1 Flood Risk Sequential Test Errata

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This errata note relates to Site Series 138 within the Flood Risk Sequential Test which is land East of Banwell at Eastermead Lane and Riverside.

1.2 Site Series 138

- 1.2.1 Series 138 comprises SHLAA sites HE201055 and HE20195.
- 1.2.2 Site HE201055 relates to Land at Eastermead Lane which is 10.7ha in size and which has an estimated total capacity of 300 homes, with 135 expected to be delivered over the plan period.
- 1.2.3 Site HE20195 relates to Land East of Riverside which is 4.8ha in size and has an estimated total capacity of 145 homes, with 30 expected to be delivered over the plan period.

| Site | Area | Total Capacity | Plan Period Capacity |
|----------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|
| HE201055 | 10.7ha | 300 | 135 |
| HE20195 | 4.8ha | 145 | 30 |
| Total | 15.5ha | 445 | 165 |

1.3 2024 FRST

1.3.1 The Stantec FRST submitted in 2024 (CD.B7) mistakenly calculated the total site area as 6.42ha rather than 15.5ha. This error arose as a result of adding together the site areas of HE201056 (1.6ha) with HE20195 (4.8ha) rather than HE201055, to get a total of 6.4ha. As a result of this, Site Series 138 was discounted through the FRST as being too small to accommodate the appeal proposals and was an 'Appendix C' site. This assessment carried through to my evidence presented to this appeal.

1.4 Assessment of Series 138

1.4.1 I have subsequently reviewed this series again. The FRST submitted with the planning application in 2023 (CD.A12) discussed this series at paragraphs 1.41-1.43 of Appendix 4 which state:

The east of Banwell at Eastermead Lane and East of Riverside (entries 121 and 124) are two sites with estimated capacities of 300 and 145 dwellings respectively. The site at Eastermead Lane is partially intersected by the proposed Banwell Bypass, with other areas of the site earmarked for environmental mitigation for landscape integration and a construction compound area. Approximately half of the site lies within the red line boundary of the Bypass application, which in addition to the construction compound, significantly reduces the capacity of the site, particularly in the short term.

The plans submitted with the Bypass application show the existing road to the south (A368) to be removed and landscaped. Access to the remaining land at Eastermead Lane would therefore not be possible as a standalone site and would only be feasible through the land to the East of Riverdale. This would be challenging as Riverside is accessed via

Church Street, both of which are very narrow roads and are likely to have capacity constraints.

The site also contains overhead powerlines which reduce capacity further and listed buildings in close proximity, the setting of which would need to be considered as part of any application. These sites would therefore not be sequentially preferable to the application site as they could not reasonably accommodate the proposal at the envisaged time of development.

- 1.4.2 I have checked this site against the above and its relationship to the Banwell Bypass CPO and planning permission (NSC Ref: 22/P/1768/R3EIA). Planning permission was granted on 16th March 2023 and Site Location Plan 3 of 9 (as attached) shows the Series 138. It shows that the Bypass application boundary extends into site HE201055 meaning only part of the site could be available for development. I have calculated the residual area of the site that is not covered by the Banwell Bypass planning permission to be 4.3ha. When considered with site HE20195 (4.8ha), the total site area, excluding the Bypass permission area, would be 9.1ha.
- 1.4.3 9.1ha is below the lower threshold of site or series size required to accommodate the appeal proposals, as set out in Section 9 of my Proof of Evidence and Section 3 of Appendix KV.9 to my Evidence.
- 1.4.4 I therefore consider that Series 138 cannot accommodate the appeal proposals on the basis of the development of the approved Banwell Bypass through part of the site. This site is therefore not reasonably available and the conclusion of my evidence therefore remains unchanged.