) <a href="#">Land at Even Keele</a> 1.35 hectares</p>	<p>These greenfield sites have been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (part of site HE1441 ) It was considered that the development of the sites would be contrary to the recent Backwell Neighbourhood Development Plan and would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets</p>
	<p><a href="#">Waverly Rd/Backwell Common Backwell</a></p> <p>3.0 Hectares</p>	<p>This site lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Land off Rodney Rd Backwell , south of West Leigh School</a> 2.38 Hectares.	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (part of site HE1467) It was considered that the development of the site would be contrary to the recent Backwell Neighbourhood Development Plan and would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land off Rushmoor Lane Backwell</a> 2 sites 0.56 Hectares and 1.3 Hectares	These greenfield sites have been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (sites HE14195 and HE14194) It was considered that the development of the sites would be contrary to the recent Backwell Neighbourhood Development Plan and would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land to the rear of 22 Hilldale Rd Backwell</a>	This site lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>		meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
Banwell	<a href="#">Rear of Orchard Close Banwell</a> 0.442 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14197) Although difficult to access, the site is below 25 dwellings and can be considered under the revised Core Strategy Policy CS32 which allows development below this threshold if certain criteria are met.
	<a href="#">Land at Church St Banwell</a> 4.81 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site NS0022) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village, add to congestion

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>		and was located in a flood zone. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land west of Wolvershill Rd Banwell</a> Size: 3.17 hectares 143 dwellings	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE 14180) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village and add to congestion. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets.
	<a href="#">Land east of Wolvershill Rd Banwell</a> 3.75 hectares 44 dwellings	<b>This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1454) Following submission of a planning application the landscape impact has been reassessed and is considered to be acceptable. The site is in a sustainable location and will be included as an allocated residential site</b>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Land south of William Daw Close Banwell</a> 2.8 hectares	This greenfield site lies to the east of site HE 1456 which has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments. It was considered that the development of HE 1456 would adversely affect the rural setting of the village, add to congestion and is distant from facilities. The same arguments apply to this site. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">South of Knightcott Rd Banwell</a> 8.94 hectares 143 dwellings	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1456) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village, add to congestion and was distant to facilities. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
Bleadon  <a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Land at The Veale Bleadon</a> 0.7 Hectares 15-20 dwellings	Bleadon is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy
Blagdon	<a href="#">Lower Hill Farm Blagdon</a> Three sites put forward: Yellow: Land off Grib Lane = 0.24ha (proposed 10 dwellings) Green: Land off Bath Road = 2.45ha (proposed 50 dwellings) Blue: Land off Score Lane = 0.83ha (proposed 20 dwellings)	Blagdon is classed as open countryside as it does not have a defined settlement boundary. Development on these sites would be contrary to Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy
Churchill	<a href="#">Land adjoining Churchill Lodge Churchill</a> ( west of Says Lane development site ) – 5 dwellings	This site being less than 10 dwellings is below the threshold of sites that are allocated in the Site Allocation Plan. However given that it adjoins the settlement boundary and is less than 25 dwellings any residential proposals will be judged against

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>		Core Strategy Policy CS 32 covering Service Villages.
	<a href="#">Land off Jubilee Lane North of Pudding Pie Lane</a> 0.7 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (part of site NS0031) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village and was distant to facilities. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets.
	<a href="#">Land at Barrowfield Cottage Front St Churchill</a> 0.7 hectares at junction of Front Street and Church Lane	This site being less than 10 dwellings is below the threshold of sites that are allocated in the Site Allocation Plan. However given that it adjoins the settlement boundary and is less than 25 dwellings any residential proposals will be judged against Core Strategy Policy CS 32 covering Service Villages.

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Land at the junction of Hilliers Lane and Dinghurst Rd</a> , abutting Ilex House, Churchill, BS25 5NA 1.7hectares	This greenfield site is considered unsustainable due to its remoteness from facilities , poor links to Churchill village and views of the site from the AONB
	<a href="#">Land fronting Ladymead Lane Churchill</a> 1.1 hectares 25-30 dwellings	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (eastern part of site HE1429) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village and had poor access via Ladymead Lane. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land north of Front Street, rear of Kewstoke Lodge, Churchill</a> Size: 0.42 hectares	This site being less than 10 dwellings is below the threshold of sites that are allocated in the Site Allocation Plan. However given that it adjoins the settlement boundary and is less than 25 dwellings any residential proposals will be judged against Core Strategy Policy CS 32 covering Service Villages

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Land south of A38 Churchill ( Churchill Gate)</a> Size: 1.76 hectares	This greenfield site lies south of the junction of the A38 with the A368 to Blagdon. Although there are no specific planning constraints relating to the site it is located in a prominent position next to a major crossroads. The landscape impact in conjunction with the extension of ribbon development along the A38 makes the site unsuitable for development. In addition the SAP allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy housing targets
Clapton-in-Gordano	<a href="#">Land between Clapton Lane ,Clevedon Rd and Moor lane Clapton in Gordano</a> 0.99hectares	This site lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
Claverham  <a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>	<a href="#">Land off High St Claverham</a> Size: 1.4hectares	Claverham is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy
	<a href="#">North of Chestnut Drive Claverham</a> 4.12 Hectares 92 dwellings	Claverham is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy
Clevedon	<a href="#">Kenn Rd Employment Site</a> Size:9.44 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (Site HE14174) It was considered that the development of the site would result in the loss of a prime employment site and any residential development would be divorced and remote from Clevedon. Sufficient land has been

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>		identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land between Clevedon and Portishead</a> ( not site specific)	This area lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
	<a href="#">Portbury House , Kenn Rd</a> (Residential /Employment Use )	This objection relates to the non- allocation of the grounds of Portbury House ( a listed building ) for residential/employment use ( mixed use ) The North Somerset Replacement Local Plan allocated this site for employment. This was based on the submission of a masterplan in 2005 and was never the subject of a planning application or

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>		listed building consent. Over 10 years has lapsed since the submission of this master plan. Given this time lapse and the request that residential should be included within the allocation, there is justification that the allocation should be withdrawn as any impact on the listed building needs to be fully reassessed.
Congresbury	<a href="#">Land off Stonewall Grove Congresbury</a> Size 0.68 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (Site NS0049) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land at Park Farm Congresbury</a> Size: 5.74 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (Site HE14191) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
<a href="#">View Additional sites put forward for development</a>		has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land west of Brinsea Rd Congresbury</a> Size 3.4 hectares 51 dwellings	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14352) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village and had poor links to facilities. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land at Wrington Lane Congresbury</a> <a href="#">Land at Wrington Lane Congresbury (2)</a> 3.42 hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14181) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
	<a href="#">Land east of Brinsea Rd Congresbury</a> 1.4 hectares 30 dwellings	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14227) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village and had poor links to facilities. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
Easton-in-Gordano/Pill	<a href="#">Land at Pill Green Land between village and A369</a> Approx 60 hectares	This site lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
	<p><a href="#">Plummers Hill Easton in Gordano</a> Land between the village and M5 Service Station 8.8 Hectares</p>	<p>This site lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016</p>
Hutton	<p>Land to north of Oldmixon Rd between Hutton and Weston-super-Mare  <a href="#">Land to north of Oldmixon Rd between Hutton and Weston-super-Mare (1)</a>  <a href="#">Land to the north of Oldmixon Rd between Hutton and Weston-super-Mare(2)</a>  <a href="#">Land to the north of Oldmixon Rd between Hutton and Weston-super-Mare (3)</a>  16.18 Hectares</p>	<p>This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14190) It was considered that the development of the site would result in coalescence with the infill village of Hutton and affect the Strategic Gap between the settlements Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
Kenn	<a href="#">Land at Stonehouse Kenn</a> 0.24 Hectares	Kenn is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy In addition it is below 0.5ha which is the threshold chosen for allocating development sites
Kewstoke	<a href="#">Land south of Lower Norton Lane Kewstoke</a> 10 Hectares	This site is not considered suitable for inclusion as it is distant from facilities in Weston-super-Mare and Kewstoke. It is also not adjacent to either settlement boundary and there would be an adverse landscape impact
	<a href="#">Land off Sand Rd Kewstoke ( Tourism Development )</a> 18.5 Hectares	Proposals for holiday accommodation are assessed against Policy DM57 of the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 Development management Policies. It is considered this proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		of the country side and its impact on the highway network would have to be carefully assessed
	<p><a href="#">Land south of Crookes Lane</a> ( Primary School Reservation) 1.5 hectares</p> <p>See Primary Scholl Reservation at Kewstoke</p>	<p>The current Kewstoke school site is undersized and inappropriate. If there were to be any new homes in Kewstoke in the future, the pupils would need to attend local provision and it is planned that the current Kewstoke school would need to be relocated and expanded to meet this need on this site</p> <p>Unless alternative location for future provision is found, this land should remain as a secured school site to meet future need.</p>
Locking	<p><a href="#">Land south east of Locking Parklands</a> 115 dwellings 3.9 hectares</p>	<p>This site forms the southern half of Site NS0108 which has been previously assessed. There are potential noise constraints associated with this site and the Grumplepill Rhyne (Site of Nature Conservation Interest) borders the site In addition the site is within the “green buffer “ as shown in the Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document and has the need for a dark</p>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		<p>corridor to cross the site in order to assist bat foraging. Detailed investigations would be required to establish if these constraints could be overcome and the site suitable for development. This should be assessed through a planning application. Any such planning application would also be judged against the revised Core Strategy Policies CS29 and 30 which subject to certain criteria allows development beyond Weston's settlement boundaries if below 75 dwellings</p>
	<p><a href="#">Locking Parklands Eastern Expansion</a> Site Size: 25 ha</p>	<p><b>This site has been reassessed in more detail due to the submission of a planning application. It is now considered that the landscape and noise objections can be overcome by careful design and layout. The site has a capacity of 250 dwellings and will be added to the Locking Parklands allocation rather than identified separately. In this way it is clear that the development of the site will</b></p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		<b>need to conform to the Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document</b>
	<a href="#">Land west of Locking Parklands ( former Moss land )</a> 7.2 ha	This site lies within the “green buffer” as identified in the Weston Villages SPD and also within the strategic gap proposed in this plan. There is therefore a landscape impact and inappropriate for site to be allocated
	<a href="#">Land at Laneys Drove between Locking and Weston-super-Mare</a> 115 dwellings 60 bed hotel	This site forms part of the strategic gap between Locking and Weston-super-Mare which helps to maintain the separate identity and character of Locking and prevent coalescence.
	<a href="#">Elm Grove Nursery Locking</a> 6.76 hectares 146 dwellings	Locking is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy
Long Ashton	<a href="#">Ashton Vale on edge of Bristol</a>	This area lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
Nailsea	<a href="#">Land at Battens Farm St Mary's Grove , Nailsea</a>	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14365 and HE14164) It was considered that the development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the countryside given its prominent corner position. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land to the south of Nailsea</a>	The development of this site could adversely affect Nature Conservation interests at Backwell Lake. It also lies within the strategic gap between

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		Backwell and Nailsea and will have a detrimental impact on the landscape Part of the site lies within the flood plain. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Youngwood Farm, Youngwood Lane Nailsea</a> 23.57 Hectares	This greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14126) It was considered that the development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape and is too distant from facilities Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Weston College Site Nailsea Town Centre</a>	The Council have received a planning application for 28 residential units (15/P/0977/O) on this site . Although yet to be determined it does demonstrate that the site is not large enough to



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		make a significant contribution to the housing supply problem
	<a href="#">Hannah More park and allotments Nailsea</a>	These community use are protected by Policy DM68 of the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 Development Management Policies and without suitable alternative provision it would be inappropriate to allocate them for development
	<a href="#">Car park to west of Crown Glass Shopping Centre</a> ( Retail use )	This car park is within the defined Town Centre area for Nailsea Town Centre (See Policy DM60 of the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 Development Management Policies). Under this policy retail development is supported in principle subject to detailed criteria including the retention or increase in the amount and quality of public car parking spaces. This would have to be demonstrated through a detailed planning application rather than a site allocation
	<a href="#">Land north of Nailsea , north of Greenfield Crescent</a> Size : 27 hectares (Suggested for 600 dwellings and 2 hectares of employment land along with strategic	This site lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
	green buffers and significant areas of community open space. )	amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
Portbury	<a href="#">Shipway Farm (Employment Use )</a>	This area of land lies within the Green Belt. . In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016 .As a result of the emerging Joint Spatial Plan there may be a requirement to review the green belt to meet housing and employment needs up to 2036
	<a href="#">Three sites on the edge of Portbury</a> Plan 1: Land off the High Street, Portbury = 0.36ha	These sites lie within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
	Plan 2: Land off Martcombe Road opposite Rectory Road, Easton-in-Gordano 1.8ha Plan 3: Land off Mill Lane, south of Mill Close, Portbury = 2.2ha	amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
Portishead/Clevedon	<a href="#">Land between Clevedon and Portishead</a> ( not site specific)	This area lies within the Green Belt. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) allocates sufficient land to meet Core Strategy targets without the need to amend the Green Belt. In accordance with Para 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF,) exceptional circumstances do not exist to warrant a review of the Green Belt and this position was supported by the Inspector at the hearing into the remitted Core Strategy policies in June 2016
Sandford	Land off Hill Rd, Sandford - three sites: Site 1 <a href="#">End of Roman Rd</a> 4.765 Hectares	Sandford is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of these greenfield

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
	<p>Site 2 (<a href="#">Land rear of Washbrook, Hill Rd</a>) 1.02 Hectares</p> <p>Site 3 (<a href="#">End of Roman Rd (East )</a>) 0.59 Hectares</p>	sites which lie outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy. Site 1 (NS0113) and Site 3 (NS0118) have already been assessed and found unsuitable for the above reason
	<p><a href="#">Land between Greenhill Rd and Sandmead Rd Sandford</a></p> <p>5.77 Hectares</p>	<p>Sandford is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy</p> <p>This site has already been assessed ( NS0117) and was considered unsuitable for the above reason</p>
	<p><a href="#">Land east of Sandford School between Greenhill Rd and Sandford Rd</a></p> <p>2.6 hectares</p> <p>80 dwellings</p>	Sandford is an infill village where only small scale development is appropriate due to the lack of local facilities. The development of this greenfield site which lies outside of the settlement boundary is

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a>  NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a>
		not in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy
Weston-super-Mare		
	<a href="#">Land to the north east of Weston-super-Mare</a> (mixed use ) 121.21 Hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1472) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the landscape and have potential access problems. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets. This is a large site and is best considered as part of the emerging Joint Spatial Plan which looks ahead to 2036.
	<a href="#">Land to the east of the M5 Weston-super-Mare</a> (mixed use )  Two sites put forward: North of A370 = 16.7 Hectares	Both of these large sites lie to the east of the M5 located within the flood zone and are divorced from existing facilities. There would also be an adverse impact on the undeveloped and open countryside to the east of the M5 and further pressure on Junction 21 of the M5. Sufficient land

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
	South of A370 = 91.8 Hectares	has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets and it is more appropriate for such large sites to be considered as part of the emerging Joint Spatial Plan which looks ahead to 2036
	<a href="#">Land off Ebdon Rd Weston-super-Mare</a> 0.9 Hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1471) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the landscape. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land at Lynchmead Farm Ebdon Rd Weston-super-Mare</a> 10.7 Hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1470) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the landscape and potentially with other sites have

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		an adverse cumulative impact on the surrounding roads. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land to the south of the West Wick Roundabout Weston-super-Mare (employment use)</a> 5.5 Hectares	This site is within the Helicopter Safeguarding Zone and also the landscape buffer surrounding Weston Villages . Both of which are defined in the Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document The site is also constrained by the Grumplepill Ryne Site of Nature Conservation Interest. All of these constraints act against the site being allocated for employment development
	<a href="#">Land at Crabtree , Lower Norton Lane Weston-super-Mare</a> 5.45 Hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14370) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the landscape and potentially with other sites have an adverse cumulative impact on the surrounding roads. .Sufficient land has been

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Hutton Moor Playing Fields</a> 12.6 hectares	<p>Policy DM 68 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies does allow for the development of playing fields provided “ alternative provision of at least equivalent community benefit is made available in the same vicinity”</p> <p>Any subsequent proposal can be judged against this policy and until further work/justification is undertaken the playing fields will remain unallocated</p>
	<a href="#">Land at Greenways Farm North Worle</a> <a href="#">Land at Greenways Farm North Worle (Tetlow King )</a> 3.2 hectares	<p>Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1469) It was considered that the development of the site would adversely affect the landscape and potentially with other sites have an adverse cumulative impact on the surrounding roads. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets</p>



<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
Winscombe	<a href="#">Land west of Sandford Rd Winscombe</a> 2.5 hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1428) It was considered that the site was too distant from facilities and with other sites would have an adverse cumulative impact on the surrounding roads...Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy targets
	<a href="#">Land north of Hillyfields Farm Winscombe</a> 5.063 Hectares	This site is within the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where in accordance with the NPPF and Policy DM11 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies development will need to conserve and, where possible, enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. On these grounds alone this site is not considered suitable for inclusion
	<a href="#">Shipham Lane, Winscombe</a> Size 0.8 Hectares 24 dwellings	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1453) It was considered that

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village, harm views from the AONB and with other sites would have an adverse cumulative impact on the surrounding roads. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy
	<a href="#">Coombe Farm Sandford Rd Winscombe</a>	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE1431) It was considered that the site would adversely affect the rural setting of the village, harm views from the AONB and with other sites would have an adverse cumulative impact on the surrounding roads. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy
Wrington	<a href="#">Gatcombe Farm Wrington</a>	This site is not considered to be Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt. In addition it is remote from village facilities at Wrington and has poor pedestrian and cycle links

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
	<a href="#">Land at Cox's Green Wrington</a> 3.8 Hectares 59 dwellings	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14179) It was considered that the scale of development proposed was excessive for a village of this size, especially as remote from most village services, even though close to existing employment. Narrow roads also leading to the village. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy Housing requirements
	<a href="#">Land to the west of Garston's Orchard Wrington</a> 1.5 Hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site NS0120) It is considered that development of the site would adversely affect the rural setting of village and the conservation area . Narrow roads leading to village Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy
Yatton	<a href="#">Land at Stowey Rd Yatton</a> 3.9 Hectares	Part of this greenfield site has been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14186). It was considered

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		that development of this site would be an intrusion into countryside have the potential to increase congestion in High St be some distance to rail station and is in close proximity to a wildlife site Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy
	<a href="#">Yatton Rugby Ground</a> 2.4 Hectares (approx. 85 dwellings )	This site is closer to facilities and the railway station than allocated sites. However, without a firm commitment and guarantee of equivalent pitches being made available prior to development, it would not be prudent to allocate this site for development. The site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary for Yatton and the most appropriate way forward would be concurrent planning applications for the development of the site and the provision of replacement pitches. This will enable the two to be linked and a full assessment of the standard of replacement pitches to be assessed.

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
	<a href="#">Land adjacent to Stowells Concrete between Wemberham Lane and end of Arnolds Way north west Yatton ( employment use )</a> 4.02 Hectares	Although the provision of additional employment land in Yatton would be welcomed, the extra traffic in particular HGV's would put increasing pressure on the High Street and surrounding roads
	<a href="#">Land at Rectory Farm Yatton</a> 14.48 Hectares 250-350 dwellings	These greenfield sites have been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (site HE14350 and HE1417). It was considered that development of these sites would be an intrusion into countryside have the potential to increase congestion in High St, in close proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest and within a flood zone. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy
	<a href="#">The Batch West of Mendip Rd Yatton</a> Approx 15 Hectares ( estimated ) 500 dwellings	These greenfield sites have been assessed previously as part of the potential residential sites assessments (sites HE14349 and HE1488 ). It was considered that development of these sites

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		<p>would be an intrusion into countryside, be within the flood zone, have the potential to increase congestion in High St, and be in close proximity to a wildlife site. Part of the sites are to remain allocated for strategic open space and a Primary School. Sufficient land has been identified in the SAP to meet Core Strategy Housing requirements</p>
	<a href="#">Chestnut Farm Yatton</a> Size: 1.5 hectares	<p>Additional greenfield development over and above that proposed at Yatton through the Site Allocations Plan will only increase pressure on the surrounding road network and will be resisted until further improvements to road and pedestrian safety are undertaken.</p>
	<a href="#">Land to the west of Chestnut Farm , Northend Yatton</a> Approx 10 dwellings	<p>Additional greenfield development over and above that proposed at Yatton through the Site Allocations Plan will only increase pressure on the surrounding road network and will be resisted until</p>

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Council's Response</u></b>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		further improvements to road and pedestrian safety are undertaken.
	<a href="#">Land opposite Brick House Farm , Northend Yatton</a> 0.4 hectares	This site is below the 0.5 hectare threshold to be identified in the Site Allocation Plan and would also require a sizable extension of the settlement boundary to make it compliant with the Core Strategy policy CS32 (as proposed to be modified ) In addition the site access is very narrow and could potentially lead to vehicles having to wait on the busy B3133 to enter the site
	<a href="#">Boxbush Farm Northend Yatton</a> (Redevelopment of the redundant farm yard of about 2 acres for commercial purposes )	This site would benefit from redevelopment and proposals can be determined under policies in the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies. The site therefore does not need to be allocated for development
	<a href="#">Land at Bridge Ground Yatton</a> (Playing fields with community facilities and a small commercial zone ) Approx 14 hectares	It is presumed that this site is planned to provide replacement pitches for Yatton RFC if their pitches are developed for residential purposes. It is essential therefore that they are of a better or equal standard and can be provided prior to the

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Summary of Responses</u>	<u>Council's Response</u>
Additional Sites put forward for development	There were 94 additional sites put forward for development ( all for residential unless indicated otherwise )	<p>To view the additional sites put forward see <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>NB Those suggested sites smaller than 10 dwellings or 0.5 ha, in the Green Belt or adjacent to villages with no Settlement Boundary e.g. Blagdon have not been individually assessed. Where appropriate each of the new suggested sites have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal and the assessments can be viewed <a href="#">Here</a></p>
		<p>loss of the pitches. This is in order to meet Sport England's requirements. At present this information is unknown and it would be unwise to allocate this site without the necessary information and Sport England's comments.</p> <p>As mentioned above the most appropriate way forward would be concurrent planning applications for the development of the rugby pitches and the provision of replacement pitches. This will enable the two to be linked and a full assessment of the standard of replacement pitches to be undertaken.</p> <p>The provision of playing fields and community facilities outside settlement boundaries is permissible under Policy DM69 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies. Any additional commercial development can be considered against Policy DM53 of the Sites and Policies Part 1 Development Management Policies</p>





# Sites Allocations Plan

(Consultation draft)



North Somerset Council has produced the above plan which allocates land for development and protects important green spaces throughout the district.

We are interested in your views, so come along to the following drop in sessions to find out what is happening in your town or village

The consultation period is from **Thursday 10 March to Thursday 28 April 2016**

For further information go to [www.n-somerset.gov.uk/sitesandpolicies](http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/sitesandpolicies)

Monday	21 March	4-7pm	Weston Library
Tuesday	22 March	4-7pm	Nailsea Library
Wednesday	23 March	4.30-7pm	Churchill Primary School
Thursday	24 March	4-7pm	Portishead Library
Tuesday	29 March	4-7pm	Clevedon Library
Wednesday	30 March	4-7pm	Congresbury School Rooms
Thursday	31 March	4-7pm	Yatton Library
Monday	4 April	4-7 pm	Winscombe Community Centre

